

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

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1874.

ART. I.—1. *Histoire du Synode Général de l'Église Réformée de France.* Paris: Juin-Juillet, 1872. Par EUGÈNE BERSIER. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher. 1872.

2. *L'Évangéliste, Journal Religieux.* Nos. 48, 49, et 50. 1874.

3. *Le Christianisme au XIX^e Siècle. Journal de l'Église Réformée de France.*

WE left M. Laurens speaking on the legal competency of the Synod. He had just traced the steps of the upward march of the Church towards the recovery of perfect autonomy. He proceeded to examine and demolish the remaining objections to the validity of the authorisation accorded to the Synod by the Government; demonstrated that the State had acted within its right in summoning the delegates there; that the decree of 1871 was perfectly legal, and that the Synod assembled under its authorisation was as perfectly competent to accomplish the work which it had been summoned to perform.

“ We have been reminded by M. Jalabert that this is no new question; for that it had been deliberated on in the Consistory of Nancy, in 1868. Yes, gentlemen! I hasten to acknowledge, and to thank him for the opportunity thus given me of speaking here of the report which he presented to that assembly, and whose conclusions that assembly adopted. He demanded a Constituent Synod, nominated by an electoral body of ninety thousand electors, divided into ninety districts, to be determined by the sole will of

the Minister [of State]. But as this project had no warrant, either in the discipline or in the Law of 1802, or in the organic scheme of the Official Synod of 1848, or in the decree of 1852, M. Jalabert, to whom belongs the sole merit of the conception, was reduced, in order to make it binding, to the necessity of appealing to the Emperor. 'What no one can deny,' said he in that report, 'is that His Sacred Majesty the Emperor has a right to take the initiative, of the time and extent of which he in his great wisdom must be the sole judge.' Be it so, M. Jalabert! But then, what do you make of the autonomy of the Church? Why did you not ask that it should be first of all consulted? How comes it that you are now so intent upon the moral authority of the present Synod, which nevertheless represents the Church, and is simply assembled to restore to it self-government, when in 1868 you were so lax in regard to this chief point that, without even consulting the Church, you cast the principle of its autonomy under the feet of imperial omnipotence?"—*Report*, pp. 53, 54.

As to the plea that the Church had not been sufficiently consulted, what had she been doing for sixty-six years but express her wishes on the great question of the day? In 1848 the whole Church had risen up with one consent to demand and to form the Official Synod. That Synod was nominated only by Consistories composed in the manner prescribed in 1802. Yet no one would deny to it, in spite of this original defect, that moral authority which is, nevertheless, refused to the present Synod, appointed by Consistories themselves elected by the free choice of all the electors of the Church. Scruples raised by the spirit of law and the rights of the Church were worthy of all respect; but they should be consistent and uniform, not deemed in some cases superfluous while indispensable in others. Either the Synod could do everything the Church required, or nothing; either it was sovereign in the fulfilment of its commission, or it was impotent in the very smallest matters. If the Commission was morally and legally insufficient, everything done under it must be vitiated. In nature, the fruit always partook of the good or bad qualities of the plant that bore it; in law, the validity of any act of a commissioner always depended on the validity of his commission; so that the Synod was as incompetent to pass the electoral law as to do anything else; and thus matters were brought to the *reductio ad absurdum* of being unable to move at all. What, in such a case, would be thought of the Synod by the Church, the Government, public opinion, and the whole Christian world?

"In acting thus, we shall strip ourselves in our own country, as well as before foreigners, of every species of moral authority. Ah, gentlemen! what would completely deprive us of it would be to make of this assembly, the object of so many good wishes, so many hopes, and on which are concentrated at this moment so many regards and prayers, a kind of Synodio abortion, unconscious of its right, uncertain on its march, recoiling from its duty, and, I venture to say, almost ashamed of its very self. No, gentlemen, it ought not, it cannot, it will not commit this moral suicide."—*Ibid.* p. 59.

This clear, well-reasoned, and telling speech produced an immense effect, especially on the Right, by whom its best points were keenly appreciated and repeatedly applauded. The speaker sat down amid vociferous cheers, which lasted for some time.

The two addresses thus summarised embodied the main arguments on either side. Several very able men took part in the discussion. The venerable Guizot lent the weight of his name to the Evangelical cause; and, after three days' debate, the Synod came to its first decisive and critical vote. M. Jalabert embodied the views of the Left in the following order of the day:—

"The assembly, called to declare itself on its character and prerogatives, acknowledges that the electoral bases adopted for its convocation do not fully secure the representation in its bosom of all the tendencies of French Protestantism, in proportion to their relative importance. But with this reservation, it considers itself in its different sections to be in relation to the Government the authorised organ of the needs, the wishes, and the sentiments of the different parties in the Church, and to be called, as respects the Protestant communities, to perform a work of union and pacification under the inspiration of Jesus Christ, the head of the invisible Church, in fellowship with whom it would labour for the advancement of the kingdom of God in all truth and charity."—*Ibid.* Vol. I. p. 98.

M. Pernassin proposed the following amendment:—

"Considering that the present General Synod has been convoked, and is assembled in conformity with the laws and decrees which have governed the Reformed Church of France since its re-establishment: Considering that the convocation and election of the said General Synod recognise and consecrate the liberties and the autonomy of the Reformed Church of France in religious matters: Considering that the elections to the present General Synod were made in full freedom, with the concurrence of all the religious authorities called to take part in them, and that the right of the Reformed Church of France to modify, if necessary, its internal religious government,

especially its electoral system as respects its future Synods, remains entire and freely conserved : passes to the order of the day."—*Ibid.* Vol. I. pp. 93, 94.

In the brief discussion which followed these formal proposals, the most forcible speech was that of M. Bois, Professor of Hebrew in the Theological College of Montauban, hitherto little known except as a scholar and preacher, but who shone conspicuously in this Synod as a debater. He objected to M. Jalabert's resolution on the general grounds that it was deficient in precision and frankness and said nothing of many important points which had been raised in the general discussion. For instance, the legality of the Synod itself, which had occupied a foremost place in the debate, was not even named in the resolution. Moreover, it was impossible that all theological tendencies should be represented in the Synod. Whatever mode of election might be adopted, the majority must govern, or there would never be any government. Besides, the proposal contradicted itself. On the one hand, it confessed that the Synod was not an exact representation of Protestantism ; on the other, it called it "the authorised organ of the needs, wishes," &c. How could that be, if its validity were doubtful ? And what of that strange phrase, "its different sections ?" What would the Government do, when five or six "sections" expressed their "needs and wishes ?" To which would it listen ? If the Assembly had any right to speak at all, it could only do so by its majority. These views prevailed ; and, after a little skirmishing, and one or two attempts to frame some compromise, M. Jalabert, "in the interests of peace and conciliation," withdrew his resolution, and the Assembly voted straight for or against that of M. Pernissen, which was carried by a majority of sixteen. The orthodox party justly regarded this as a great triumph. The Synod, by a decisive vote, had declared itself duly constituted ; and it was now evident that, in the great and critical struggle immediately impending, the majority would be able to rescue the faith from the hands of Unitarians and Deists.

On the following day—Thursday, June 13th—the great conflict began. M. Bois had given notice of a motion embodying the Confession of Faith. In the meantime, the Left and the Left Centre had each deposited a memorial expressive of its own views ; the former contending for the allowance of absolute liberty of opinion in the Church, and

the latter a strangely indefinite document, interlarded with Scriptures, which, as concerned its apparent purpose, were wholly irrelevant. It was a plea for peace, but not for peace founded on truth. The proposal of M. Bois was in the following terms :—

“ At the moment of resuming the succession of its Synods, interrupted for so many years, the Reformed Church recognises the duty, above all things, of offering thanks to God, and of testifying its love to Jesus Christ its Divine Head, who has sustained it during the period of its trials. It declares that it remains faithful to the principles of faith and liberty on which it was founded ; with its fathers and martyrs in the Confession of Rochelle, with all the Churches of the Reformation in their symbols, it proclaims the sovereign authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith, and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ the only Son of God, who died for our offences, and rose again for our justification. It preserves, therefore, and maintains at the foundation of its doctrine, its worship, and its discipline, the great Christian facts represented in its religious solemnities and expressed in its liturgies ; especially the Confession of Sins, the Apostles' Creed, and the Liturgy of the Holy Supper.”—*Report*, Vol. I. pp. 117, 118.

The debate on this great question lasted till June 20th, and called forth many very remarkable speeches : remarkable for learning and intellectual power, for all but uniform courtesy, for the extremes of faith and unbelief expressed, and for the eminent position occupied by many of the speakers. It is, of course, quite out of the question to reproduce with any minuteness so lengthened a discussion. But for many reasons—especially that English readers may obtain a glimpse of the calibre and earnestness of these contending minds—we wish to let one or two of the more remarkable men on each side speak for themselves ; at least, so far as a very condensed summary will permit. M. Bois, the originator of the resolution submitted, opened the debate by reminding the Synod of the greatness of the issue at stake, affecting, in his judgment, “ the life of our souls, the dignity of our consciences, and the very life of our Church.” He maintained that there had never existed a Church without a Confession of Faith. Christians were not born such, they became such ; and among the Reformed a solemn engagement had always been required from catechumens. There could be no bond of union if there were not a common faith ; and this faith must be declared, especially as, after centuries of silence, the Church had

recovered her right to speak out. No one thought of specifying every detail of the faith, or elaborating a minute and comprehensive declaration of it. It was not even proposed to repeat the Confession of Rochelle, that calumniated but beautiful work. But in harmony with it, it was proposed to affirm the authority of the Scriptures, salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, and the Christian facts which are embodied in the liturgies and the sacraments, and accepted by the Protestant people. The speaker then sharply and forcibly contrasted the points at issue, showing that on the Divinity, spotless purity, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, opinions were wide as the poles asunder; that the innovators had not introduced merely certain "shades" of opinion, but had accomplished a revolution of which they often openly boasted; had founded, not indeed a Church, but a new religion, such as never yet had been known, "without dogma, without the supernatural, without prayer." So that the real question at issue was, "Shall the Reformed Church of France change her religion?" All who believed Christianity to be, not the most sublime effort of the human conscience, but a Divine revelation, must declare that the Church would maintain and confess her faith.

M. Pécaut spoke in answer to M. Bois. He read his speech, which must, therefore, have been very deliberately prepared, and has something of the character and importance of a manifesto. After intimating that both parties were animated by the desire to defend "their religious country"—meaning Protestantism—and to keep it for their children, and that it was a strange sight to see independent and serious men hastening so far apart for love of the same spiritual country, he adverted to what he believed to be "the mission of the Synod." First, as to its title, it was not a body of fathers, a council in miniature, but a Protestant Synod, elected in order to express the dominant opinions of the Reformed people who had chosen it. Therefore, it was essentially representative and popular; religious, not theological. There were, as there must be in every active, thoughtful, and sincere society, various parties in the Church: the party of the theology of the sixteenth century at one extreme, that of free thought at the other, and an intermediate party, willing to keep at an equal distance from what they deemed to be a twofold excess. The Protestant people did not

wish any course to be adopted which should remove from the Church any one who belonged to it by birth and free choice. Any course which should do this would sow in the general mind the worst of seeds, namely, discouragement and unbelief. "Protestant society in France distrusts radical novelties; but it equally distrusts theological zeal, and has a horror of the sectarian spirit. Above all, it wishes to live, and feels with certainty that dismemberment would be death." As it is, he contended, it was found hard to live; ideas and faith were not enough to sustain a spiritual society; it must have a number of persons on its side, "a public sufficiently numerous to sustain an earnest movement, with its opposite poles, to create speakers and writers, men of thought and men of action." Still more imperious was the question of permanent recruiting by means of marriages. This was not felt much in large communities or towns, but where Protestants were comparatively few or isolated, every one confessed that many were daily lost by the increasing dispersion of the faithful, who, in the second generation, were absorbed, for the most part, "in the huge Catholic wave," especially through the marriage difficulty. The uniting force being thus enfeebled, that of dispersion was accelerated. Literature, education, marriages, whatever tends to uphold a religious society, became difficult, and often impossible of production. In the Synod there were men who only cared for principles, and for the maintenance of what they held to be divine. M. Pécaut did not think the people went fully with them. They were more alive to practical consequences, and, ruled by "the instinct of living," did not wish to see either victors or vanquished. The mission of the Synod was Conservative, especially so in regard to two sentiments, which were far more cared about than the most venerable doctrines. The former was the Christian sentiment, by which "all are attached in some degree (!) to the person and teaching of the revered Head of the Church, and to primitive tradition." The second was the Protestant sentiment, distinguishing its adherents from all other Christians. The former, under very different dogmatic versions, would lead to repentance, filial piety towards God, spiritual life in communion with Jesus Christ and the universal Church.

"The second, under equally different forms, claims for each believer, in the name of his personal and direct relations with

God, full moral autonomy, the government of his own mind and conscience, independence of all authority, the free interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures themselves."—*Report*, Vol. I. p. 126.

The speaker then said that both the Christian and the critical spirit were found more or less in every Protestant soul, and that the Church, so far as its members were concerned, was neither orthodox nor heterodox, but Christian and Protestant. On this broad and fruitful territory sincere, fraternal, living union was possible, provided they mutually respected each other's liberty, and had faith enough to submit their particular opinions to "a régime of cohabitation and reciprocal toleration." He then admitted that the majority would probably undertake to formulate a confession under either an historical or a dogmatic form, which, in his judgment, would be rather an advantage, provided always that the symbol, even if curtailed, should not be obligatory nor permanent; should bind no one; should borrow all its authority from its intrinsic value, from its own attracting power, or from the moral ascendancy inseparable from an act of the majority; "a testimony worthy of respect, not a chain of slavery." But it was astonishing that an assembly representing such a mixture of beliefs and doubts, vehement aspirations, and so forth, should resume in miniature the work wherein Councils and Synods had miscarried; that, in short, "in imposing upon everyone this little *credo*, under pain of expulsion, it should take away the rights of citizenship from the minorities voluntarily attached to the Church." Where was the objection to maintaining the *status quo* as it had existed since the beginning of the century? It had been said that the régime under which different tendencies dwell together paralyses the normal development of both. M. Pécaut himself once thought that the bringing together in the same Church of two such opposites as supernatural Christianity and Theistic Christianity, was all but impossible; but that arose from his not understanding the essential character and true functions of religious societies. Churches, especially national ones, are not theological, nor strict sects of professors or saints; still less supernatural institutions destined to transmit supernatural sacraments; but rather like a common religious country, wherein community of heart and action might co-exist with diverse doctrinal belief; wherein intellectual diver-

sities might somehow be founded in community of religious sentiment and moral effort; wherein the man of science might, without losing his holy independence, renew his strength in the commerce of the newest belief; wherein the present and the past might meet, interpenetrate, and fertilise one another. He preferred therefore to a dogmatic alliance a religious and practical society, animated, no doubt, by an abiding interior tradition, attached to an immortal name, great memories, an illustrious history, revered books; but open to the spirit of inquiry and reform, and consequently indulgent to differences of doctrine. Why should every little difference give birth to a sect? The two parties were necessary to each other, and the more they interpenetrated each other, the better would it be. "Whether you have need of us or not, we think we have need of you." Separation was the work of a word, a moment; union, of centuries. Separation was easy; union, without confusion, the real difficulty, and the sign of real strength. Suppose "the radicals" were got rid of; who would be included in the number? Not, assuredly, the crowd of indifferent and frivolous people,—they would concede more doctrines than the orthodox desired,—but the most conscientious and sincere among us, such as constituted the strength, the moral reserve of a society; and not pastors only, but serious laymen, devoted to the Protestant family,—flesh of your flesh, bone of your bone,—and for what crime? For having been earnest in their faith. Besides, the suppression of the radicals would not suppress the causes which, in all Protestant Churches had produced a theological or philosophical movement hitherto unparalleled. The doubts of young ministers, the ease of your own consciences, the settlement of the questions of the authority of the Holy Scriptures, of the history of Jesus, of Apostolic doctrine, and of the moral questions at the bottom of these, would not be at all advanced. The crisis of transformation everywhere approaching would simply be troubled by a coarse and violent hand. But suppose what was called "order" were to be re-established in the Church. Probably many would sign compliance, whatever might be suggested; others would quietly leave the Church, and the orthodox would remain masters and at rest. Discord would soon be reproduced within the pale, under the divine impulse of sincerity. And it would soon appear that, if a great

Church wisely governed could endure prolific internal controversies, a reduced one, incessantly assailed by the flood of a hostile majority, could not free itself without running great risks. "Obligatory unity costs individual dignity." The younger clergy might comply meekly, and for a long time, less by choice than by necessity; but their virility will be gone, they will be priests rather than free men. For himself he could not be content to see the destruction, little by little, of that powerful agency of Protestant education by which here, as elsewhere, to-day, as heretofore, *men* are made. They, like many others, owed to that education all they were worth. If this should disappear from their dear country just when it was most needed, their children would pay the penalty.

"Abandoned to demi-Ultramontanes, delivered to all the perils of a growing isolation which is already grievously felt on a thousand sides, they will one day bitterly reproach us for not having made the utmost efforts to save the integrity of the Protestant family; you will have destroyed at one blow, by your shortsighted zeal, both our spiritual city and one of the only established moral influences which still subsist in France."—*Report*, Vol. I. p. 137.

This clever and eloquent, but shallow and sophistical, appeal to sentiment, produced a thrilling effect, and was vehemently applauded by the Left, as was also that of Gaufres, conceived in a similar spirit. On the other hand, let us give the substance of the speech of M. Gustave Delmas, in answer to M. Pécant's appeal to the younger clergy. He said that being, as they were, in the presence of three declarations of faith or principle, every one must feel that it was impossible to keep silence. An awakened Church was like a new-born child, and must utter a cry. Men would believe that Confessions of Faith would strangle Churches, when the life of the great and fervent Churches of Scotland, Switzerland, Holland, and the United States had been explained to them,—a life under the so-called mortal *régime* of Confessions of Faith. The Confession now proposed was said to be not explicit and precise enough. What if it had been made fuller? Then the orthodox would have been accused of wishing to dogmatise everything; now, it seems they have not done enough. The proposed declaration was not sufficiently popular! What would be popular enough? The shred of talk from the other side about the resurrection, their theories about the

higher life in God? The declaration is merely the simplest account of the life and work of Jesus Christ. Was that not popular? If it be asked what use was proposed to be made of it, he would answer unhesitatingly that he would not impose it on every believer, but would require every one who aspired to become a teacher in the Church to accept the charter of the Church. The functionaries of a nation must accept the constitution; the soldiers in an army must swear by its flag; and the members of the Church must adhere to its faith. Oppression? Was any one compelled to enter the Church? Any one who no longer partook of its faith could go to some other founded on his own principles. The liberals attacked liberty by trying to prevent their opponents saying what they believed to be the truth. After what had been said in this discussion, it might almost be asked, whether there is any truth. Much had been said of a series of imperceptible "shades" on one point or another; but no one had clearly said, "This is true, and that is false."

Such a Church as the Left proposed would give access to everybody; would have no door, nor fence; would be a thoroughfare where people would go and come, enter and depart, as they listed. On the ground now pleaded, the pastor might teach what he pleased; he would be his own authority. He would preach in his own name. Under him the Church would consist of *disjecta membra*. A new catholicism would be invented, composed of all who have "religious sentiments;" that is, of all mankind. At bottom the so-called Church was humanity at large—a notion which did violence to common sense.

"You would impose on us the *status quo*. I protest against the *status quo*. It cannot last any longer. An association founded on the juxtaposition of contraries cannot be accepted; and does not everything warn you that the situation has become cruel, intolerable, and must be absolutely remedied? I protest against the *status quo* in the name of the moral sense. I cannot approve of that state of things which you profess to sanction. It is for me a duty of conscience. I wish to save my responsibility. It is immoral to impose on us the conjoint responsibility of ideas which we hold to be anti-Christian, and which we repudiate. I protest against the *status quo* in the name of the liberty of the Churches, which are absolutely sacrificed to the good pleasure of the pastor; for, in fact, our flocks would, on your system, be at the mercy of as many Popes as there are pastors. Every pastor could, if he pleased, attack convictions the most sacred, the dearest, to men's consciences;

and yet you dare to speak of the liberty of the Churches, obliged to accept all that in silence and in impotence."—*Report*, Vol. I. pp. 247, 248.

The Right had been called *doctrinaire*, and accused of misconceiving facts. Were not the facts everywhere? in the bosom of the flock, from the height of pulpits where what is affirmed to-day is denied to-morrow? Was that an edifying sight? Would not Catholicism triumph, if the Church should prove incapable of getting rid of its impotence, of affirming anything? And could it be thought that the atheism about which there was so much concern would be reconciled by maintaining the *status quo*?

"At bottom, when I seek to designate you by a common name, I can only characterise your 'tendency' by the word 'indetermination;' and that reminds me of what I heard said by a pastor who had denied in his sermon the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Called to explain the above before his Consistory, which had the audacity to object in the name of the Church, he replied, 'I shall not explain myself; you have no right to interrogate me. What do I say? I have not the right to interrogate myself.'"—*Report*, Vol. I. pp. 248, 249.

Such a system would entail the most radical impotence, and condemn to abortion. Public attention might be occupied and interested,—talent would always effect that,—but no work would be done. The speaker wound up in noble and memorable words:—

"I declare to you that the *status quo* cannot last any longer. I declare it in the name of a whole section of the younger clergy, who have said to us, 'We must, at any price, get out of this situation!' Certainly, it is a great proof of the vitality of Protestantism that it has been able to subsist under conditions that would have been fatal to any other society. But we must no longer imagine that this can last. We are bound; we are no more united. That is the truth; and I am happy to have affirmed it, for the repose of my conscience and the comfort of my soul."—*Report*, Vol. I. p. 249.

This unmistakable and trenchant address drew forth cheer after cheer from the Right, and must inspire in the heart of every lover of the Gospel the highest hopes for the future of the French Reformed Church. M. Delmas was followed by M. Colani, who had been pastor and Professor of Theology at Strasbourg before the war, but sat in the Synod as a layman. He once signed himself, "I am no

longer a pastor, thank God!" and is, perhaps, the most able and unscrupulous defender of the advanced liberal school. His speech occupies five-and-thirty pages of the printed Report, and is hardly susceptible of abridgment for our purpose. Suffice it to say that it is as cold-blooded a piece of theological dissection—we might almost say vivisection—as we ever read. Scalpel in hand, he cuts and slashes, not only through the proposed Confession, but through the most venerable Christian symbols; and fastens on the Apostles' Creed especially, not sparing to scrape to the very bone in his remorseless "demonstration." It is an admonitory and most affecting sign of what can come of the mere intellectual man, from whose eyes are hidden the things which are clearly "revealed unto babes."

Two other speeches demand some attention; the one on account of its extraordinary—we might say its exulting—acknowledgment of heterodoxy on every vital point of theology, the other for the venerable age and high position of the speaker, and for the philosophic breadth and calmness which he brought to the discussion. The former speaker was M. Athanase Coquerel; the latter, M. Guizot. In epitomising M. Coquerel's address, and giving one or two characteristic passages from it, we deem it right to caution our readers against being prejudiced by its apparent flippancy and even irreverence. We are persuaded that this is only apparent; and though his remarks would be hardly to the spiritual taste of devout English readers, he does not appear to have spoken consciously in a trivial or unbecoming spirit. He began by disavowing any intention to wound the most delicate susceptibilities, and apologised beforehand for any word that might be likely to produce that effect; but assumed that all he had to say could not be equally agreeable to all his hearers,—a remark which drew forth many sympathising and concurring exclamations. He expressed grave apprehension lest a year after Frenchmen had been fighting Frenchmen in civil war, "in presence of the foreigner encamped upon a great part of our territory," a similar spectacle should be presented by the Reformed Church in face of the external foe. The two enemies of Protestantism were Ultramontanism and Atheism: priests becoming more and more powerful on the one hand, raising themselves above the law and imposing the will of one man upon all consciences; and on the other hand, the Atheism of the street, penetrating

everywhere and affecting every class and age. The great mass of men rejected Atheism; but they could not believe in the dogmas of Papal Infallibility and the Immaculate Conception. They rejected Romanism because of its attacks upon human liberty. Neither orthodox nor Liberals in that Synod differed upon a point like that. If any one therefore should attempt to impose on them anything which they knew to be false, neither talent, nor genius, nor glory, nor authority, would succeed in the attempt; and the words of M. Guizot to the Protestants would receive new confirmation,—“You are essentially opponents; you have never been subdued.” Yet see the situation now produced. What was M. Bois’ Confession? Only the opinion of the orthodox? As such, it was no doubt deserving of profound respect. If it were only their flag, “the standard of the Cross,” the speaker could respectfully salute it, though by no means on his knees. But, if it were to be a sword drawn from the scabbard to cut into the quick and cleave in two the Church, the situation became very different. It was the sword of Damocles hung over their heads, and yet they were asked to deliberate calmly. Why had they so little influence among the floating mass around them? True, every year men were added to the Protestant ranks, whether orthodox or Liberal; but why did not the Church make greater encroachments on it? In his judgment there were two reasons. In the first place, a Church had only a certain amount of force, of life, of time, at her disposal; if that were expended in “miserable quarrels,” there would be so much less for the service of God and man. In the next place, there was a sad lack of that spirit which caused the Carpenter of Nazareth to be moved with pity when He saw the multitudes as sheep without a shepherd. M. Guizot had advised them to be liberal. The speaker was always glad when the word “liberal” was found to be so beautiful that its adversaries were eager to adopt it; but he had further said, “Be not radical.” M. Coquerel would reply, “Gentlemen, if you would serve your country and your Church, be not doctrinaires!” Doctrinairism was that spirit which judges everything according to a preconceived and irrevocable system, and governs according to abstraction without sufficiently considering facts. Now there were three facts in the present instance of special importance. In the first place, there was the exist-

ence of the Liberal party. The Confession could not be that of the Church, because many now in the Church could not possibly adopt it as their own. There had always been Liberals in the Church, such as Jean Fabre, Daillé, Blondel, d'Amirault, Casaubon, Charles du Moulin, and "the most illustrious of the Reformers, Zwingli himself." Of course his friends on the right would say, "Would to God your heresies were not graver than these!" But the heresy of the time always appeared the greatest of all. It had been so in the past, and would be so in the future. There had always been two currents of thought in the Church, a Right and a Left; and just as past heresies appeared to the orthodox of to-day at least excusable, so in the coming generation, it would be said of men like MM. Pécaut and Gaufres that there was a generous sap, a great elevation of piety, in their discourses.

"For myself, I was baptized by a liberal pastor; brought up as a liberal, received into Church membership as a liberal; and as a liberal admitted also into the holy ministry by sixty-eight pastors, of whom some were orthodox; and I took one sole engagement, namely, to preach the Gospel according to my conscience. Orthodoxy is an utter stranger to me. I have not abandoned it; I never knew it. And precisely as I heard with deep feeling M. Guizot proclaim at that tribune that he is of the old Huguenot race, and a descendant of the pastors of the desert, so I am proud to be on one side of my family of the old Huguenot stock, and on the other, of the old Liberal race."—*Report*, Vol. I. p. 160.

M. Coquerel stated that in 1806 his great uncle published some writings against the doctrine of the Trinity, for which his Consistory censured him; whereupon he sent in his resignation. But he was recalled, and his liberty and right were acknowledged.

The second thing to be considered was, the faith of the Liberals. They had a faith, not by any means so long a list of dogmas as the orthodox, but accepted with a faith as intense and lively as theirs. If it were thought that Rationalists had neither zeal nor charity, the works of the respective parties stood side by side, and it would be found that in their common labour the Liberals had been as fruitful as their opponents. The orthodox believed in uniformity of faith; the Liberals in the law of diversity, which was in harmony with the will of God. Those who contended that there were not two shades, but two opposite sets, of opinion, had conveniently forgotten all the graduated

series that lay between. The orthodox themselves were far from being of one mind in all things; nay, the precepts of Jesus Christ, as in the parable of the tares and the wheat, expressly recognised the admixture, and forbade any attempt at separation. That could only be at the end of the world, and by the hands of angels; and "You, gentlemen, are no doubt very pious orthodox men, but you do not pretend to be angels." Certain illustrations of this "unity in diversity" must be given in the speaker's own words:—

"Take away from the New Testament either St. Paul or St. James; for the one says that which saves is faith, not works, and the other that it is works, not faith; which each proves by the same examples. I ask to what doctrine you adhere most strongly as the most precise and the most sharply defined. Is it the Divinity of Jesus Christ? The Gospel gives three distinct theories of it. The oldest is that He was made Divine and full of God after His baptism, the spirit of God then having descended upon Him for ever. The second, taught by St. Matthew and St. Luke only, is that the Holy Ghost was His father; neither St. Mark nor St. Paul, nor the Gospel and Epistles of St. John afford the slightest trace of it. Finally, certain Epistles of St. Paul and the Gospel of John declare Him pre-existent, Divine from all eternity, having created the world, the Incarnate Word. Is the dogma of the resurrection of Jesus Christ more important still? The New Testament offers two very different conceptions of it; the one in the Gospels, the other by St. Paul, who attached to that fact the highest importance, but who understood it quite otherwise than the Evangelists. I render thanks to God for that rich diversity which I find in the Scripture, and which, far from being a wrong, is in my eyes a glory and a power."—*Report*, Vol. I. pp. 163, 164.

A third part remained to be specified—the number of the Liberals. If it should be said that this party was too largely represented in the Synod, there was a sure way of testing that statement. Let the electors be asked to make a new choice of delegates; and he ventured to affirm that, now the question of schism had been raised, and the sword of Damocles suspended over the head of the Church, a very large majority of liberals would be returned. The Church did not wish schism, loved such unity as was consistent with diversity. If the orthodox party should pronounce the schism, the Catholics, both clergy and laity, would rejoice at such a proclamation of the principle of authority. "Do you deny it? I will write upon that tribune an article which would appear on the day after the schism in such

journals as the *Univers* in praise of you." A peaceable separation had been suggested ; but divorce did not exist in France ; and, if it did, both parties must agree to it. The Left never would ; and the Right must act for and by itself ; either in renouncing the schism, or in persecuting and driving away the Left.

"God calls you to regenerate France. God calls you all by my voice, however little worthy it may be of so great an honour, to effect the spiritual conquest of our country. Zwingle has said, 'It is the duty of a Christian not to talk proudly of dogma, but to labour, always with God, at great and difficult things.' Yes ; it is a great and difficult work to regenerate, to liberalise, to Christianise France ; and you are small and feeble for its accomplishment. But you are more numerous than the first Christians in the upper room at Jerusalem. If we had the sacred fire as they had it we might be, we should be, 'the little leaven that leaveneth the whole lump.'"—*Report*, Vol. I. pp. 166, 167.

It may excite wonder that this speaker did not remember how these first Christians in that "upper room" "were of one accord in one place." But, after we have seen his allegations quoted above, we suppose there is nothing in that phrase inconsistent with the utmost diversity of opinion among the primitive disciples. Nor will our readers fail to see how little these last words of M. Coquerel agree with those of M. Pécaut about the necessity of a numerous body in the Church for the production of "men of thought and men of action," &c. But this, too, is probably only another sign of that delightful "diversity in unity" which constitutes M. Coquerel's ideal. It will be seen how very much these Liberal speeches abounded in vague sentiment and merely general terms. There is, as might be expected, wonderfully little clearness or precision about the notions which they express.

But now, finally, let Guizot be heard ; Guizot, who devotes his life's late evening to the cause of his Church, as his illustrious political rival of thirty years ago devotes his to the cause of his country. After insisting on the necessity of detaching the discussion from everything but "the question in itself and in that alone, alike in its simplicity and in its greatness," he said that he had been taught by experience that the shortest and safest way was to place in a clear light the good reasons in favour of what one believes to be the good cause, rather than combat those given for the contrary one ; and touchingly deprecated the mistrust

with which he had been suspected of wishing an alliance between Catholicism and Protestantism—whereas he was a grave and serious Protestant, loyal to the faith of the Church of his fathers. And now he would go to the question itself:—

“When the Synod was opened; when I entered this place, and saw the Bible open before us all, above the chair of our president; when I heard him called by the name of Moderator; when I saw our sessions beginning with prayer and the reading of the Holy Scripture, I felt in the presence of our whole past, of the faith and traditions of our ancient Church. Are we come here to form a new society, to proclaim a new faith? I have not for a moment thought so. I have felt that I have re-entered, that we have all re-entered, into the inheritance of our fathers, while advancing ourselves in the ways of justice, of liberty, and of Christian charity. When our debates began; when I heard the authority of the sacred books in matters of religion attacked, the great Christian facts contested, and all religious authority other than that of individual opinion denied; then my surprise began, gentlemen. Every association has its motives and its conditions; there is none without a common faith and purpose.”—Vol. I. p. 287.

The speaker appealed to political and economical associations, wherein agreement in principle was deemed essential to association and co-operation. So with Christianity.

“At its origin, there were at Jerusalem different religious societies—the Pharisees, the Sadducees. Did the Apostles try to attach themselves to the one or the other? They associated among themselves, with their Divine Founder, and their proselytes. He among them who had the largest mind and heart, St. Paul, went to Athens. An inscription ‘to the unknown God’ seemed to him an occasion for propagating the Christian faith among the Athenian philosophers. He entered into conversation with them; but he spoke to them of Jesus risen from the dead. At these words, they mocked him, and the association between them and him became, for him and for them, impossible. Why, in the sixteenth century, were the Reformed naturally led to separation from the Catholics? Because, by the side of great common beliefs, there were very conflicting ones, which both judged to be essential, and which rendered their religious association impracticable. A common faith is the principle and basis of every religious society, and that principle has prevailed, has been maintained at epochs, and in social conditions, the most diverse. Permit me to relate to you a memory of my youth. Sixty years ago, I went to visit in the Cevennes, at Pont-de-Montvert, an uncle of my mother. He was pastor; there was

not as yet any temple there. People assembled on the mountain-top, on a plateau which might also be called the desert. My great uncle asked me, before his sermon, to read the Bible; two or three thousand peasants were assembled. What brought them together? Faith in the authority of the Holy Scriptures, faith not indeed intelligent, but living, and the bond of their union. Lately, when our honourable friend M. Babut preached at the Oratoire, which of you was not struck with the crowd which gathered around his pulpit? It was not the science of some, but the common faith of almost all, which created that immense gathering. That is the natural and necessary bond of religious society."—*Report*, Vol. I. pp. 288, 289.

M. Guizot then referred to the excellent men, such as the illustrious Vinet, who had seceded from the Church after 1802. But, while they were to be much honoured, many equally sincere and excellent Christians had remained in the National Church, where they had done much to revive faith and Christian piety. They had done well by being willing to work as a minority until, by the growth of faith and zeal, they should become the majority. But should the minority forbid the majority to raise its flag, to proclaim its faith, and to say what is the faith of the Church? Had the Church no authority? Was she condemned to a declared and accepted anarchy because there was a majority and a minority? M. Vigné had pleaded in favour of leaving the solution to time and nature. Nay,—

"At the revolution, M. de Laetelle, sen., had a brother whom the Jacobins had put in prison. He was implored to interpose in his favour; he replied, 'I expect the enlargement of my brother from the progress of intelligence.' Neither Christian charity nor human experience require such inaction in the presence of evil; the action of man himself is necessary. We have witnessed, for a sufficiently long time already, a new explosion of anti-Christian ardour. Pantheism, which is only materialism cleverly disguised; historical criticism, whose scientific liberty I would by no means restrain, have no right to enter and reign in our temples, and to put their negations, in the place of the great facts which are the object of faith and of Christian traditions."—*Ibid.* p. 290.

The people, said M. Guizot, did not call such persons Christians. The war against the supernatural was the great moral malady of the age. He had heard an eminent scientific man say, "God is an hypothesis of which I have no need."

"If I might say here what I think, at bottom, upon all these

questions, I should find the pantheism and the historical criticism of our time much less philosophical than their adepts believe. I too have drunk like others at the chalice of human science, and more than others at that of human power; I know and respect their rights; but I have learned also to recognise their limits, and their inability to give satisfaction to the religious needs of the soul and of human society. Neither great philosophers nor great politicians have been wanting to the world. None among them have founded or maintained a religion; Socrates and Plato no more than Cæsar or Marcus Aurelius.

"God alone, by the natural and supernatural action which he puts forth according to His purposes towards men, accomplishes such a work. We live under the notice of God; there is no science or skill that can deceive Him. He reads our hearts, and knows who they are who serve His cause. The Declaration of Faith proposed by M. Bois affirms the great facts which constitute Christianity. In voting that, we defend Christianity, in the Church, against those who attack it. I am convinced that this is our right and our duty. If the proposition is voted, we shall not impose it on the laity; but it will become the basis of the official teaching of the Church."—*Ibid.* pp. 291, 292.

This touching, dignified, and profoundly wise address has a special interest, not only on account of its own excellence, but because it is, probably, the last important utterance of the venerable speaker. M. Guizot, a few days afterwards, was compelled, by his infirmities and fatigues, to resign his place in the Synod, and, of course, took no further part in its discussions. It will remain matter of history that the ex-minister of Louis-Philippe, the philosophical historian of European civilisation and the English Revolution, the renowned statesman who appeared at one time almost to rule the destinies of Europe, devoted the latest year of his glorious, protracted, and useful life, to the defence of Christian truth in the Church of his fathers. His speech may be taken as his farewell to public life; and it is a legacy worth preserving by all the loyal children of the French Reformed Church.

It was soon agreed to close the discussion on the general question; but much remained to be done before the decisive vote could be taken. Several amendments and "sub-amendments" were proposed, each of which had to be "developed" by its author, to the great consumption of the time of the Synod. That body refused to take some of them into consideration. One only was actually put to the vote, proposed by M. Pelon, to the effect that the fol-

lowing preamble should be prefixed to the Confession of Faith proposed by M. Bois ; namely—

“ The members of the General Synod, without pretending to the right of decreasing the faith of their brethren, adopt as the expression of the religious doctrines professed by the Reformed Churches of France the following Declaration, which they recommend to the conscience of the faithful.”—*Ibid.* p. 396.

At first this preamble appeared acceptable to M. Bois and his supporters of the Right ; but discussion soon showed that the opposite parties were resolved to construe it in different senses ; and, in spite of earnest private negotiations, it did not finally commend itself to them. When put to the vote it was lost by a large majority. The voting then took place on the original proposal of M. Bois, slightly modified. The result gave to the orthodox just the same majority as in the former instance ; namely, sixteen.

Undoubtedly the Evangelical cause won a great and decided triumph by this vote. But, when we look at the respective numbers—sixty-one to forty-five votes—we have a lively impression of the extent to which Rationalism had spread in the Church, and a feeling that M. Coquerel was perhaps nearer to the truth than some wished or imagined when he said that a fresh election, with the issues clearly put to the constituency, would probably have resulted in a Liberal majority. The truth somewhat narrowly escaped shipwreck ; and, if so, we cannot but rejoice that the informality of the election, in some respects, was overruled for the preservation of the ark of God, placed in such serious and imminent peril. It will not fail to have struck our readers that, in one respect, there was an appearance of halting and timidity on the part of the orthodox majority. We allude to the care with which the champions of that party explained that the Confession of Faith was not to be imposed on the laity. Probably the narrowness of their expected majority had something to do with this, which we can scarcely look upon other than as a logical inconsistency.

There yet remained a third topic, of no slight importance, to be discussed ; namely, whether the Declaration of Faith should be obligatory upon the pastors. In one respect, the struggle on this question was really the critical and decisive one ; for if the Pastorate had been left free to accept or reject the Declaration, that document, however respectable, and however worthy of regard as expressing

the opinion of the majority, would have been absolutely worthless as a Church instrument; and the Liberal party might have multiplied and grown till the Declaration itself should have been repealed. Moreover, in view of the relations between the Synod, as representing a National Church, and the Government, it was necessary to obtain the official sanction of the latter to any procedure of the former. In that event, should the pastors be required by the Synod to sign the Declaration of Faith, it would become a powerful and effectual instrument for the suppression of heresy and the maintenance of Evangelical discipline. We shall not need to pursue the discussion here, inasmuch as the arguments were almost identical with those which were urged for or against the Declaration itself. Some general notion of the opinions broached on either side may be gathered from the speech of M. Delmas the younger. He remarked that the family, every political association, the military compact, all involved the sacrifice of individual right to the fundamental principles and obligations of the institution. Even the Liberals would make education obligatory; and why should a religious society be the only exception? It had been said that the faithful were all equal, all "priests and kings." That was true, as before God; but in the Church the pastor held a special and exceptional position. Profound studies, intellectual guarantees, were required of him. Why not moral ones? No family would be opened to the first servant that might offer. There must be proof of fitness; and was what all held to be necessary for the family unnecessary for the Church? In politics and political elections, did a man deem the electors tyrants because they asked for an exposition of his political opinions?

"We are here under the eternal conditions of every association; we are under the imperious law of common sense. The Church, as an association, cannot swerve from that law; and, in asking her to do so, you impose conditions inconsistent with life; you lead her to suicide. Yes; we have the right to say to the man who presents himself for the service of the Church, 'Here is what we believe. Dost thou believe it? If thou believest, we can labour together. If not, join those who share thy opinions.'"—*Ibid.* Vol. II. p. 236.

This was said to be an attack on the liberty of the pastor. Was any one obliged to become a pastor? Might not a man please himself? And ought nothing to be asked

from one who chose to seek the office? Was that most touching and respectable of virtues—fidelity—to be imperilled by the employment of pastors who did not know from day to day what to believe, obeyed only themselves, and were not bound by any tie?

It was said that the Confession would make hypocrites! A hypocrite was a person who lived otherwise than he thought; for instance, a pastor, who to avoid shocking any one, should not preach what he believed. Was that true of men who freely offered themselves to the Church on the basis of its Confession? What hypocrites must the ministers of the Scotch and American Churches be! what schools of hypocrisy these Churches themselves!

"Ah! gentlemen, it is not the grand Anglo-Saxon race, formed by those Churches, that has furnished Machiavels and Tartuffes; that race has been the loftiest school of sincerity the world has ever seen; we do not lower that character; we fully respect the conscience of the pastor; and our system might take for its motto, 'The free pastor in the free Church.'"—*Ibid.* Vol. II. pp. 238, 239.

M. Delmas proceeded to say that the Left-Centre was inconsistent, being willing to accept a formulary identical in terms with that proposed. What, then, was not the formulary to be taken in earnest? Might mental reservation accompany the act of subscribing it? The Left had spoken more explicitly. "The pastor to preach the Gospel according to his own conscience." "The Gospel!" That was very vague. Not even all the books of the New Testament were accepted by some; nay, there would be as many Gospels as persons, when each could impose an arbitrary limit; a limit essentially personal and capricious. "The conscience!" It had been said that this was the Spirit of God in man. So the pastor would select from the Bible whatever he chose, would preach his own conscience; in other words, himself. Was conscience, then, never deceived, or self-contradictory? Men might always act conscientiously without acting always in light and truth. What insanities, errors, strange sects, grotesque and even monstrous systems had not been set a-going by men acting according to conscience! Yet, on the principle now contended for, every one of them might be lifted into the pulpit! What was to hinder a Jew from preaching in the Reformed Churches? He saw in God a Father, in Jesus a sage, perhaps the greatest of sages,—which was as much as many Protestants believed. A Liberal pastor, an

excellent man, greatly beloved, had been asked by an elder of his Consistory, "Suppose you should come to believe in the immaculate conception, would you preach it in our temples?" He answered "Yes!" without hesitation. Such was the logical result of the Liberal position. On the other hand, there would be as little control over a pastor who, to the distress of his flock, should preach absolute predestination and the damnation of little children. Would they send erring pastors to laymen? Such pastors would despise laymen just as doctors do those who depreciate their skill, and would as contemptuously refuse their judgments. Should they be sent to their colleagues, pastors like themselves? Should they be threatened by their brethren? Their dignity would be affronted, and they would speak of their conscience. Should they be dismissed? Pray, in what name? They would each reply, "I have preached the Gospel according to my conscience." So that the Church would be at the mercy of men whom neither limit nor bridle could restrain, but who would say what they pleased. While, therefore, the orthodox would proclaim the pastor free in a free Church, the Liberals would proclaim him omnipotent in an enslaved Church.

"I appeal to you, gentlemen of the laity, who have uttered here words of manly humility. You have said you love your pastors. We understand and respect your sentiments; but the present question concerns the dignity, the liberty of our Churches, and you ought not to sacrifice these to any personal considerations."—*Ibid.* Vol. II. pp. 242, 243.

No wonder that this keen and witty speech was vehemently applauded by the Right. It is not necessary to pursue the discussion farther. This specimen shows how everything turned upon the doctrinal questions so elaborately and exhaustively debated in the discussion of the Confession of Faith. When put to the vote, the proposition to make the Confession of Faith binding upon the pastors was carried by an increased majority; namely twenty-three, or sixty-two to thirty-nine votes.

The following resolution on the separation of the Church from the State was subsequently adopted:—

"The General Synod, recognising that the principle of the reciprocal independence of the Churches and the State should be inscribed in the law of modern societies, convinced that the Reformed Church of France is disposed to accept with confidence, so far as concerns itself, separation from the State, when the

authorities may judge it necessary for all forms of worship, thinks it right to invite the Church to prepare for it."—*Ibid.* Vol. II. p. 343.

A Permanent Commission was appointed to uphold, in negotiation with the Government, the projects of organic law and discipline adopted by the Synod. This Commission was not to have power to consent to any modifications which might be demanded. If such should be requested by the Government, they were to be submitted to the General Synod, which should decree, in concert with the State, the arrangement of the "concordatory law" (which should be presented to the National Assembly), and the disciplinary provisions necessary for the execution of the law. The Synod agreed to adjourn to the fifteenth of November, unless it should, during the negotiations with the Government, appear to the Permanent Commission necessary to adjourn till a later period. The Synod did not, in fact, meet till a year later. The Commission, consisting of three pastors and four laymen, appears to have been chosen exclusively from the Right—a natural result enough, considering that it would have to seek the support of the Government for conclusions in whose favour the Right alone had voted.

A pastoral letter to the Churches, proclaiming these conclusions, was agreed upon; and then the Moderator, in a speech full of pious feeling and good taste, gave his valedictory address, concluding with the following touching and graceful words:—

"Gentlemen, I repeat, in conclusion, that the first General Synod of our emancipated Church will not have been fruitless. In calling me to preside over it, you have suddenly raised me from a humble and obscure position to a function glorious among all others. Pardon me for not having more worthily fulfilled it, and permit me, in expressing my gratitude, to ask the Head of the Church, and of our Church, to cause our labour to promote the glory of His name. In the name of God, the God of the Gospel, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, I declare the close of the First Session of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of France in 1872.—*Ibid.* Vol. II. pp. 362, 368.

It was well that the Synod left the time of its adjourned meeting to the discretion of the Permanent Commission; for, chiefly as we suppose from the slow progress of the negotiations between that body and the Council of State, more than a year elapsed between the period named by the

Synod and the actual assembly at the adjourned meeting. That did not take place until the 20th of last November. When the Synod did re-assemble, a strange and startling sight was presented—the Left “were conspicuous by their absence.” Every one was thunderstruck. None of the eclat or excitement which characterized the opening in June 1872, was observable now; “no animated conversation, nothing which indicated a grand contest.” Men spoke in whispers, “or mounted the empty benches of the Left like soldiers equipped for battle, who, just as it seemed likely to be joined, discovered that the enemy is disarmed.” Astonishment and embarrassment were the first feelings, for it was feared that a too easy victory would be gained; the worthy delegates apparently not believing in the sentiment—

“Whereby his victories were the more complete,
For that he had no foes to fight withal.”

No doubt, also, all hearts were saddened by the feeling that they were on the eve of an inevitable rupture; by the anxiety each felt for the Church which, already small enough, would become yet smaller by the division; and though they could not hesitate where conscience spoke, they could not obey its voice without sorrow. The Moderator opened the session by the reading of a chapter from the Bible, and by a short address, in which he referred with deep feeling to the loss by death of two of their most esteemed colleagues. After bearing testimony to their excellence, he called upon the members of the Synod to “treat of the grave questions to be submitted to them as servants whom the Master would presently summon.” The letter of the Minister of Worship was then read, and the assembly was constituted by the filling up of vacancies and the re-election of the old committee.

Profound silence reigned while the Moderator announced a communication of great importance which had just been forwarded to him. It came from the members of the Left, explaining the motive of their absence. As this is a document of permanent historical interest, we give it entire:—

“In presence of the protests raised throughout the Church by the decision of the majority of the Synod in its preceding session,—to render obligatory the Declaration of Faith: Interpreters of the legitimate fears awakened among our constituents by the steps recently taken to give to that declaration an executive character: We

declare that we cannot take part in the deliberations of the Synod as long as it shall not, by a formal vote, affirm that the Confession of Faith, adopted by the majority of its members, is simply a declaration of religious principles, binding only upon its authors and their adherents, and not to be directly or indirectly imposed by the present assembly on any of its members, present or future, pastors or laymen of the Reformed Church of France. We claim unanimously, the truly Christian and Protestant measure, which alone will permit us to discuss with our orthodox brethren the interests of the Church. We believe we have hitherto given vivid proof of our love of conciliation. There is, however, a limit which we can never trespass, beyond which we cannot, on behalf of our constituents and ourselves, sanction the desertion of the principles of freedom, which are the *raison d'être* of Protestantism, and the exclusion of the minority by the worst kind of constraint, that which does violence to conscience."—*L'Evangeliste*, Nov. 27th, 1873.

M. Bois, by direction of the Synod, prepared the following resolution, which was at once and unanimously adopted:—

"The Synod, in view of the letter which has been addressed by MM. Vigué and Larac in the name of a certain number of its members: Considering that, while always ready to introduce into its work the amelioration which shall be proved to it to be necessary, it cannot abandon the constitutional principles of the Faith of the Reformed Church which it has proclaimed: Considering further that it has not taken and will not take any step contrary to the liberty of the Churches, and opposed to liberty of conscience,—maintains its former decisions, and passes to the order of the day."—*Ibid.*

The Report of the Permanent Commission was then read by its president, M. Louis Vernes. It spoke of the courtesy and kindness of the Minister of Worship and M. Thiers, President of the Republic, in the interviews granted by those gentlemen to the Commission. M. Thiers, especially, had so spoken as to encourage the hope that the sanction of the State would not be refused. He had remarked,—
"A Church cannot exist without a doctrine, and ought to maintain it intact." M. Vernes announced, to the gratification of all present, that the Council of State had recognised the validity of the decisions of the Synod, thus settling the question of its legal competency; but that the Council would await the formal application of the Synod itself before pronouncing any decision respecting the Confession of Faith. The Report concluded by recommending: 1st. That the Synod should at once seek the sanction of

the Government for the publication of the Declaration of Faith. 2nd. That it should further request the sanction of the second article of the discipline, relative to the use to be made of the Declaration after its promulgation, that article being as follows :—" Every candidate for the holy ministry must, before receiving consecration, declare that he adheres to the faith of the Church as declared by the General Synod." 3rd. That the Synod should nominate a Commission, whose duty it should be to study the truest and readiest method of obtaining official sanction for the other Synodal arrangements.

The reading of this document produced a profound impression. The assembly was greatly excited ; and, when M. Lassère proposed that they should render thanks to God, all rose as one man, and joined in earnest prayers. Opposition was offered, by some of the few loyal members of the Left Centre, to the three proposals mentioned above. Messieurs Roberty and Corbière implored the assembly to suspend the request for publication, at least as far as the second proposition, relative to the adhesion exacted from candidates for the ministry, was concerned. This was urged in the interests of conciliation, and in the hope that, if matters should be postponed till the next Synod, more regularly elected, should meet, probably some of the Left would have been gained over ; and, at any rate, the Synod would have acted with charity. But it was urged in reply, that after the declaration of its validity on the part of the Council of State, the Synod could not be content to do nothing ; it must act. Charity for the flocks was quite as necessary as charity towards each other. There was no design against liberty ; but the Synod must have guarantees. Young candidates for the ministry must not enter upon the sacred office unless it was clear that they partook of the faith of the Church. Several laymen, especially, in the name of the body of the people, protested against further delay ; and, after a brief discussion, the three propositions of the Permanent Commission were, with slight modifications, almost unanimously adopted ; and it was resolved to associate eight members with the Permanent Commission for the purpose of obtaining the sanction of the Government for the other decisions of the Synod.

The following electoral law was passed, with only one dissentient vote :—

"French Protestants, who, fulfilling the existing conditions, and bringing up their children in the Protestant religion, declare their hearty attachment to the Reformed Church of France, and to revealed truth as contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, shall, upon their own request, be inscribed or retained on the parochial register."—*Christianisme au XIX^e Siècle*, March 13, 1874.

A petition in favour of securing religious liberty in the army had been referred to a committee of nine, and their report recommended that the Synod, while expressing sympathy with the petitioners, should not interfere actively in the matter. This astounding suggestion was strongly opposed, and in the end the Permanent Commission was instructed to take the necessary steps, both with the Government and the Churches, for obtaining religious liberty in the army. Well might a spectator exclaim, writing as correspondent of *L'Évangéliste*, "You will think with me how strange it is that, in this age and in our country, we have yet to ask for our Protestant soldiers the liberty of not prostrating themselves before Catholic fetiches, and that a Protestant Synod should hesitate for a moment in granting the weight of its authority to a petition having for its object the suppression of this scandal."

The embarrassment produced by union with the State seems to have been severely felt; especially as the ecclesiastical organisation adopted in 1872 had to be revised in several important particulars, in order to bring it into harmony with "existing laws." The same correspondent shrewdly remarks on this, "Ah! the advantages of union with the State. One must come here to study them,—into the bosom of this assembly of a great Church, arrested at every step by the fear of displeasing the civil power, and exposing itself to its veto."

Several Non-conforming Evangelical Churches having expressed a wish to be re-attached to the Synod, the Permanent Commission was instructed, as far as possible, to meet their religious needs, and to seek the best method of complying with their request. Its action will not be final until confirmed by the next Synod.

Matters of finance occupied much of the attention of the Synod; and it would seem that a good deal of time was lost by what are waggishly called "the unparliamentary habits" of the representatives; "interruptions, conversations, and discussions on the mode of procedure in parti-

oular matters ; " and so forth. This was so generally felt, that a Commission was appointed to draw up a code of regulations for the sittings of the Synod. At length, on the 3rd of last December, the labours of this adjourned session were completed. The Moderator rose, and closed the session in the following brief but very touching address :—

"Circumstances are not the same now as they were eighteen months ago ; after fruitless efforts to secure the prevalence of its own tendencies, the Left has withdrawn from the assembly. This has resulted in greater harmony in our deliberations, but also in a sentiment of profound sadness. Is this separation the prelude to a complete and definite separation ? Is our Church, after having triumphed over persecution, to be enfeebled by herself ? I am heart-broken when I think of the Protestant hearers, who scarcely deserve to be called flocks ; the good shepherd would weep over them as sheep having no shepherd. What impression will the separation produce upon them ? Will they not lose the last remnants of respect and confidence ? As to ourselves, whatever may be the anguish which we shall feel if a separation takes place, let us console ourselves in the sentiment of duty done. We have affirmed that our Church has a faith which she is bound to respect, and the maintenance of which is confided to our religious community ; we have exhibited in clear light the organisation of our Church—Presbyterian-Synodal. What will come of all this ? I know not. We have to pass through evil days. We have obtained, indeed, considerable success ; let us bless God, but let us not assume the attitude of conquerors. Let us be patient ! Time is a great teacher. Let us be gentle ! the meek will be the heroes of faith. If our Church is to escape the woes that threaten it, it will owe its escape to its undoubting fidelity in truth, but especially in charity."

—*L'Évangéliste*, Dec. 11, 1873.

The Permanent Commission has lost no time in bringing the wishes of the Synod under the notice of the Government ; and it is to ourselves almost an unexpected token for good that the reactionary successors of M. Thiers and his colleagues have, apparently in entire good faith, redeemed the pledges given by that statesman's administration. We have received, but an hour or two before writing these words, a copy of the correspondence between the Commission and the Minister of Public Worship relative to the legal position of the Synod, and especially of the Confession of Faith. The latter we have given in the terms finally agreed upon on both sides. The official Decree, omitting the reasons assigned for it, is as follows :—

"The President of the French Republic decrees . . . 1. The publication of the Declaration of Faith, voted by the General Synod of the Reformed Churches of France and Algeria in its session of June 20th, 1872, is authorised. 2. The said Declaration of Faith shall be transcribed upon the registers of the Council of State; mention of this transcription shall be made on the original document by the Secretary of the Council. 3. The Minister of Public Instruction and Worship is charged with the execution of the present decree, which shall be inserted in the *Bulletin des Lois*. Done at Versailles, Feb. 28th, 1874. Signed, MARÉCHAL DE MACMAHON, DUC DE MAGENTA; countersigned 'By the President of the Republic, DR FOURKON, Minister of Public Instruction and Worship.'"—*Christianisme*, March 13th, 1874.

Thus closes the first act of what we presume to call this great ecclesiastical drama. Great indeed, for, if the actors were comparatively few, and the stage for such a country as France small, the scenes were full of interest, and the *dénouement* cannot fail to be of surpassing influence, not in France only, nor in French-speaking countries, but throughout Christendom. How the friends of Evangelical truth in France look upon this auspicious completion of the work of the Synod may be guessed from the following pardonably exultant words of the official organ of the Church, commenting on the Decree:—

"The Reformed Church of France is a Presbyterian-Synodal Church; that is to say, a Church directed by representative assemblies called Synods; and, according to the words of Daillé, Moderator of the Synod of Loudon, 'it is impossible that the Reformed religion can be preserved without holding such assemblies.' Every Protestant ought to understand that.

"Our enemies were never deceived. When Louis XIV. wished to destroy our Church, before revoking the Edict of Nantes, he began by forbidding the assembly of the Synods. When Louis XV., imitating his predecessor, would condone his own infamies by a new destruction of Protestantism, he sent detachments of troops to suppress the Synods of the Desert. Lastly, when such despots as Napoleon I. and Napoleon III. were obliged, after the Revolution, to reconstitute the Reformed Church, they did not deny her right to have Synods; but, fearing that with them she would become too powerful, they refused to permit them to assemble.

"Happily the friends of the Reformed Church of France have not been less clear-sighted than her enemies, and the attachment of the Protestants to their Church is always measured by their attachment to her Synods. In the sixteenth century we know what danger and what punishments our fathers braved to hold their first Synod,

that of 1559. In the eighteenth century, when Antoine Court began to restore Protestantism ruined by persecution, he hastened to inaugurate Synods, which became famous under the name of Synods of the Desert. Finally, in our century, since the Law of the Year X., Protestant Consistories, Presbyterian Councils, simple believers, have never ceased to utter their protestations; and in 1848, when the liberty of assembly was recognised, the first care of the Church was to assemble in general Synod, and who took the initiative of that restoration? The then Liberal party upon the proposal even of the Consistory of Nîmes.

"The thirteenth session of the Reformed Church of France, assembled in 1872, is legal, and its authority is above all controversy. The only electoral faith valid in the Reformed Church of France is that decided by the Synod, and conveyed to the cognisance of the Consistories and Presbyterian Councils by the circular of December 22nd. That circular did not open an inquiry, but promulgated a law. In an audience with the Minister of Worship, which was requested, and which took place on the 6th of March, that functionary clearly declared, 'There is no wish to open an inquiry; and, in my eyes, there is at this moment only one Reformed Church of France, the Synodal Church.' We guarantee the accuracy of this double declaration. Finally, this single Church has a flag which every one may see: it is its Declaration of Faith promulgated on March 7th, 1874.

"Whoever protests against the authority of the Synod, rejects the electoral law, or denies the Faith proclaimed by the solemn assembly of the Reformed Church of France, departs from that Church."—*Christianisme*, March 13, 1874.

We trust that this review, though somewhat lengthy, will not have proved uninteresting or tedious to our readers. It is not too much to assume that French Protestantism, and especially the state of things in the Reformed Church, is comparatively little known to the great majority of English Christians. In Scotland it is otherwise. There the religious public generally feel a deep interest in that Church; not merely because of the Protestantism common to both, but because of that Presbyterian organisation and discipline which, in both lands, has survived the fiercest and most fiery persecution, and in Scotland has struck its roots deep into the popular heart, and wrought beneficial results little less than miraculous. We have purposely chosen to be historians rather than critics; and it is for this reason that we have allowed the disputants in the portentous strife which has resulted so auspiciously to speak for themselves. The Church is already beginning vigorously to use

the power with which she has thus been entrusted. Heretical pastors have been deposed, and Evangelical ones appointed in their stead. Doubtless the secession of the Left will issue in the departure of many from the temples and houses now virtually declared to be the property of the Church, and under the control of its General Synod. Probably such defection will, considering the smallness of the Church, be somewhat extensive; and for some time to come it may be difficult to supply, at least with men of the right stamp, the numerous vacancies that will occur. But that Great Head of the Church who, for the three hundred years of the afflicted and oppressed history of this portion of it, has walked "in the midst of the fire" with His faithful and persecuted servants; that "only Son of God," who has enabled the Synod, after years of unhappy and shameful treason on the part of so many pastors, to confess Him in the glory of His person, the authority of His Word, and the reality and efficacy of His redeeming work, will not desert it now in its sore strait and need. The exigency to which we refer is the result of Christian and ministerial faithfulness. The conquest, after two centuries of abasement and suppression, of the right to rule on the basis of its original constitution, and by the ministry of its Supreme Central Church Court, is worth any sacrifice. The Reformed Church of France will not, in the end, suffer by the secession or excision of so many of her unworthy sons, however painful and distressing may have been the process which has accomplished that result. "The right hand" has been "cut off;" the "right eye" has been "plucked out and cast" from her; but, if we may venture so to adapt the words of our Lord, it has been done that she may "enter into life." Unsympathising lookers-on may pity the supposed infatuation under which the majority have consented to see that which was small enough before so seriously "minished and brought low." The orators of the Left, who boasted of their own numbers, and insisted on the necessity of a numerically large Church for the production of "men of thought and men of action," may await, with premature confidence of anticipation, the fulfilment of their own sinister predictions. The hearts of the timid in the Church itself may sometimes misgive them, and to the distress of the enforced separation may be added the gloomy promptings of distrust. But we hope no man's heart in that com-

pact and resolute band of about sixty delegates who formed the residuary Synod in the closing days of last year, will really fail him. "There is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few." Not once only in Church history has it been shown that the loss of numbers has been followed by an enormous increase of moral and spiritual power. The men who, whether by secession or exclusion, "go out" from the Church because of the Declaration of Faith, will do so because they were not "of" it,—the cause of its weakness, not contributors to its strength. The number of disciples who met in the upper room in Jerusalem, including the women, was "about a hundred and twenty." The world has known something about them for nearly two thousand years. The drops converge and become rills; the rills combine into rivulets; the rivulets conjoin to become rivers; "and all the rivers run into the sea." Like the three hundred through whom "Israel was saved in Midian's day," let the men who have dared the worst, in spite of paucity of numbers, for the defence and deliverance of the ark of God, go forth "in this their might," and the world will soon hear that they do valiantly. Let them, having broken their pitchers, lift up their "lamps," and cry, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon;" and now, as then, they shall see "the hosts of aliens fly;" and yet shall they reconquer their beautiful and beloved land, *la belle France*, for our God and for His Christ.

And let this little band of heroes—in some sort the forlorn hope of French Protestantism—be sustained by the prayers, the sympathies, and the helpful co-operation of all British Protestants. The enemy musters before us in formidable and serried array. Our own ranks, it appears, are occasionally thinned by something worse than death. Let us, as Protestants, whether British or Continental, close our ranks, and be true to our colours. Then "One shall chase a thousand, and two shall put ten thousand to flight."

Errata in the former part of this article:—For "Charles the Nineteenth," on page 188, read "Charles the Ninth;" and for "the two pastora," on page 188, read "the ten pastora."

ART. II.—*Dante and his Circle : with the Italian Poets Preceding Him.* (1100—1200—1300). A Collection of lyrics, Edited and Translated in the Original Metres. By DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI. Revised and Re-arranged Edition. Part I. Dante's "Vita Nuova," &c., Poets of Dante's Circle. Part II. "Poets chiefly before Dante." London: Ellis and White, 29, New Bond-street. 1874.

In a literature of great wealth and nobility, the grand figure of Dante Alighieri stands central and sublime; as unapproached as the central figure in our own poetic literature. We need not care to inquire into the precise ratio of the distances at which those two great men stand from all others in their respective spheres; nor do we deem it profitable to discuss which was absolutely the greater poet, Shakespeare or Dante: probably anywhere out of Italy the precedence would be awarded to Shakespeare: but what we do care to note on the present occasion is the complete correspondence between the different kinds of portrait which the general mind of civilised humanity preserves of these two poets, and the different character pervading the two sets of works. There is no poet on record, and scarcely even an historical personage, concerning whose personality and its physical and moral attributes the world has a more definite and uniform conception than it has of Dante. And there is no great poet whose personality is so out of all proportion with the magnificence of his works as the almost mythical giant whom Richard Wagner has called "the enormous Shakespeare."

We say "almost mythical," because so vaguely have the attributes of Shakespeare come down to us that some clever persons have even doubted whether there ever was a Shakespeare; while of that fierce yet most tender exile, whose face and form and very gait are clearly perceived by us across a gulf of six instead of but three centuries, we do not know that any such doubts have ever been expressed. To us it seems that the reason of this disparity of results must lie in the dispositions of the two men, though of

Shakespeare's disposition we have scarcely a straw of evidence at all direct. We should judge that the vast-minded and vast-hearted Englishman was too frankly in love with humanity at large in every phase, too much lifted up above the embittering influences of those personal hates that arise from intolerance, and too widely apart from merely local and temporary questions, to feel the irksomeness of a central self; so that, instead of dealing with every item of his consciousness in perfect reference to that central self, he frankly and grandly dashed aside the trappings of his personality, and merged his whole being in every character he created; living through with a force akin to reality all the varied circumstances of his dramas. So strongly does this seem to have been the case that we cannot even be certain his seeming-autobiographic sonnets are not a glorious masquerade in which he plays the part of one who is making personal records in that most personal and intimate of all lyric forms. How, indeed, should we know anything of such a being, too greatly preoccupied with the large aspects of the world and man as he found them to feel the need of recording himself?

But of Dante,

"Who loved well because he hated,—
Hated wickedness that hinders loving,"

it is true that he felt that centrality which really belonged to him in a degree quite unusual with the greatest sons of song. He recognised himself as an important factor in the political and religious life of the time and land into which his music-charged being had been born. He could not withdraw himself from the eager trouble of the epoch; and the introspective element that must have formed a part of his subtle character by inheritance and fostering took hold of every outer circumstance, feeling with the most delicate thrills of joy whatever was grateful to Dante's heart, and burning with a bitterness almost incomparable at whatsoever seemed hateful to his keen intellect and finely constituted feelings. The polemical cruelty of this great man is only matched, in the range of high and noble art, by the exquisite, we had almost said divine, tenderness of his affections. And it is precisely those natures which are most keenly impressed, for pleasure or for pain, for love or hatred, by the currents and eddies of surrounding life as they wash against the insular "me," who have the biting

individuality that leaves a mark on everything they do, a memory in every mind they come in contact with. Of our own poets we should single out two, Milton and Chatterton, as peculiarly endowed with this fascinating individuality; and of these the frustrated boy was probably nearer in this one particular to Dante than was the Puritan giant-singer, so much more akin to the Florentine in everything else. Indeed, in the mean and sordid drama of eighteenth century literary life, Chatterton seems far more central than Milton in the grander drama of his time; and yet not this marvellous boy possessed nearly in the same degree as Dante did this fascination of pungent individuality to which we have been referring, and which, in the case of the Italian, sets him so clearly before us as the central figure, not in the mere living drama of his time and place, but in the literature of his country.

But if the portrait of Dante has been clearly defined among us ever since we took to the serious examination of foreign literature, it must certainly have become more generally so since we received among us a family of his countrymen who have been more than ordinarily occupied with the great Florentine. The devotion of the late Gabriel Rossetti to the study of Dante is too well known to need recalling; but it is worthy of remark that three of the children whom he has left to live, work, and sing amongst us have followed in the same bent, though using the tongue of their adopted country. It seems almost poetically fitting that this gifted family should repay whatever debt may be deemed to attach to their citizenship with choice offerings springing from the best that their lovely country has yielded; and from the several admirable contributions they have made to the English literature of Dante, we have now the agreeable task of singling out the volume of translations made by Mr. Dante Gabriel Rossetti many years ago, and recently republished in a revised and rearranged form.

This book was originally issued under the title of *The Early Italian Poets, from Ciullo d'Alcamo to Dante Alighieri*; and Mr. Rossetti tells us that, in giving it the new title of *Dante and his Circle; with the Italian Poets Preceding Him*, as well as in placing the portion relating to Dante and his immediate circle before instead of after the selection from the early poets, chiefly before Dante, the object has been to make more evident at first glance the important relation of

the whole book to Dante. "The *Vita Nuova*," says the translator, "together with the many among Dante's lyrics and those of his contemporaries which elucidate their personal intercourse, are here assembled and brought to my best ability in clear connection, in a manner not elsewhere attempted, either by Italian or German editors." The result of this operation is one of no small importance, because, added to the advantage of translations most perfect as such, we have the benefit of that higher additional work that may be fairly called creative, and which usually distinguished the best criticism founded on poetic intuition from the mere intellectual acuteness and cultivation of our ablest critics who are nothing more than critics. The titles added by Mr. Rossetti throughout this volume, and the method of throwing the poems together so that one shall reflect light clearly on another, result in the development of a connexity and vitality quite apart from the mere rendering; and when the rendering is so entirely admirable, as is the case throughout this collection, the reader of refined intelligence cannot but find himself joyful among a company of living singers instead of being driven to consort with ghosts in such a grave-yard as most volumes of selected translations are at best.

For those who have no acquaintance with Italian, and cannot read for themselves even the *Vita Nuova*, much less burrow among the many books of early poetry that Mr. Rossetti has used for the purposes of his work,—to those who must perforce put themselves at the mercy of a translator for any acquaintance with the actual work of Dante, the present rendering of the *Vita Nuova* is of a value not easy to calculate. It has not in the slightest degree that character of remoteness and constraint which almost all so-called "poetic" translations have, simply because poets in their own right seldom take up the task of translation. Mr. Rossetti has so managed matters that he brings his English readers face to face with the great Florentine of six hundred years ago, and silences that ominous question so constantly recurring to the readers of translations from ancient and mediæval literature, "How did this read to the author's contemporaries of his own race?" So far as perfect freedom from incongruity is concerned, the Dante of this *Vita Nuova* might be our own countryman addressing us in our common tongue; and we never feel impelled even to take up the original for the purpose of verifying this or

that expression; in fact, we almost forget there is an original. And the work is the more priceless inasmuch as the Dante of the *Vita Nuova* is less familiar to the English reader than the Dante of the *Commedia* and of the biography of Boccaccio. Scarcely less majestic than the exile of later manhood, with the unsparing scourge for evil-doers, the youthful devotee to an embodiment of the purest womanhood is himself one of the purest, most high-minded, most refined types of humanity whereof we have any authentic record; and the combination of tenderness and simplicity with the subtlest intellectuality and the highest moral force, is simply unrivalled. It is doubtful whether there is any book in the whole range of literature better calculated than the *Commedia* to repay the careful reader with that cultivation of the better nature in us which should be the supreme object of all art, and which in fact is the result of all the highest art; but if there be any books better constituted in this behalf, the *Vita Nuova* is surely one of them, the ideal of that perfect little work being at once so pure, so majestic, so spiritually uplifted, so pre-eminently religious in the best sense, that it is hardly possible to escape its marvellously potent influence. Such a book in the hands of the youth of these half-hearted and in many regards sordid times, might do more than we can readily foresee towards a better balancing of the general character; and he might well be called a philanthropist who should circulate at a small cost the translation Mr. Rossetti has made of it.*

The youthful stage of a nobly pure and exalted passion of a man for a woman has never been recorded, as far as we are aware, with so much delicacy of touch and greatness of intelligence, as in the *Vita Nuova*; nor do we know of any book wherein the loveliness of pure and devotional love (as distinguished from the debased sentiments generally accepted for that holy passion) has been rendered so attractive and impressive; and we cannot but think that such a book, brought home to English readers of to-day by means of a translation that should rather be called a transubstantiation, would strike shame into the heart of many a man and woman, and many a youth and maiden,

* We should be glad to see this *Vita Nuova*, with such a comment as the translator might deem peculiarly fit for introducing it to our youth of both sexes, reprinted in a small pocket volume, at a cost of not more than a shilling; so that it might be within the reach of almost any one.

whose ideas of love and "being in love" are so much less than noble. For this is not merely the record of a life's devotion most admirable and beautiful in itself, but of the workings of that passion upon the spirit of one who was, before all things, a giant in strength; so that, getting to know more and more intimately both the tenderness and the strength of Dante, our young people might come to see in time that this chivalrous delicacy of loving is strength, and that the robuster and more material phases of passion in general acceptance are, in comparison, mere weakness.

The profound seriousness of Dante's record concerning his first, last, and only passion, is an element in the work most difficult to preserve, especially as regards the prose portions, in the process of transfer from early Italian to modern English; but for the purposes of this most earnest undertaking there was one source of diction which was properly available, and which unfortunately has been again and again drawn upon by unscrupulous persons for purposes for which it certainly was not properly available. We refer to the noble phraseology of the authorised version of the Bible, a phraseology quite removed from the sordid uses of everyday, pure and elevated in itself, and which, notwithstanding its archaic character, is as universally understood in the English-speaking world as the English of common parlance. Associated as this phraseology is with the most reverential feelings of Englishmen at large, the fact that it befits the *Vita Nuova* is the highest proof of the elevated character of the book; and that Mr. Rossetti should have made a faithful translation of the prose portions, adopting as far as possible that phraseology, is proof of a tact and insight as rare as they are desirable. Dante's devotion to Beatrice, alive and dead, was so intimately blended with his religion, that it cannot be rightly felt and appreciated unless we come in contact with it in a religious and reverent atmosphere perfectly familiar to us; and such an atmosphere is best supplied in the method adopted by Mr. Rossetti. The rare poetic quality of his version of the sonnets and *canzoni* suffices to preserve the afflatus of noble rhythm and perfect cadence and musical recurrence of sound; while the corresponding end has been attained in the prose portions, partly by as faithful a transcript of Dante's sense as was possible, and partly by that appeal to our sense of what is sacred and rarified, made by the introduction of Biblical phrases.

A few extracts from Mr. Rossetti's volume, however, will give our readers a better notion of his method and of its success than anything we can say; nor need we be fastidious in our choice of portions for excision. The opening of the "New Life" will serve our purpose as well as any other passage in this regard, and it has the advantage of affording at the same time a specimen of commentary on a hard passage.

"In that part of the book of my memory before the which is little that can be read, there is a rubric, saying, *Incipit Vita Nova*.* Under such rubric I find written many things; and among them the words which I purpose to copy into this little book; if not all of them, at the least their substance.

"Nine times already since my birth had the heaven of light returned to the selfsame point almost, as concerns its own revolution, when first the glorious Lady of my mind was made manifest to mine eyes; even she who was called Beatrice by many who knew not wherefore. She had already been in this life for so long as that, within her time, the starry heaven had moved towards the eastern quarter one of the twelve parts of a degree; so that she appeared to me at the beginning of her ninth year almost, and I saw her almost at the end of my ninth year. Her dress, on that day, was of a most noble colour, a subdued and goodly crimson, girdled and adorned in such sort as best suited with her very tender age. At that moment, I say most truly that the spirit of life which hath its dwelling in the secretest chamber of the heart, began to tremble so violently that the least pulses of my body shook therewith; and in trembling it said these words: *Eccce deus fortior me, qui veniens dominabitur mihi*.† At that moment, the animal spirit, which dwelleth in the lofty chamber whither all the senses carry their perceptions, was filled with wonder, and speaking more especially unto the spirits of the eyes, said these words: *Apparuit jam beatitudo vestra*.‡ At that moment the natural spirit, which dwelleth there where our nourishment is administered, began to weep, and in weeping said these words: *Heu miser! quia frequenter impeditus ero deinceps*.§—Pp. 29, 30.

We must here break in upon the text, in order to let Mr. Rossetti speak as to that sentence at the beginning, deemed the most puzzling passage in the whole *Vita Nuova*—

* "Here beginneth the new life."—Foot-note, p. 29.

† "Here is a deity stronger than I; who, coming, shall rule over me."—Foot-note, p. 30.

‡ "Your beatitude hath now been made manifest unto you."—*Ibid.*

§ "Woe is me! for that often I shall be disturbed from this time forth."—*Ibid.*

"La gloriosa donna della mia mente, la quale fù chiamata da molti Beatrice, i quali non sapeano che si chiamare."

The last clause, meaning literally "who knew not what she was called," has been translated by Mr. Rossetti, as we have seen, by the words "who knew not wherefore,"—the literal rendering presenting, as he points out, the obvious difficulty that her name really was Beatrice, and that Dante uses that name throughout. The comment proceeds thus :—

"In the text of my version I have adopted, as a rendering, the one of the various compromises which seemed to give the most beauty to the meaning. But it occurs to me that a less irrational escape out of the difficulty than any I have seen suggested may possibly be found by linking this passage with the close of the sonnet at page 77 of the *Vita Nuova*, beginning, 'I felt a spirit of love begin to stir;' in the last line of which sonnet Love is made to assert that the name of Beatrice is Love. Dante appears to have dwelt on this fancy with some pleasure, from what is said in an earlier sonnet (page 38) about 'Love in his proper form' (by which Beatrice seems to be meant) bending over a dead lady. And it is in connection with the sonnet where the name of Beatrice is said to be Love, that Dante, as if to show us that the Love he speaks of is only his own emotion, enters into an argument as to Love being merely an accident in substance,—in other words, 'Amore e il cor gentil son una cosa.' This conjecture may be pronounced extravagant; but the *Vita Nuova*, when examined, proves so full of intricate and fantastic analogies,* even in the mere arrangement

* That Dante knew and intended this book to be full of subtleties—a book for close study and not for mere enjoyment—is shown by the sonnet he sent with it to Brunetto Latini, rendered thus by Mr. Rossetti :—

"Master Brunetto, this my little maid
Is come to spend her Easter-tide with you;
Not that she reckons feasting as her due,—
Whose need is hardly to be fed, but read.
Not in a hurry can her sense be weigh'd,
Nor 'mid the jests of any noisy crew:
Ah! and she wants a little coaxing too
Before she'll get into another's head.
But if you do not find her meaning clear,
You've many Brother Alberts hard at hand,
Whose wisdom will respond to any call.
Consult with them, and do not laugh at her;
And if she still is hard to understand,
Apply to Master Janus last of all."—P. 110.

It is uncertain whether the last line was intended to refer Brunetto to the twofold oversight of the god Janus, or to some contemporary who bore the name of Janus (Giano), a name used in Italy at the time of Dante.

of its parts (much more than appears on any but the closest scrutiny), that it seems admissible to suggest even a whimsical solution of a difficulty which remains unconquered. Or, to have recourse to the much more welcome means of solution afforded by simple inherent beauty, may not the meaning be merely that any person looking on so noble and lovely a creation, without knowledge of her name, must have spontaneously called her Beatrice, i.e., the giver of blessing? This would be analogous, by antithesis, to the translation I have adopted in my text."—Pp. 4, 5.

Certainly the word "wherefore" seems to have more of the prismatic quality of Dante than the literal rendering of the words, "*ehe si chiamare*," would have; and yet we should have no hesitation in adopting the ultimate solution of the foregoing comment,—that Dante meant the primary sense of the words to be, that many strangers called her Beatrice on account of her beneficent qualities. To us this seems the most obvious meaning, whatever subtler intentions may be coiled beneath it. The first sonnet named above by Mr. Rossetti in connection with this passage is a particularly excellent specimen of sonnet-writing in English, and we have thus a twofold purpose in quoting it:—

" I felt a spirit of love begin to stir
 Within my heart, long time unfelt till then ;
 And saw Love coming towards me, fair and fain
 (That I scarce knew him for his joyful cheer),
 Saying, ' Be now indeed my worshipper !'
 And in his speech he laugh'd and laugh'd again.
 Then, while it was his pleasure to remain,
 I chanced to look the way he had drawn near,
 And saw the Ladies Joan and Beatrice
 Approach me, this the other following,
 One and a second marvel instantly.
 And even as now my memory speaketh this,
 Love spake it then : ' The first is christened Spring ;
 The second Love, she is so like to me.' "—Pp. 77, 78.

Not less excellent is the other sonnet referred to in corroboration of the commentator's view:—

" Weep lovers, with Love's very self doth weep,
 And with the cause for weeping is so great ;
 When now so many dames, of such estate
 In worth, show with their eyes a grief so deep :
 For Death the churl has laid his leaden sleep

Upon a damsel who was fair of late,
 Defacing all our earth should celebrate,—
 Yea all save virtue, which the soul doth keep.
 Now hearken how much Love did honour her.
 I myself saw him in his proper form
 Bending above the motionless sweet dead
 And often gazing into Heaven ; for there
 The soul now sits which when her life was warm
 Dwelt with the joyful beauty that is fled."—P. 38.

The foregoing quotations form but one example of the manner in which the many gems of this book are so placed and brought together as to reflect light one upon the other ; and we would willingly, if space permitted, give other examples. Especially would we be glad to extract for our readers the description of the Vision of Dante, given in prose shortly after our first quotation, the sonnet which he wrote upon the vision and sent to many poets of his day, and the sonnets of interpretation returned by Guido Cavalcanti, Cino da Pistoja, and Dante da Majano. We might also select some dozens of instances in which the translator has brought into prominence, by sample and connecting comment, the lines of relationship between the great poet of the Middle Ages and other poets either mentioned in the *Commedia*, or bearing in some other way on Dante's life and works. But the following-out of these matters on the reader's part is no small portion of the great pleasure afforded by the book ; and we prefer to leave that pleasure unforestalled for him, quoting, instead, another specimen of Dante's work of a very different kind.

The sestina to which Mr. Rossetti has prefixed the title "Of the Lady Pietra degli Serovigni," is an example of a form which we do not know to have been used in England at all : it is a very beautiful form, and one by no means easy to preserve in translating ; and, as Dante introduced it into the Italian language, so his translator appears to have introduced it for the first time into our tongue ; thus :—

" To the dim light and the large circle of shade
 I have clomb, and to the whitening of the hills,
 There where we see no colour in the grass,
 Nathless my longing loess not its green,
 It has so taken root in the hard stone
 Which talks and hears as though it were a lady.

- " Utterly frozen is this youthful lady,
Even as the snow that lies within the shade;
For she is no more moved than is a stone
By the sweet season which makes warm the hills
And alters them afresh from white to green,
Covering their sides again with flowers and grass.
- " When on her hair she sets a crown of grass
The thought has no more room for other lady;
Because she weaves the yellow with the green
So well that Love sits down there in the shade,—
Love who has shut me in among low hills
Faster than between walls of granite-stone.
- " She is more bright than is a precious stone;
The wound she gives may not be healed with grass:
I therefore have fled far o'er plains and hills
For refuge from so dangerous a lady;
But from her sunshine nothing can give shade,—
Not any hill, nor wall, nor summer-green.
- " A while ago I saw her dressed in green,—
So fair, she might have wakened in a stone
This love which I do feel even for her shade;
And therefore as one wooes a graceful lady,
I wooed her in a field that was all grass
Girdled about with very lofty hills.
- " Yet shall the streams turn back and climb the hills
Before Love's flame in this damp wood and green
Burn, as it burns within a youthful lady,
For my sake, who would sleep away in stone
My life, or feed like beasts upon the grass,
Only to see her garments cast a shade.
- " How dark soe'er the hills throw out their shade,
Under her summer-green the beautiful lady
Covers it, like a stone covered in grass."—Pp. 127—129.

The workmanship of this, whether as above or in the original, is hard to surpass. The recurrence of the same terminal words in a new order in every stanza produces an effect as musical as rhyme; and in the modulations of this form of verbal music effects of the most exquisite delicacy are produced; but lovely as the form of the poem is, far lovelier is its substance. The translator tells us he has connected it with the name of a Paduan lady, *Pietra degli Serovigni*, chiefly to mark it as having no relation to *Beatrice*; but we do not suppose he means to imply that its

beginning and end are to represent an episode of light-loving in the austere life of Dante. If it has reference to this Lady Pietra, it is, probably, only in some typical fashion, having also, hidden beneath its perfect surface, reference to something deeper than a passing fancy. Mr. Rossetti himself says the statement in regard to the lady must be considered as a "doubtful conjecture;" and, indeed, if she had anything to do with it at all, we should imagine it to be an allegory suggested by the poetic utility of her name (*pietra*=stone). For the meaning of the allegory, we would throw out, merely as a hint for students of the subtleties and connections of Dante's entire works, the question whether it cannot be explained as bearing upon the hard-heartedness of Florence, and the poet's never satisfied desire to return thither honourably, and be crowned with the laurel he had earned, and refused to receive in any other city. The sonnet which follows this poem in the present collection originally bore the stony name of the same lady; but in the present edition it has been re-entitled "A Curse for a Fruitless Love." We prefer this title to the original one, and the more so because the sonnet seems particularly suggestive of that fruitless love which Dante bore to Florence, and which came to be so fierce a hate. The sonnet is as follows:—

"My curse be on the day when first I saw
 The brightness in those treacherous eyes of thine,—
 The hour when from my heart thou canst draw
 My soul away, that both might fail and pine;
 My curse be on the skill that smooth'd each line
 Of my vain songs,—the music and just law
 Of art, by which it was my dear design
 That the whole world should yield thee love and awe.
 Yea, let me curse mine own obduracy,
 Which firmly holds what doth itself confound—
 To wit, thy fair perverted face of scorn:
 For whose sake Love is oftentimes forsworn
 So that men mock at him; but most at me,
 Who would hold Fortune's wheel and turn it round."—P. 130.

To attempt any disentanglement of Dante's subtle purposes in this or any other poem is far beyond our present scope, particularly as there is an obvious literal sense here, as elsewhere, in the poet's work, which sense is always sufficient to go on with; but here, as elsewhere, there is a vista of uncertainty only growing wider in its

possibilities of significance, so that by the time one knows it by heart, and turns it over a few dozens of times, many distinct significances come to present themselves as inseparable from it. And it must ever be borne in mind that there is ample room for believing that Dante's gift of double and triple significance was perfectly within his own knowledge and control, inasmuch that he purposely framed his poems so that there might be several meanings lurking behind the obvious primary meanings, and awaiting discovery. Of this particular sonnet Mr. Rossetti observes, that he has kept it apart from "the pieces bearing on the *Vita Nuova*, as it is naturally repugnant to connect it with Beatrice." He adds, however, that he cannot "but think it possible that it may have been the bitter fruit of some bitterest moment in those hours when Dante endured her scorn." Of course, no one dare dispute the *possibility*; but it seems to us that the "natural repugnance" that sets the poem apart from Beatrice has reason as well as feeling on its side. There is hate in this sonnet, but righteous hate, if, as we surmise, it was directed against that Florentine Republic, bitterly described as

" *Repubblica*—a public thing;
A shameful shameless prostitute,
Whose lust with one lord may not suit,
So takes by turns its revelling
A night with each, till he at morn
Is stripped and beaten forth forlorn,
And leaves her cursing her."

Stripped and beaten forth forlorn and cursing, Dante certainly was; but his curses had none of the poison of perverted love that must ever accompany any anger at a rejected suit to a woman; their pungency was of fire, not of poison; and they fell, surcharged with the sublimity of glorious indignation, upon heads deserving the keen chastisement of that fire. There was none of the poison of ordinary hate in the cantery of

" that hot ink he dipped for,
When, his left hand i' the hair o' the wicked,
Back he held the brow and pricked its stigma;
Bit into the live man's flesh for parchment;
Loosed him, laughed to see the writing rankle—
Let the wretch go festering through Florence."

This scalding ink was altogether a product of his supreme perception of the good, the beautiful, and the true; and

the bitterness of his denunciations was the result of the sins of others against the good, the beautiful, and the true, operating upon this perception—just as the sublime utterances of doom against evildoers were inspired in the mighty Hebrew prophets through their burning desire after righteousness. It would be a real pain to a lover of Dante to conceive of him as uttering words of hate against that Beatrice whom he ever described as perfectly good, beautiful, and true, and whose being became a part of his religion. One of the chief charms of the love-poetry of Dante, one of the strongest holds it has upon the best part of the imagination, is the entire absence of fluctuation even in the direction of lukewarmness; and there would be a serious lessening of power for good if we had to admit such a sonnet as that just discussed as referring to Beatrice.

The immeasurable rise which Italian poetry took in Dante's hands is, to some extent, indicated by the comparison of his works in this volume with those of all his predecessors, beginning with Ciullo d'Alcamo; and his towering superiority over all his contemporaries is seen by the like comparison of their work with his. This we say chiefly in relation to the substance of his verse, disparity in workmanship not being so clearly shown, by reason of the high class of labour which seems to have been bestowed on all poets alike by the translator. It is one of Mr. Rossetti's technical feats that he has conferred on our colder northern tongue an Italian aptness to be always musical and delicate, whatever the subject; and thus, even the most trivial matters discoursed of by Dante's predecessors and contemporaries, are given to us in a garb of clear-ringing poetry. But, inasmuch as every poem in the whole collection is faithfully rendered in the metre of the original, one cannot but be struck with the marvellous wealth of lyric utterance subsisting among a large number of people with comparatively little to utter. We note this, not as detracting from the value of what must have been a most arduous labour, however much a labour of love, but as a clear guarantee of the whole-heartedness of that devotion to the central purpose of illustrating Dante for English readers. We may well imagine that, as the translator went scrupulously through three centuries of lyric work, and devoted to each poem selected those ardent powers of versification belonging, not to a mere translator, but to a poet in his

own right—as he gradually built up an anthology that should be for the home of his adoption a clear and correct view of the most important period in the literature of the land of his fathers—he must often and often have had to fall back for support on the grandeur of that Dante to whose figure even the most beautiful things here are but, as it were, the background and accessories. And some such sense of an ultimate grandeur must ever be at work in securing for humanity at large productions replete as this is with steadiness of purpose and nobility of craftsmanship. It must have been a real pain to such a worker to face such a possibility as he faces in his note to the sonnet last quoted, as there must have been a sensible depression of his great central figure in the direction of that level of feeling represented by such poems as the *ballata* at page 451, beautiful in form, but with the dreadful burden of perverted sentiment :—

“ For no love borne by me,
Neither because I care
To find that thou art fair,—
To give another pain I gaze on thee.”

We know well that the poet to whom we owe this admirable book, full of insight and light thrown, in the potent method of high art, on Dante and his time, regards the record of the great Florentine's early life and love for his lady as we should ever desire to have it regarded—namely, as a work fraught, for all its subtleties of form and intricacies of thought, with the underlying simplicity of “the kingdom of heaven.” We put in evidence the following sonnet on the *Vita Nuova* :—

“ As he that loves oft looks on the dear form
And guesses how it grew to womanhood,
And gladly would have watched the beauties bud
And the mild fire of precious life wax warm :—
So I, long bound within the threefold charm
Of Dante's love sublimed to heavenly mood,
Had marvelled, touching his Beatitude,
How grew such presence from man's shameful swarm.
At length within this book I found portrayed
Newborn that Paradisal Love of his,
And simple like a child ; with whose clear aid
I understood. To such a child as this,
Christ, charging well his chosen ones, forbade
Offence : ‘ for lo ! of such My kingdom is.’ ”

- APP. III.—1. *Irish Federalism.*** By ISAAC BUTT. Third Edition. Dublin: Falconer. London: W. Ridgway. 1871.
- 2. *A Plea for the Home Government of Ireland.*** By J. G. M'CARTHY. Dublin: A. M. Sullivan. 1872.
- 3. *Ireland in 1868.*** By GERARD FITZGERBON, Esq., Master in Chancery. Second Edition. London: Longmans and Co. 1870.
- 4. *Ireland, Primitive, Papal, and Protestant.*** By JAMES GODKIN. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1878.
- 5. *Home Rule Conference.*** Dublin: *Freeman's Journal* Office. 1878.

THE first volume of this Review has an article on Ireland which opens with a statement often made, and not without truth, that "Ireland is England's difficulty." Twenty years, embracing an immense amount of legislation on behalf of Ireland, have elapsed, and yet the fact stands out as distinctly to statesmen and to all thoughtful people as it did then. With respect to the last five years of that period, wherein measures full of promise for its pacification and welfare have passed into law, the *Times* newspaper gives the following verdict:—"Whatever has been done for Ireland during this period, and however the authors of it might disguise their misgivings, it was always quite certain that few would appreciate it, and that none would be grateful. After a world of talk it is the fact which survives, and the fact is that nothing ever has, nothing does, and nothing ever will satisfy Ireland. That name stands for the insatiable cravings of a native race, for the enormous pretensions of an utterly intolerant Church, and for a conspiracy which began before history, and would, if possible, survive it." This judgment, whether as a description of the past, or a prophecy of the future, is discouraging, and might be a check upon any further attempt to deal with a subject so incorrigible; but, for weal or for woe, Ireland forms a portion of the United Kingdom, and if there be any chance of improvement, increased knowledge of everything peculiarly Irish must contribute to that improvement.

Without referring just now to its ancient history, it may

he stated without hesitation that Ireland, for the last half century, has, perhaps more than any other country in Europe, been the scene of perpetual agitation. After Catholic Emancipation, which should have been granted, if at all, when the Union took place, there came the cry for the Repeal of the Union. Following upon this, we had Smith O'Brien's futile attempt at a revolution. No sooner was that crushed than the Phoenix Association arose, followed by Fenianism, the dregs of which have found a repository in Home Rule. The most painful aspect in which this, as well as other periods of Irish history, must be regarded is the injudicious, not to say unjust, manner in which successive Governments have tried to manage the conflicting affairs of that country. If when the Union took place, which proclaimed *perfect equality*, there had been incorporated with it—as Mr. Pitt earnestly desired—Catholic Emancipation, and thenceforward had followed a total avoidance of exceptional legislation, there would be at this day a different state of things in Ireland from what there is. This mistake having been made, it is yet more to be regretted that subsequent legislation has not been based upon the broad principle of what was right, calmly and fairly investigated, and spontaneously granted. Instead of this nothing has been yielded but what was obtained by clamour, disaffection, and making a display of physical force. "England has taught us," said one of the speakers at the Home Rule Conference, "for centuries that the only mode of obtaining concessions of what was just and right was by disaffection and resistance." The following sentiments of Mr. Fitzgibbon are well worth pondering by British statesmen:—

"What is to be done with Ireland? Do with it as you do with England; enact no special laws for Ireland that you would not enact for England. Be deaf to the speeches of patriots who represent no constituencies but Romish priests. Think not that you can quiet these by any concessions short of a counter-reformation, and short of placing in their hands the executive power of the Sovereign, whereby to enable them to enforce that obligation which their Catechism dogmatically imposes, of belonging to their Church. Make no alliance with these men or their representatives for party purposes, and agitation will soon become a bad trade, and Ireland will cease to be England's difficulty when it ceases to be the battle-field for English party strife."

—*Ireland in 1868*, p. 315.

The advocates of Home Rule loudly assert that Ireland is discontented. This will be readily admitted so far as the great bulk of the people is represented. A careful and candid examination into the causes of the discontent would be too much to expect from this class of patriots; their answer to the question is always ready,—“the evils which afflict the country are all owing to English misrule,”—and they dwell unceasingly and in the most extravagant strains of eulogy upon what Ireland was before the invasion and conquest in the time of Henry II., and in the interval from 1782 till the “accursed Union” took place. There has been too much credence given to the statements of Irish historians, respecting the condition of their island previous to the invasion by the Danes, and its conquest, or partial conquest, by the English. Let it be admitted that the seats of learning were numerous, that the monks of St. Patrick and Columb of the Churches were learned and pious, that these colleges were resorted to by royal personages and nobility from England and the Continent, and that there went forth from these monasteries zealous missionaries to evangelise the nations of Europe, does it follow that the community at large, what may be called the Irish people, were remarkable for their piety, or for a high degree of civilisation? Unhappily, the very reverse is found to have been their condition. Mr. Godkin, in his *Religious History of Ireland*—a work of little value, except for retailing the opinions of others—says, in reference to the state of things in the sixth century, that “the scattered pastoral people, with their numerous petty chiefs, were so liable to be plundered by marauding hosts, that they could never count on reaping or grinding what they had sown, their only mill being the quern, worked by the hand of a woman. Then civil war was almost incessant, and, as may be seen in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, the end of the vast majority of the rulers was a violent and untimely death. In fact those Annals, so far as they relate to worldly affairs, are little more than an account of robberies and butcheries perpetrated by the Irish upon one another before the Danish invasions.”

The foregoing account, which is in strict accordance with Dr. Keating's history, is corroborated by the writer before quoted. Master Fitzgibbon says :—

“In the annals of Ireland as it was before the English invasion there is little to be found descriptive of the social and domestic

habits of the people. So far as these can now be traced by inference from what is known of their laws and other authentic records, nothing can be discovered in them which a philanthropist could desire to see revived. No effects of laborious industry or agricultural skill can now be traced. No evidence of national union or national strength can be discovered; while the proofs of intestine discord, broils, and battles, and internecine feuds, are patent in every page of their authentic history. A disposition and apparently native propensity to continue these destructive quarrels is one of the most obvious parts of their moral inheritance. Aversion from tillage and partiality to cattle and to pastoral life was also one of their most palpable characteristics, and so continues to this present hour. The aboriginal Irish followed the wandering habit of the Scythians, and continually sought new pastures for their cattle. Hence what Spencer observed of them in the sixteenth century, that neither landlords would give, nor tenants take, land for any greater term than from year to year, or at will. From the reason which he gives for this we can infer one of their social habits, viz., 'That the landlords there used most shamefully rack their tenants, laying upon them coigny and livery at pleasure, and exacting of them (besides his covenants) what he pleaseth.' These exactions were countenanced, not by English government or English laws, but formed a part of ancient Irish dealing of landlords with their tenants, and were protected by native Irish laws, until they were restrained by a Statute in the 10th and 11th Charles I., c. 16, entitled, 'An Act for Suppressing of Coaserers and Wanderers.'—Pp. 140, 141.

As illustrative of the civilisation of a much later period, a quotation may be made from the same observant and impartial writer:—

"From the state of the roads, and the defective approaches to habitations at a distance from roads, carriage on horse-back was very generally used, and often used in a way highly characteristic of the nation. On my return from the Connaught circuit, I once paid a visit to Dr. Sanders, the then Bishop of Cashel, who had been my tutor in Trinity College. He asked me about what I had seen in Connaught. I told him I saw in Mayo what I had often heard of, but had never seen before, viz., the load suspended at one side of the horse, balanced by a stone of equal weight at the other side. "Well," said he, "for twenty years of my early life I saw every year, several times during the butter season, fifty horses, each led by a man, and having a firkin of butter suspended at one side, and at the other side a stone, to balance it; all leaving my father's town-land of Sallow Glyn, in the County of Kerry, in a troop for Cork, a journey of fifty Irish miles; and it

never occurred to them to leave twenty-five of the horses and the fifty stones at home."—P. 153.

It may, however, be admitted that Ireland might have fared better under English rule; it probably would, had the conquest of the country, in the first instance, been complete, and Saxon laws been introduced. The rebellions, attainders, and confiscations which extended over several centuries would not have occurred; there would have been no provocation for the enactment of those terrible penal laws that brought so much discredit upon the Government, and that are still such a fruitful source of complaint and invective on the part of Irish demagogues, although abolished long since, and that by a purely Protestant legislation.

With respect to the period of 1782, of which the orators at the Home Rule Conference so loudly boasted, there needs but little to be said. Everyone familiar with the history of that period knows well that there existed perpetual quarrels between the Parliament and the volunteers on the one hand, and Dublin mobs on the other, as also with the Imperial Parliament on matters of commercial law and the Regency question; and so little influence did it exert, that Ireland, most of the time, was in a state of chronic rebellion, which came to a crisis in 1798. The turbulent and unruly use made of the legislative independence of 1782, made the union, or a total separation, indispensable.

The spirit that induces men to exaggerate respecting the condition of Ireland in former times, leads them to misrepresent and depreciate her social condition in later and in the present times. Complaints are constantly made on the platform, in the disaffected Irish press, and from the altar, on the subject of *emigration*; and anything but the true cause is assigned to account for it, fairly considered. Want of employment is referred to as one cause. This will be readily admitted; but why, it might be asked, this want of employment? "There is no manufacture in the country, and no fisheries along the coasts," is the reply. It is lamentably true that there are no manufactories worth naming out of Ulster; but why is Ulster in possession of them, and the other three provinces, possessing greater material advantages, without them? Not for want of capital, for there is abundance of it. Dr. Handcock's summary, just issued, shows that the sums deposited in

joint stock and savings' banks amounts to £32,000,000, being an increase of £20,000,000 over the deposits of 1845, and the whole capital of Ireland is estimated at £217,792,000, being an increase over that of 1840 of £59,191,000. But if an answer must be given, we venture to say that the risks to capitalists are too great, and, so far as the priests are concerned, the number of holidays they inflict on the people militate against steady industry. The same may be said of the fisheries. How is it that hundreds of boats, with their steady and industrious crews from Cornwall and the Isle of Man, spend several months of the year fishing along the Irish coasts, with profit to themselves, or to their employers? Are they aided by Government grants? The loudest outcry on the subject of emigration is raised against the landlords. This is just as fallacious as the other arguments that are used. The farmers find that laying out the land in pasture pays them better than tillage; can they be blamed, and much less the landlords, for adopting this course? While within the last ten years there is a slight falling off in the cultivation of wheat, of oats, and potatoes, there is an increase of crops required for feeding cattle; and of cattle and sheep, as shown by the returns of the Registrar-General, of the former 83,003, and the latter 218,799, making an increase in the total value for the ten years of £276,665. Moreover, the emigration from Ulster has been probably as great as from any part of Ireland, and tenant right, which is so eagerly desired in the South and West, there prevails. If there be any element other than to better their condition in influencing Ulster men to emigrate, it is to quit a country where so much encouragement is given to agitation, and a premium put upon sedition by successive Governments bestowing offices and emoluments upon a class who are labouring with all their might to perpetuate disloyalty; and there is reason for believing that many well-to-do and quiet Roman Catholics, as well as Protestants in the South of Ireland, have reluctantly emigrated to escape the annoyances and perils of disaffection, which the priests could have easily controlled or prevented. Emigration may in part be ascribed to several of the causes hinted at, but in a greater degree it arises from a redundancy of population; and viewed in that relation, it is a blessing rather than a curse, inasmuch as it reduces the supply of labour to the demand, and thus, by raising wages, increases

the comfort of the labouring class. The emigrants themselves are generally bettered by it, by going where there is employment, and making their escape from a country where the idle become the easy dupes of would-be patriots, who trade in politics for the accomplishment of their own selfish ends.

In the agitation now afresh set on foot for a restoration of the Irish Parliament, while there is frequent reference to that of 1782, it is not intended to go back to the state of things before the Union. The design is to embrace all the reforms and advantages which Catholic Emancipation and recent measures have conferred, with a greatly enlarged programme. "The Irish House of Commons," says Mr. Butt, in his *Irish Federalism*, "ought to be numerous enough to constitute a really popular assembly." In addition to those returned for the counties, he contemplates every town having a population of more than 3,000 being represented, and the grouping of smaller towns, so that every district in Ireland may be adequately represented. The number of the Commons he estimates at from 250 to 800 members. The higher figure would bring it on a par with the Parliament before the Union. The House of Lords presents a greater difficulty to the Home Rulers. Some would dispense with the Upper House altogether, but Mr. Butt does not at present contemplate a step so revolutionary; it should, however, in his opinion, be modified by several restrictions:—for instance, by descent from those who sat in the Irish House of Peers, and who had connection with the country, by residence in the country, at least for a certain period. Of course, it would be competent for the Sovereign, as she might be advised by her Irish Parliament and Executive, to create new peers; so that veteran Irish patriots, as O'Neill Daunt, John Martin, and Mitchell Henry, may entertain expectations that their services to the cause of Ireland's regeneration shall not go unrewarded. The powers of the new Parliament are thus summarised by Mr. M'Carthy, whose little book has the merit of great clearness, so far as it goes.

"As to the Irish Parliament, it would have supreme control of the internal affairs of Ireland, just as if no Imperial Parliament existed. Its jurisdiction would include every exclusively Irish interest: education, agriculture, commerce, manufactures, public works, courts of justice, magistracy, public railways, post-office,

corporations, grand juries, and every other detail of Irish business and Irish national life. If deemed desirable, however, it might be arranged that the establishment of any religious ascendancy, or the alteration of the Acts which settled Irish property in the reign of Charles II., should be placed beyond its jurisdiction."

The powers of the Imperial Parliament are thus presented by Mr. M'Carthy, in agreement with Mr. Butt's *Treatise on Federalism* :—

"As to the Imperial Parliament, it would continue to have the same supreme powers that it now possesses over all Imperial affairs just as completely as if no Irish Parliament existed. Its jurisdiction would include every international transaction: all relations with foreign states; all questions of peace and war; the government of the Colonies, the army, navy, and all that relates to the defence and stability of the empire; control of the Imperial customs, and general trade regulations; control of expenditure and supplies for all Imperial purposes; power to levy general taxation for such purposes; charge of the public debt and the Imperial Civil List; and sovereign power, within the limits of its attributions, over every individual citizen of both countries."—
P. 10.

This plan would involve the necessity for the English members to meet in a separate assembly, for the transaction of all purely English business. If Scotland wished for a separate Parliament, Mr. Butt thinks the matter could be easily arranged, and a time could be fixed for the meeting of the Imperial Parliament, when Ireland would, of course, be represented. In ordinary times, it is Mr. Butt's opinion that its business would be light, and could be got through in two months of the year.

Some serious difficulties present themselves at the very threshold of this edifice, and they are either not noticed or but very superficially treated by the expounders of Home Rule principles. There is the difficulty of determining what are Imperial and what are Irish questions. Education is placed among the subjects to be left to the Irish Legislature. Germany very properly treats this as an Imperial question, and one of vital interest to a nation. It may be very convenient to say, as has been said: "It is of vital importance to Ireland what her boys and girls are taught in schools; but of what concern is this to other parts of the empire?" It is certain that denominational education would soon become the law of the land; for every Home Ruler on the hustings pledged him-

self to support it. This would be, however, to disregard the views of the majority of Protestants, not only of the North but throughout all Ireland. Moreover, what guarantee should we have that the Irish Parliament would confine itself to questions of a purely local kind? The experience of Poor Law Boards and Town Councils in Ireland is entirely on the side of perpetual interference with matters beyond their province. And, further, there exists a "Catholic Union" in Dublin, with Cardinal Cullen at its head, which charges itself with Catholic interests throughout the world, and is pledged to restore the Pope to his temporal power. This may be regarded as an Ultramontane club, for the purpose of directing Parliamentary action, and there will be probably an association of Home Rulers with the same object in view, if there be ever a Parliament in College Green. In addition to the above considerations, it may be inquired, will any sane man suppose that, if supplies are to be voted for war purposes, there would not be opposition where the interests of Romanism are imperilled? It may be affirmed, without question, that there is scarcely a member of that Church in Parliament that would not sacrifice any interest belonging to the British Empire to the demands of Romanism in any part of the world. There needs be little said respecting two other subjects which are anticipated by Messrs. Butt and M'Carthy—viz., religious ascendancy and the disturbance of the Act in relation to the settlement of property. At the Home Rule Conference it was with great difficulty that resolutions affecting these questions passed. Forsooth, it was humiliating for such a dignified assembly as that to be asked to bind themselves to such a course, and it was inquired, "Is there not religious ascendancy in England?" As to the alteration of the Acts of Charles II., relating to the settlement of property, there is nothing upon which a large number of Romanists, descendants of the ancient Septs, have set their hearts with so much tenacity as the recovery of those possessions of which their ancestors were deprived. The literary and artistic class among the Fenians, or, as they are now called, the Nationalists, have maps of those properties carefully prepared, to be produced whenever the fitting time arrives for their use.

The main difficulty, however, of Ireland—whether things remain as they are, or the Home Rulers succeed in the effort to establish a Parliament in College Green—is the

priesthood, and especially as it exists under such influence as that of Cardinal Cullen. Belonging, as is generally the case, to the low farming or shopkeeping class, brought up with but a partial knowledge of modern history, and with exaggerated ideas respecting their own country in former ages, and of the wrongs inflicted by English conquest and dominion, their education but ill suits to make them contented or loyal subjects of the British nation. They are the most Ultramontane of any of their class in Europe. They seem to be animated by one predominant feeling of hatred to England. Whatever is calculated to lower her, gratifies them. They endeavour to throw a dark shade over everything that places her in a favourable light. It is to be feared this spirit influences them to such an extent that they would rather keep the people in agrarian disturbance than aid in the settlement of conflicting matters, such as would produce quietness and contentment. With respect to education, mechanics' institutes, reading rooms, temperance associations, Freemasonry, their influence is invariably exerted to hinder the blending of Romanists and Protestants. They incessantly labour to widen every breach, and aggravate every cause of separation. Their whole effort appears to be in view, not of promoting a common citizenship, but of ridding the country of the Protestant population, whom they ever regard as representing an alien Church and English interests. No matter to what extent they may have been served by such statesmen as Earl Russell or the late Lord Palmerston, if a disparaging sentence has dropped from their pen, or their lips, respecting their Church, they bear them undying hatred. And they communicate their prejudices to their flocks, so that the very servant girls attending mass become politicians on all subjects which affect the welfare of their Church.

At the Home Rule Conference, and in subsequent newspaper correspondence, the greatest difference of opinion prevailed. Some were for simple repeal of the union, others had views of Federalism, not in accordance with the Council of Home Rulers; and an extreme party of Nationalists, who would doubtless proclaim a Republic, complained of being "gagged." But not a few of the most shrewd among those holding extreme opinions professed satisfaction with Federalism, reserving to themselves, when that is obtained, as they hope it will, to pursue the old course to which they have been accustomed in Ireland, of

getting up a fresh agitation for something in addition. To the vast majority of the Celtic population, in the addresses of candidates and election speeches, nothing suited better than the phrase, "Home Rule." Whatever may be Mr. Butt's explanation, the great bulk of the people throughout three of the provinces understand by it separation from England, getting rid of the landlords, and communism in land and other property. The fact of having more than half the number of members from Ireland pledged to Home Rule, is formidable in itself; and, were a Government disposed to barter for the Irish vote, the consequences, not only to Ireland, but to the British nation, might be very serious. However, it is a gratification to know that the present Ministry is placed in circumstances to resist the temptation, and to stand by the great principles of the Constitution. This course will be approved by the British public, by the Protestants of Ireland, whose opinions and interests for a long time have received but little attention from British statesmen, and by the intelligent and quietly disposed portion of the Roman Catholics. Under a system of patience and perseverance, carried out with firmness and impartiality, there may be, sooner than might be expected, a healthful public spirit created in Ireland, which will lessen, if not destroy, the influence of unprincipled and bigoted agitators. In connection with this, Government ought to see the necessity of making an arrangement for the carriage of private and local Bills relating to Ireland transacted without involving the immense expenditure of time and money now incurred. And we think it not yet too late to establish a Royal Residence in Ireland, through which the country might see more of its own nobility, and be brought to feel that it is treated, not as an outlying province, but as a part of a great nation, and entitled to a share in its dignities and honours.

ART. IV.—1. *Llyfryddiaeth y Cymry; or, Cambrian Bibliography, containing an Account of the Books Printed in the Welsh Language, or Relating to Wales, from the Year 1546 to the End of the 18th Century.* By the late Rev. WILLIAM ROWLANDS. Edited and Enlarged by the Rev. D. S. EVANS, B.D., Rector of Llan-yn-Mawddwy, Merionethshire. Llanidloes: John Pryse. 1869.

2. *Yr Eurgrawn.* (Welsh Wesleyan Magazine.) 1868.

3. *The History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales.* By THOMAS REES. London: 1861.

It is not a little remarkable that a community should be found, in the nineteenth century, inhabiting the twelve counties west of the Dee and the Severn, within a few hours' ride of London, speaking and writing a language so different in sound and structure from the noble language employed by their neighbours and fellow-subjects. It is strange that, rather than abandon their ancient vernacular, they seem even to take increasing interest in cultivating it, and in improving and extending its literature. The Welsh language, whilst certainly dying away on the borders of Wales, is, we believe, through the increase of population, emigration, and other causes, more extensively read, if not spoken, this day than ever it was. The question has been much discussed of late in some quarters, whether it would not be better for the Welsh people to forsake their ancient language as soon as possible, and substitute for it the world-wide English. It is alleged that the Welsh is a harsh, barbarian tongue; that some of the people who speak it are but semi-civilised; that it is a barrier to the moral and intellectual progress of the people of the Principality; and that, before the advance of railways and telegraphs, school boards and schoolmasters, this relic of ancient barbarism will soon be swept away, and that the sooner the better. We have heard one hundred years—and even fifty—stated as the utmost remainder of its unexpired lease even in the Welshest parts of Wales.

Some Englishmen may believe all this for want of

better acquaintance with the actual social state of the Principality. This is the opinion of some Welshmen, and may be the wish of a few, who, puffed up with vain refinement, despise the grand old language of their forefathers. Everyone must admit that, since the introduction of railways, the English language has very rapidly extended in Wales. We are surprised but pleased to hear English spoken daily in localities where, thirty and forty years ago, an English word could hardly be heard once in six months. But, it should be remembered, that the same facilities which occasioned such an influx of English people into Wales have also conveyed multitudes of Welsh people into England, thus creating fresh demands for Welsh books and Welsh religious services. In London, in Birmingham, in Bristol, in Liverpool, in Manchester, and in many other great English centres, there has been of late years a considerable increase of Welsh-speaking people. And this remark applies also to America, Australia, New Zealand, and other distant lands where Welsh populations gather and Welsh Churches form, thus occasioning new and pressing demands for instruction in that language. Never, we believe, did the Welsh press show so much activity as at the present day; never was there so loud a demand for preaching and for books in the language of Wales.

All day-schools in the Principality, it is true, teach the English language, and encourage its spread in Wales, and it only; but most of the Sabbath-schools very zealously teach the young to read, learn, and love the Holy Scriptures in the native tongue.

Judging from present prospects, and not forgetting future changes in the state of the population, we believe there are many parts of Wales where the population is still so settled, and so purely Celtic, as to afford but few indications of the early decease of the old language. In the hilly parts of the counties of Carmarthen, Cardigan, Montgomery, Merioneth, Carnarvon, and Anglesey, families can trace their pedigree back to ancestors who occupied their houses, cultivated their fields, and spoke their language centuries ago, and the present probability is that these occupations will be carried on by their descendants also for centuries yet to come. We think we know neighbourhoods amongst the hills of Wales so little given to change as to make it appear probable now that English-speaking

people visiting them a hundred years hence, will have their questions answered with—*Dim Sa'sneg.*

As to the Welsh language being an obstacle in the way of moral improvement, the fact should not be overlooked that Wales is as free from crime as any part of the United Kingdom. Judges visiting Welsh circuits have often light duties to discharge, and have been frequently presented with white gloves. Cardiganshire is a Welsh county, but it frequently happens that in its Quarter Sessions there is no prisoner at all to be tried. Very lately, at the county gaol, the governor, matron, cook, turnkeys, surgeon, and chaplain had but one prisoner under their care.

As to intellectual cultivation, the youth of Wales should by all means be encouraged to learn the English language. If they do not, they will certainly be excluded from many important advantages. English is required for all posts of honour and emolument; commercial transactions are carried on in English; able volumes in theology, history, and science are issued in it, and can be studied in it alone; these and other considerations should impress upon the minds of the rising generation in Wales the great importance of obtaining acquaintance with the English language. But whilst we encourage them by all means to acquire a knowledge of that tongue, we are not of the number of those who would tell them to neglect and forget their own; as we believe that it also may be of great use, besides affording them both pleasure and instruction. And those who may not have any opportunity of learning English, may, in these days, find valuable means of mental improvement in their own language, although not to be compared with those supplied by its wealthy sister. Nothing surprises a Welsh student more, on his acquiring a knowledge of English, than the vast and varied stores of knowledge to which he is introduced through its medium.

We know that languages die hard, and believe that the Welsh is too deeply rooted in the hearts of the Cymry to die for a long time. They are a religious people, and the Welsh, with the majority of them, is the speech of their religion. They may prefer to use the English in the transaction of business, in education, in correspondence, and in conversation, but they will *pray* in Welsh. They love the Welsh Bible, the Welsh sermon, the Welsh hymn, and the Welsh englyn. Indeed, we may say

that it is religion that supports the Welsh language. It is held up by the pulpit and the Sunday-school. All day-schools exclude it. Law courts ignore it. Eisteddfodau even deteriorate into mere musical festivals. The Welsh, in our judgment, is not the best adapted for business, education, science, nor philosophy. But it is the Welshman's sacred language. He believes it the best for devotion, and the most forcible in praise, prayer and preaching.

The interest of many Welshmen in their old language has been quickened of late years by the publication of the singular volume at the head of this paper. The publication of this work discovered what ancient treasures in theology, history, and poetry that language possesses; and it served to show that, whenever the language of the Cambro-Britons dies, it will transmit literary works worth bequeathing to posterity. Before we examine this volume, we will briefly look at the life of its author.

His biography appeared in the successive numbers of the *Eurgrawn*, or the Welsh Methodist Wesleyan Magazine for 1868. The Rev. William Rowlands, who was a Wesleyan minister, in the Welsh work, was a native of Carnarvonshire, and was born in the year 1802. When a youth, whilst reading in the above magazine an article on "Eternity," that word, in Welsh *tragwyddoldeb*, was so deeply impressed upon his mind as to lead to thoughts which ended in his conversion. Beginning to preach, the Methodist Conference of 1829 appointed him to the Cardiff (Welsh) Circuit. His early advantages had been but scanty, but he had naturally a strong passion for books, especially for ancient books which amounted almost to a mania. During the two years he spent at Cardiff, he read no less than 108 volumes, some of them large, and indicative of the early bias of his mind to biography and antiquity,—his favourite subjects through his after life.

Mr. Rowlands spent many laborious years of the earlier part of his ministry in several circuits in North Wales. After three years of great labour at Newmarket, we find him removing to Ruthin. During his two years here, besides his constant journeys in the Vale of Clwyd, and many duties, we find that he preached no less than 635 times. His next removal was to Llanidloes. In the present day it would take but a few hours to convey a family from Ruthin to Llanidloes, but then—in 1842—it was a tedious journey, occupying three days and two nights.

At the latter place, Mr. Rowlands, in addition to his circuit duties, had to discharge the office of editor in the Connexional Bookroom. In 1853 we find him burdened with the entire care of that establishment, being book-steward as well as editor. But this was congenial with his taste; he was never more in his element than when surrounded by books and papers. He laboured in the Itinerancy until 1864, when his health gave way; and the following year he died, aged 63 years.

Mr. Rowlands was a man of good abilities, of scrupulous fidelity, and of unsurpassed diligence and perseverance. Through life he was a bookworm, and had an eager passion for ancient British books, and for all sorts of documents in any way pertaining to Wales. Early in life he formed a resolution to ascertain what remains of this character existed; and succeeded in compiling a register of such books from the first printed in 1564 down to the year 1800. The Itinerancy was favourable to his purpose, giving him opportunities of searching shelves and libraries in every part of the Principality. Since his death this lengthy catalogue has been most carefully revised by the Rev. D. Sylvan Evans. Mr. Evans was a friend of the author, and sympathised thoroughly with his cherished literary undertaking. He is also an accomplished Welsh scholar, and the author of an English-Welsh Dictionary and other useful works. He has discharged his editorial duties most ably and faithfully. The work is published in a goodly octavo volume of 784 pp., and is written in the Welsh language.

Mr. Rowlands' researches carry us back from the present time to the year 1546, 328 years ago. Having concluded his record with the last century, the period he has traced embraces 254 years. Beginning in the reign of the Tudors, this period extends over the reign of the Stuarts, the Commonwealth, the reign of the Prince of Orange, and the stirring events of those times, coming down to the reign of the third George. Thus we are led by him to look at the literature called forth by the Protestant Reformation, and at the free use made of the press as well as the pulpit by the Reformers, the Puritans, and the Nonconformists of Wales, in order to enlighten their benighted land. We are also led to see the obstacles and difficulties by which the efforts of those good men were impeded, as Popery and other influences were successively in the ascendant. We

believe that the literature of any age is a good index of the character of that age. The Reformation from Popery in this kingdom called forth a healthy literature, whilst the restoration of Popery checked the growth of knowledge and learning. We find that a few Welsh books were published in the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII. and during the reign of Edward VI. Many such books were issued under the reign of Queen Elizabeth, but not one during the reign of the Popish Queen Mary! Facts like these are very significant.

The Reformation created a vehement demand for the Word of God in the Welsh tongue, and it sought also to supply it, although too slowly. The first book found in the Welsh language is called "Beibl," but it appears that it contained no more of the Holy Scriptures than the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. This volume was printed in London in 1546. The books which next followed were chiefly grammars and dictionaries of the Welsh language, by Mr. William Salesbury. Mr. Salesbury was a superior Welsh scholar, a zealous patron of Welsh literature, and a sound Protestant. In 1551 he issued a version of as much of the Holy Scriptures as was then used in the Church Service. In 1567 there appeared a translation of the New Testament into the Welsh language, chiefly by Mr. Salesbury. The following lines are found at the end of the volume :

"Imprinted at London, by Henry Denham, at the costes and charges of Humphrey Toy, dwelling in Pauls Church-yard, at the signe of Helmet."

This first edition of the New Testament in the Welsh language was the result of an Act of Parliament passed in the fifth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to the effect that the entire Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, the Common Prayer, and the service of the Sacraments, should be translated into the British or Welsh language, and published under the editorship of the Bishops of St. Asaph, Bangor, St. David's, Llandaff, and Hereford, and be ready for use in the churches by the first day of March, 1566, every one of the Bishops to be fined to the amount of £40 in case of failure.

This edition of the New Testament was divided into chapters, every chapter being preceded by its "Argument," or contents; and from the beginning of the Second Epistle of Timothy to the end of Revelation it is divided into verses. The volume is introduced by an able pre-

face by Dr. Richard Davies, Bishop of St. David's. This good prelate, and the Rev. Thomas Huet, precentor of St. David's, greatly aided Mr. Wm. Salesbury in his undertaking. In his preface, the Bishop appeals to the Welsh people to appreciate the Divine volume, assuring them that the Old Testament also should soon be given them. Twenty-one years, however, passed away before they received this boon. It was not until the year 1588 that the entire Bible, including the books of the Apocrypha, was first printed in the Welsh language.

It appears strange that such a long delay should occur in accomplishing the work which, according to Act of Parliament, was to be done in three years. It must, however, be admitted that the time specified in the Act was too short for so great an undertaking. Besides this, it does not appear that any provision was made for expenses incurred by translating, printing, and securing a copy of the Holy Book for every one of the nine or ten hundred churches and chapels in the Principality. However, the year 1588 was a happy year for Wales; and the name of Dr. William Morgan, Bishop of St. Asaph, is dear to the heart of every true Welshman, he having been the instrument of rendering the entire Word of God into the language of his countrymen.

It does not appear that Dr. Morgan undertook this work so much on account of the Act of Parliament, as from a sense of the crying need there was for the Word of Life. In his dedication of the Bible to Queen Elizabeth the Bishop gratefully acknowledges the help he had received in his undertaking from Archbishop Whitgift; the Bishops of St. Asaph and Bangor; Dr. David Powell; Archdeacon Prys, of Merioneth, author of a poetical version of the the Psalms; the Rev. Richard Vaughan, then the Rector of Lutterworth, afterwards Bishop of Bangor, Chester, and London; and Dr. Daniel Goodman, Dean of Westminster, at whose house Dr. Morgan was entertained whilst superintending the press. The work was printed in London, in black letter, by Christopher and Robert Barker, in a large folio volume, with some marginal references, a Kalendar, and a Latin Dedication.

Dr. William Morgan was a native of Carnarvonshire; was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; received the vicarage of Welshpool in 1575; and in 1578 was preferred to the vicarage of Llanrhaidr-Mochnant, Denbigh-

shire. It was whilst residing at this latter place that he undertook and accomplished the arduous task of translating the entire Scriptures into the Welsh language. A strong desire prevailed at the time amongst many of the people for such a version ; but the laudable work of obtaining it was strenuously opposed by the Popish party, who complained to the Bishop of the Diocese, and even to the Archbishop of Canterbury, of the unfitness of the Vicar Morgan for the work of translating the Holy Scriptures. This led to the introduction of the vicar to the Primate, who, on examination, found him to be a perfect master of both the Greek and Hebrew languages. The Archbishop (Whitgift) then asked him if he knew the Welsh language as well as he knew Hebrew ? The vicar modestly replied, " I trust, my lord, you will allow me to assure you that I know my mother's language better than any other language." In a few years after accomplishing this great work the learned and pious vicar was promoted to the bishopric of Llandaff, as he was afterwards to the bishopric of St. Asaph, where he died in the year 1604.

In 1620, another edition of Bishop Morgan's version appeared, revised by Bishop Richard Parry, his successor at St. Asaph. This learned gentleman was a native of Ruthin, and was trained under the historian Camden, at Westminster School. From thence he went into the University of Oxford. He afterwards became head-master of Ruthin School, which was founded by Dr. Gabriel Goodman. In revising Bishop Morgan's version, he was much assisted by his learned chaplain, Dr. John Davies, of Mallwyd. This edition is substantially the same as the standard version in present use,* and is acknowledged to be an excellent translation.

These editions were only of a limited number of copies, for use in cathedrals and parish churches ; but in the year 1680, in the reign of Charles II., some aldermen and citizens of London, to their great honour, brought out, at their own expense, a cheap and portable octavo edition of the entire Scriptures, including also the Apocrypha, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Psalms in verse, in the Welsh language. This edition was for the use of the people of Wales. The Word of God should be no longer

* Dr. Phillips' *Jubilee Book*, p. 40.

chained to the reading-desks of damp parish churches, but should circulate freely amongst the masses of the people. In 1647 an edition of 1,000 copies of the New Testament was issued. As religious knowledge increased and extended, there was a louder cry for the Scriptures; and in 1654, the first year of the Protector, through the labours of two itinerant preachers, Mr. Walter Craddock and Mr. Vavassor Powell, an edition of 6,000 copies of the Bible was issued. This edition is often called "*Bibl Cromwell*." In 1672, chiefly by the aid of a generous Englishman, Mr. Thomas Gouge, an 8vo. edition of the New Testament and the Psalms in prose and verse, was issued; and in 1678, chiefly by his help, an edition of 8,000 copies of the Welsh Bible, with the Common Prayer, was printed in London. One thousand copies of this edition were given away to the poor, and the other copies were sold for four shillings each, being less than cost price. Mr. Gouge and Mr. Stephen Hughes, two pious clergymen, ejected for their Nonconformity—one in London, and the other in Carmarthenshire—laboured worthily to supply Wales with the Word of God, the former by his liberality, and the latter by his zeal in collecting subscriptions and correcting the press. In 1690, an 8vo. edition of 10,000 copies of the Bible was published by another ejected clergyman, the Rev. David Jones, of Llandysilio, assisted by Lord Wharton and others. In 1690, an edition of 1,000 copies of the Bible was printed at Oxford, for use in the Welsh parish churches. This edition contains some chronological notes and references by Bishop Lloyd, and is known as *Bibl Esgob Llwyd*.

Corporations and societies can always bring about great works far better than individuals, however zealous and devoted. In 1719 appeared the first edition of the Holy Scriptures in Welsh, under the patronage of the Society for the Diffusion of Christian Knowledge. This edition was printed in London, under the supervision of the Rev. Moses Williams, Vicar of Devynock, and contained the Apocrypha, hymns, forms of prayer, marginal references, &c. Ten thousand copies of it were printed. In 1727, an edition of 5,000 copies was issued; in 1746, another edition of 15,000 copies; another again in 1769, of 20,000. Editions now became more frequent, until the memorable year 1804, when the British and Foreign Bible Society was established. This society circulated at various times between the years 1806 and 1853 no less than

818,745 copies of Bibles and Testaments in the Welsh language. Besides these, large editions were also issued and circulated during this period by the Society for the Diffusion of Christian Knowledge.

The services of good churchmen, especially learned bishops, three centuries ago, in securing the great boon of the entire Scriptures in the native tongue of Wales, are but seldom appreciated, and sometimes ignored. The Rev. (now Dr.) T. Raes, in his *History of Protestant Non-conformity in Wales*, complains of the "culpable carelessness and apathy of the Welsh bishops and clergy of the sixteenth century," in withholding the Word of God from the "body of the people for nearly a century after the overthrow of Popery" (p. 11). Again :—

"The Protestant religion had been established in this kingdom thirty years before the Bible was translated into the language of Wales; thirty-four years before we find any Welshman recommending anything like separation from the established worship, and eighty-one years before any actual separation took place. The Church had the whole field to herself for eighty-one years, but nothing worthy to be recorded had been done during this long period to enlighten the nation, except the laudable work of translating the Scriptures into the vernacular, and this had been accomplished by a few worthy individuals upon their own responsibility. The mass of the nation were as ignorant and superstitious in 1689 as they were in 1558, with the exception of a few thousands who had been enlightened by the earnest preaching of a small number of persecuted clergymen."—Pp. 37, 38.

Certainly it is a relief to know that there was "earnest preaching," and that there were "a few thousands enlightened" by it in those dark and distant days. The Established Church of the sixteenth century, with all its serious shortcomings, could not have been altogether indolent. A nation deeply sunk in the Popish ignorance and servility of feudal times and dark ages, could hardly be expected to shake off its vices, superstition and degradation, and to arise into the higher life of liberty and enlightenment in a day. What took place in this kingdom in the sixteenth century was more the "overthrow" of the temporal power of the Papacy than of the religious system of Popery. The power and authority of the Pope as head of the Church of England were overthrown, but Popish doctrine and practice were still extensively maintained by King Henry VIII. and by his subjects. An

incredible amount of bigotry and intolerance prevailed through the land for a long time. "Earnest clergymen" were "persecuted," and efforts to provide the Holy Scriptures in the native language were discouraged and opposed. The ignorance and apathy of the mass of the people of Wales were very great, and it is stated upon undisputed authority that not more than one in a hundred of them then could even read.* Had the Scriptures been earlier translated, as doubtless they might have been, it appears that but comparatively little use could have been made of them.

It was providential for Wales that the "few worthy individuals" who undertook the task of translating the Holy Writings into Welsh lived at the time they did, and were so highly qualified for the work which they so ably executed. These "few worthy individuals" were learned clergymen and bishops, except Mr. Wm. Salesbury, and he was appointed to the work of translation by the bishops, and greatly aided in it by the Bishop of St. David's. The names of Bishop Davies, Bishop Morgan, and Bishop Parry, should be held in highest esteem by all who love the Welsh Bible; and no antipathy to episcopacy, or zeal for the separation of the Church from the State, should forbid any Nonconformist historian to allow them and the Church they represented the high honour they deserve for having rendered the Divine Word in the language of the Cymry. Had all the successors of those good and learned prelates been, like them, Welsh-speaking bishops, doubtless the position of the Established Church in the Welsh dioceses at the present day would not have presented so humiliating an aspect. Dr. Rees has written an able and useful history, but it is too much the history of Independency to be a fair history of Nonconformity in Wales.

The circulation of the Holy Scriptures in Wales caused the Welsh language to be increasingly studied and cultivated, grammars and dictionaries of it to be written, books to explain and enforce the doctrines of the Bible to be prepared, and a gradually increasing literature to come into existence. Divine Providence raised up men of piety, talent, and energy, to be the instruments to arouse and enlighten their countrymen by means of both the press and

* *Hanes Crefydd y Nghymru*, p. 220.

the pulpit. Mr. Rowlands and Dr. Rees have both given us brief but valuable accounts of these worthies.

The first and most notable of these evangelists since the Reformation was John ap Henry, or the valiant martyr, John Penry. He was a native of Breconshire, and was born in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558). We shall not now dwell upon his history, but refer the reader to the Life by Dr. Waddington for an account of his self-sacrificing labours, through his printing press and in other ways, for the evangelisation of Wales. John Penry, Walter Craddock, Vavassor Powell, and several other early evangelists, used the English language in their ministrations; but other eminent labourers were raised up, who wrote and preached in their native tongue, and were more successful in reaching the hearts of the masses of their countrymen.

One of the first and most famous of these was the Rev. Rees Prichard, the vicar of Llandovery. He was born in that town in the year 1579, and was the eldest son of a gentleman bearing the singular name of David ap Richard ap David ap Rhys ap David. Mr. Rees Prichard was educated at Oxford, where he took his degree of M.A. In 1602, he was appointed to the curacy of Witham, in the county of Essex, and was in the same year promoted Vicar of Llandovery, where he ministered until his death in 1644. He also became chaplain to the Earl of Essex, and held many other preferments. As he was a sound Protestant and an able preacher, pluralities in him proved a good thing, his official visits to the several localities with which he was connected being a very great benefit to the people. Multitudes crowded to listen to his Evangelical ministry, which could not be contained in the churches, and to them he preached in the open air.

During the earlier part of Mr. Prichard's ministry, no Welsh Scriptures could be found anywhere except in the parish churches. Perceiving the ignorance of the people, and knowing their native love of poetry and music, he was led to versify the substance of his sermons. This he did in a simple racy style. Written copies of them were circulated amongst the people, and were rendered a great blessing. In 1646, these compositions were published, bearing the title, *Y Seren Fore, neu Ganwyll y Cymry* (*The Morning Star, or the Welshman's Candle*). This work had passed through no less than sixteen editions

by the end of last century. An English edition (8vo.) appeared in 1771, translated by the Rev. William Evans, Vicar of Lanbaden, and printed at Carmarthen. The spot where the pious vicar was buried is unknown, but "*Canwyll y Cymry*" is no mean monument of his name and virtues. Next to the Bible, probably no book in the Welsh language has been so much read and treasured in the memory; no book so many of whose sentences are become household words in Wales; no book which has exercised so beneficial an influence upon the character of the Welsh nation.

In the year 1671, twenty-seven years after the death of Vicar Prichard, was published *Y Ffydd Ddifuant*, or, *The Unfeigned Faith*, "being a defence of the Christian religion, and containing a brief history of it from the beginning of the world." Little is known of Charles Edwards, the learned and diligent author of this work. It appears that much of his time was spent between London and Oxford, in active efforts to prepare Welsh books for his beloved countrymen. This useful volume on the history and evidences of the Christian faith, which has undergone many editions, is a lasting memorial of the excellent author.

We must again refer to a great patron of Cambrian literature, mentioned by us before, a contemporary and probably a friend of Mr. Charles Edwards, as well as Mr. Stephen Hughes—the Rev. Thomas Gouge, M.A., son of Dr. Gouge, of Blackfriars, London. He was educated at Eton, and appointed to the living of St. Sepulchre, London, where he laboured usefully until he was silenced by the Act of Uniformity. He directed his attention to needy Wales, and, in union with Archbishop Tillotson, formed a Voluntary Society for the establishment of day-schools, and for the distribution of Bibles and good books in the Principality. He was the means of founding between three and four hundred day-schools to teach children to read; and even in advanced age delighted to travel amongst the hills of Wales to distribute his own and other charities to poor ministers and others. Archbishop Tillotson preached the funeral sermon of this good man and great lover of "his nation." It is impossible now to ascertain how indebted Wales is to the labours and the liberality of the Revs. Thomas Gouge, Stephen Hughes, Charles Edwards, and Archbishop Tillotson, in supplying it with Bibles and good books, and in establishing day-schools in a time of pressing need.

We pass on to another benefactor, who did much for the enlightenment of Wales by establishing day-schools, as well as by means of both the press and the pulpit—the Rev. Griffith Jones, of Llanddowror. He was a native of Carmarthenshire, and was born in 1683. He was educated at the Grammar School, Carmarthen, and ordained by Bishop Bull, in 1708. In 1716, he was promoted to the living of Llanddowror, Carmarthenshire. Occasionally he also officiated in the church of Llanllwch, near Carmarthen. Attending his ministry at the latter place was Miss Bridget Vaughan, who afterwards became the wife of Arthur Bevan, Esq., of Lacharn—a lady whose memory is blessed in Wales on account of her goodness and liberality. In 1730, the Rev. Griffith Jones began his circulating day-schools. These schools were removed from one parish to another, as called for, and were the means of imparting instruction to above 150,000 persons. After the death of Mr. Jones, they were carried on by the liberality of Mrs. Bevan, who also bequeathed the sum of £10,000 towards their support. Mr. Jones died at Mrs. Bevan's house in 1761, aged 78 years. This good man was the means of bringing out two editions of the Welsh Bible. He also wrote and published eleven or twelve different works in the Welsh language, and some in English, and several of them have been repeatedly published. He was one of the excellent of the earth, and by his schools, his preaching, and his useful publications, was the instrument of doing incalculable good to his own and succeeding generations.

The next step will bring us down to the Methodist Revival. We shall only notice two or three eminent individuals who exercised the greatest influence upon the literature of the latter half of the last century in Wales. The first is known as the "sweet singer," the Rev. William Williams, of Pantycelyn. He was born near Llandovery, in 1717; was converted through the instrumentality of Mr. Howell Harris, at Talgarth; was ordained deacon by the Bishop of St. David's, in 1740, and served curacies for three years. Refused admission into priest's orders, owing to his Methodism, he became an itinerant preacher until his death, in 1791. Mr. Williams is distinguished as the author of a vast number of beautiful hymns. He was highly gifted with the *awen*, or muse, and its effusions, however inferior to the strains of Charles Wesley and Dr. Watts, will undoubtedly be used

in the devotional exercises of Wales as long as the Welsh language shall endure.

The Rev. Peter Williams was the first to write a Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures in the Welsh language. His Bible, with expository notes, was printed at Carmarthen, in 1770. This was the first Bible ever printed in Wales. The first Welsh book printed in the Principality was a translation of *The Whole Duty of Man*, which was printed at Wrexham, in the year 1718. Welsh books prior to this time were printed mostly in London, Oxford, Shrewsbury, and Chester. London was the seat of early Welsh literature, and the source from which the Scriptures were diffused in Wales. To issue an edition of 8,000 copies of his Family Bible was to the Rev. Peter Williams a great undertaking. His notes, founded upon those of Ostervald, are very suitable for family and devotional reading. He was the author, also, of a Bible Concordance, and several other useful works.

This eminent man was a native of Langharne, in Carmarthenshire, where his family attended the ministry of the Rev. Griffith Jones, of Llanddowror. He was educated at Carmarthen, and converted under a sermon delivered in the open air in that town by the Rev. George Whitefield. He was ordained deacon in 1745, and served several curacies for short periods. Finding that he should not be admitted into priest's orders on account of his too Evangelical preaching, in 1746 he joined the Calvinistic Methodists, and laboured hard in the ministry, through much discouragement, for nearly fifty years. He was a man of great gifts, and did more for the cultivation of Welsh literature than any man of his time. He died in the year 1796.

The Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala, contributed largely to the literature of his country, both in the latter part of the last century and in the beginning of the present century. He was born in Carmarthenshire, in the year 1755. In 1775 he entered Oxford University, where he graduated B.A. He was ordained deacon in 1778, and served several curacies until 1785, when he joined the Calvinistic Methodists, amongst whom he exercised his ministry until the close of his laborious life, in 1814. Finding so many persons unable to read and write, he instituted circulating schools in North Wales, similar to those which the Rev. Griffith Jones instituted in South Wales. He was also one

of those who commenced the Sunday-school in the Principality—an institution which has been the means of doing incalculable good, and is still in a very flourishing condition. He had also the honour of being one of the founders of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Mr. Charles did much also in the way of authorship, and his useful Sabbath-school Manuals and excellent *Biblical Dictionary* are likely to be in extensive use. He was a man evidently raised to do a great work for Wales, especially in the North, and was not inappropriately called by that eminent revivalist, the Rev. Daniel Rowlands, of Llangetho—"The gift of God for North Wales."

The Methodist Revival in the latter part of the last century called forth a mass of useful literature, which, like an ever-widening stream, flows and increases unto the present day, diffusing life, fertility, and joy along its course. To Mr. Rowlands, however, belongs the honour of discovering the source and tracing the earlier course of this stream. His diligent hands have secured to us a chronological list of all the Cambrian books—two thousand in number—which he could discover down to the end of the last century. Other hands may supply what escaped his researches, and perhaps extend his record to present times. However, much credit is due to him for his efforts to save the memory of early authors and their labours from sinking into oblivion, as was the case with many of the very early British manuscripts containing ancient poetry, the Triads, and the history of the times of our Aneurins and Taliesins.

The literary register which Mr. Rowlands has prepared may be of great help to students, publishers, and antiquarians. It is to be hoped that his labours may suggest the propriety of forming a Cambrian Antiquarian Society and a National Museum, where rare books and manuscripts may be preserved, and accessible to those who may wish to examine them.

The student of Mr. Rowlands' long record will notice that by far the greater number of the books specified in it are religious books, and will take this fact as indicative of the religious character of the Welsh people in past centuries. Many of those books are Calvinistic, some of them savouring even of Antinomianism; a great many of them are miscellaneous and unimportant; and perhaps no great colossal and original work, either in prose or poetry, can

be pointed out; that no Milton nor Shakspeare, Howe, Watson, or Macaulay can be found in the list; but, with very few exceptions, the books have the merit of being moral in their tone, and pure and good in their object and tendency.

Printed literature in Wales commenced with the publication of the Holy Scriptures in the Welsh language, and the books which followed partake largely of the spirit and style of the Sacred Writings. They are mostly streams from that fountain, or, like lesser lights, reflect the light of the great luminary. No atheistic, profane, ungodly books have ever been issued in Wales. Such authors as Bolingbroke and Herbert, Paine, Voltaire, and Strauss have never had their scepticism published in the Welsh language; whilst Welsh readers have long been familiar with the names and writings of Baxter, Bunyan, Henry, Burkitt, Gurnall, Doddridge, Scott, Coke, Wesley, Benson, Clarke, and a host of other eminent divines, who, "being dead, yet speak," with a Welsh tongue, to the Welsh people. And may the Welsh language perish rather than it should become a medium to poison the minds of the Bible-reading people of Wales with the foolish speculations and the pernicious errors so rife in other lands.

All denominations of Christians in Wales at the present time manifest considerable zeal in the cultivation of literature. As might be expected, this literature bears evidently a sectarian stamp. Our monthly periodicals and weekly journals are tinged with sectarianism, and a vast amount of the literature of the present century is denominational and controversial. Amongst the questions which have occasioned much controversial writing in Wales are Calvinism and Arminianism; the subjects and modes of baptism; the nature of Church government; the disestablishment of the Church; and education. But, apart from sectarian and controversial writings, many works of permanent value, in theology, history, and science have been published of late years. As an instance, we may mention the *Gwyddoniadur* (*Universal Encyclopædia*), edited by the late Rev. Dr. Parry, of Bala College. This useful and valuable work, when completed, will itself form no mean library for an ordinary man.

Our only Welsh quarterlies are the *Traethodydd* and the *Berniad*. The former is published in North Wales and the latter in South Wales. In their pages, general and

important subjects are calmly and ably discussed; but their circulation is far less than what they deserve. Indeed, considering the limited circulation, and the consequent inadequate remuneration received by authors and publishers, the wonder is that the book-market of Wales is so well supplied.

The Welsh people, although by no means devoid of taste for reading, delight chiefly in poetry and music. Of the former there is abundance and not a little to spare; and the latter is cultivated with quickened assiduity since the Crystal Palace competition last summer.

The Welsh people, although industrious and persevering, are comparatively poor, and only a few of them have the means and leisure for literary indulgence. They are also a quiet and peaceable people; and no section of Her Majesty's subjects are more loyal to the Throne and Government of the country than the million and a quarter of them who dwell amongst the hills of Wales. Nothing like Fenian agitation or Home Rule clamour ever disturbs the peace of their lovely vales and barren mountains. These mountains, although wild and sterile, are yet found to be rich in coal, iron, lead, and various precious metals, inviting the investments of enterprising English capitalists to develop their hidden wealth, thereby greatly benefiting both the English and the Welsh, and tending to identify them, notwithstanding two languages, as one people.

- ART. V.—1. *Ueber die Bedeutung der Schädelknochen, ein Programm beym Antritt der Professur zu Jena.* Von LORENZ OER. Frankf. 1807. 4to.
2. *Ueber die Entwicklung der Geschlechtswerkzeuge bey den Wirbelthieren: N. Schr. Naturf. Danz.* 1. 4. H. RATHER. Isis. 1827. X. p. 862.
3. *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Natter (Coluber Natriz).* H. RATHER. Königsb. 1839. 4to.
4. *Vergleichende Entwicklungsgeschichte des Kopfes der nackten Amphibien, nebst den Bildungsgesetzen des Wirbelthierkopfes im Allgemeinen und seinen hauptsächlichsten Variationen durch die einzelnen Wirbelthierklassen.* K. B. REICHERT. Königsb. 1838. 4to.
5. *Hunterian Lectures on Comparative Anatomy.* R. OWEN. Vol. II. London. 1846. 8vo.
6. *Report on the Archetype and Homologues of the Vertebrate Skeleton.* R. OWEN. British Association, 1847. 8vo. Pp. 169—340.
7. *Abstract of Papers submitted by Professor Goodsir to Section D at the Cheltenham Meeting of the British Association, August 5th—12th, 1856.* Published in the *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal* for 1857. J. GOODSIR.
8. *The Croonian Lecture on the Vertebrate Skull. Proceedings of the Royal Society,* Nov. 18th, 1858. T. H. HUXLEY.
9. *The Elements of Comparative Anatomy.* T. H. HUXLEY. 8vo. London. 1864.
10. *Introduction to the Classification of Animals.* T. H. HUXLEY. 8vo. London. 1869.
11. *The Anatomy of the Vertebrate Animals.* T. H. HUXLEY. 12mo. London. 1871.

THE appearance of the *Theoria Generationis* of Caspar F. Wolff, in 1759, may be considered to be the dawn of our present Morphological Science. Yet it is only of late years that the very term "Morphology" has been applied to the study of animal forms. The botanists have long used it,

and gradually those anatomists who began their researches in the vegetable kingdom have unconsciously used the word as equally applicable to the study and comparison of the animal types. Indeed, those are the men who, in this country at least, have shown themselves most capable of handling the subject of organic forms as a whole; careful students of the great vegetable morphologists (especially Robert Brown and Schlieden), they have transferred the very spirit of this research into another sub-kingdom.

It was at one time enough that the rough anatomy of adults was understood, and the character of the various types compared; there was but little conception of *unity*; everything was referred to *use* and *fitness*. *The Bridge-water Treatises* are a standing memorial of the stage of thought at which scientific men had arrived forty or fifty years ago; and the most enlightened of those who wrote on anatomy at that time—we refer to Sir Charles Bell and his work “On the Human Hand”—were affected with a religious terror of Morphology in its broader aspect. (See p. 173.)

To one familiar with modern researches, Wolff's theory of the fecundation of plants and animals appears to be such as any one might think out; and yet it had not been thought out before his day. That all the foliar organs of a plant are but modified leaves, the ground leaves passing by insensible gradations into those of the stem, these into bracts, bracts into the parts of the calyx, then the elements of the corolla, the stamen, and, lastly, the carpels, or divisions of the young fruit: all this seems very simple and self-evident now.

The *still-life* study of animals is quite similar in its teachings and results; the lower worms are seen at once to be a string of potential animals (zoïds), and these may generate by transverse fission, or the dropping off of part of the series as a new worm: in the higher type the many *potentials* become one highly-organised *actual*, and the life-power, whatever it is, then reigns through the whole, subordinating part to part, and controlling every function and every action for the good of the complex individual. Even the organic cell itself is a potential individual, but becoming “a living stone” in “a living temple,” all its individual actions and processes are correlated and subordinated to the *multiple* creature, of which it may form an extremely minute part.

In all this we see the gradual evolution of the *growth* and the *architecture* of organisms; and, were they conscious, we might preach to the trees of the field, the fishes of the sea, or the beasts that trample the forest, and say, "Ye are God's husbandry; ye are God's building."

The distinctive characters of the vertebrata may now be considered.

The difference between an animal the skeleton of which is external, thus revealing all its serial structures, and one in which the ringed solid parts are within, and therefore hidden, is easily understood and appreciated. Thus in articulated animals, such as the lobster and its allies, and the insects proper, the joints of the body along its axis, and the joints of the paired limbs and like appendages: all these are outside, and are, indeed, the skin itself, either stony, as in the lobster, or horny as in the insect. The vertebrata have their rings imbedded in the flesh, a true internal skeleton, and when the body is well nourished, however delicate the skin, the bones that form the series of rings do not "rise up and witness against" their owner, but are hidden away by comely masses of flesh and intervening cushions of fatty tissue. Nevertheless, many of the lower types of the vertebrata are covered with stony (calcareous) plates; but they have always the true ringed internal skeleton, which is often somewhat soft and gristly if the outer integument be hard. Yet that dense bony armour, which with its richly sculptured and enamelled surface protected the partly ossified skeleton of the "Ganoid"* fishes, did not correspond in its divisions with the "Somatomes," or proper segments of the body. This hidden skeleton of the vertebrata, although composed of a series of similar (homologous) rings, differs in a most important manner from the outer skeleton of an articulated animal—lobster, insect, &c. Let the observer break a lobster through, and he will see that each segment is a simple ring; this ring has the simple heart of the creature lying beneath its upper part, and the nervous system on the lower; the mouth will be seen to open on the under or *neural* aspect. But if, in passing the shambles, the longitudinal or transverse section of a sheep be noticed, it will be seen that each body-segment is composed of a *ring* and a

* Most of these are extinct; they abounded in the "Old Red Sandstone" period.

hoop—in the ring is the spinal cord; in the hoop the heart, and the organs that are correlated with it in the manufacture and aëration of the circulatory fluid. The mouth opens in this case on the ventral aspect of the body where the heart lies, and does not correspond in position with the principal parts of the nervous system.

Thus, at once, we get two excellent grounds of distinction between articulated and vertebrate animals, namely, that in the one the body is composed of single and in the other of double rings, and that whilst the articulates are neurostomous, or have a mouth on the neural aspect of the body, the vertebrata are hæmostomous, or have the mouth on the same aspect as the heart. The limbs of the articulated animals are three, four, five, or many pairs; there are only two pairs in the vertebrata. At no stage of life has an insect or a lobster any structure equal to the nerve-ring, and its contents—the spinal cord and brain; their nervous system is a double series of little knots or ganglia with connecting threads, and lying in the ventral region.

The vertebrata have a similar series of ganglia, called the sympathetic system, placed beneath the spinal column, in addition to their large, continuous, proper nervous axis. As a rule, this continuous nervous axis of a vertebrate swells in the region of the head into large masses of nervous substance, termed collectively the brain; there is, however, one exception to this amongst living animals of this sub-kingdom, and, most probably, a large number of similar low primordial types have become extinct. Yet this exceptional form, the Lancelet (*Amphioxus*), conforms to the rule just spoken of; it is a double-tubed creature with its mouth placed, like the heart, on the ventral aspect. The contemplation of a type so singularly simple as the lancelet, with no brain, and scarcely the trace of even a cartilaginous skeleton, produces in the mind of such as are addicted to anatomical research a very strong hunger for more of such creatures; a deep sorrow for the loss of all the relatives of a type whose structure might have been a revelation of lines of affinity totally unknown to us now, with so many missing links—links that the imagination totally fails to fill up.

This one low bizarre creature, the lancelet, by its very isolation suggests to the mind the extinction of innumerable soft-bodied and very simple fishes that were, during their existence, the phyla or life-bands between the simplest

possible expression and development of a vertebrate creature and the types now extant. The lowest of these brain-bearing types is the lamprey; and the distance from this form to the highest—to man himself—is not greater, speaking from a purely morphological point of view, than that from the lancelet looking in a downward direction. The vertebrates that intervene zoologically between the lamprey and the higher sucking animals—the Mammifers—must not be supposed to be more than very partially extant; they have become by shoals and countless multitudes extinct: yet waifs and strays of many of the lost types still exist. Whole orders, however, in some cases have vanished, to say nothing of families, genera, and species. Hence the zoologist, who classifies the types principally by taxonomic characters derived from a study of the outward form, and the morphologist, who digs deep to find the first signs of a budding variation; each of these workers is often brought to a dead stand through the extinction of so many types.

Professor Flower has aptly compared our present position as students of the animal types to the contemplation of a tree from its top twigs; scarcely any view being obtained of the branchlets, branches, leaders, and trunk. Yet if those lost treasures could be found, the unity of this great sub-kingdom would be seen to be as absolute in reality as the unity of the tree; lower and lower should we descend, and the infinite specialisation of the culminating forms would lessen point by point, each type traced downwards becoming more general, the divarications and forkings would insensibly lessen; we should, as it were, pass from twig to branchlet, from branchlet to bough, and from the less divided boughs to the single stem.

The Classification of the Vertebrata begins as the work of the naturalist or zoologist, and the taxonomic characters are, at first, taken from the outer parts of the animal. Gradually, however, the work of the anatomist begins to tell upon mere zoology, and a truer conception of the relationships of types is obtained. Yet for the most part this has been, and still continues to be, merely *gradational*; the worker having the structure of the adult forms as his object.

The rise of a new school, however, in Germany, about half a century ago, was an era of the utmost importance

in this branch of biology. I refer to the labours of the great embryologists Von Baër, Ratkke, Reichert, and others.* The value of these labours has only slowly come to light; this has arisen from the fact that many of the best anatomical workers, early in the present century, were put upon the wrong track through the glamour thrown upon this subject by the transcendentalism of Oken.† Unfortunately for British workers, Professor Owen, who was not altogether ignorant of the splendid labours of the safe and sure embryologists in Germany, yet swallowed the whole grist unsifted of Oken's views. These were recast by him, and additions made which added to their showiness, but which made the whole theory "like a paling set against the wind in a high place:" a little additional stress, and the whole structure came down, broken and irreparable. This school reasoned from what they saw in the adult, forgetting that each type has a developmental life-history, of greater or less length, and that the parts in the fully-grown creature have undergone a large amount of change, by the blending together of parts having a dissimilar origin and the abortion of many of the most important elements that appear first in the embryo.

It gradually appeared to the better workers at home that the whole subject of the structure of the vertebrate types must be taken up again from the point where the German embryologists had been working. This was seen and well acted upon by the late Professor Goodsir, of Edinburgh; but that excellent worker never escaped from the silken nets of the transcendentalists, and his latest views are a curious mixture of *à priori* and *à posteriori* reasoning.‡ The small but not smooth stone which felled the obstructive form of transcendentalism came from the hands of a young and, at that time, but little appreciated worker.

On June the 17th, 1858, Professor Huxley delivered his "Croonian Lecture" at the Royal Society. This appeared

* For bibliographical references to the numerous memoirs by these and other embryologists, the reader is referred to the *Bibliographia Zoologica et Nomenclologica* of Agassiz and Strickland. Ray Society, 1846—1854.

† Lorenz Oken, *Ueber die Bedeutung der Schädelknochen, ein Programm beym Antritt der Professur zu Jena*. Frankf. 1807. 4to.

‡ See *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*, 1857, for an Abstract of Papers submitted by him to Section D at the Cheltenham Meeting of the British Association, August 5—12, 1856.

in the *Proceedings* for November 18th of the same year. Anyone familiar with the entanglements of the subject—for some of the school (Spix, for instance) had “woven fine cobwebs fit for skull that’s empty when the moon is full”—are ready again and again to return to the strong and refreshing common sense of that lecture. The lecturer, scarcely thirty years of age, had not only mastered the main facts of embryology, by corroborating the researches of Von Baër, Reichert, and Ratkke, but he had also learnt the whole strength and weakness of the enemy. From that date anatomists began to work, in this country at least, at the point where a successful worker always does begin—namely, at the beginning.

In classification, a conception of the unity of nature must co-exist with the ever-increasing knowledge of her diversity, and this unity is only to be seen by descending into the deep wells of the science of development. Then, resting awhile from work, to make a sabbatic contemplation of the whole, the labourer sees, as Bacon would say, the tips of the horns of “Pan”* as well as the diverging fibres of their broad roots. Yet this contemplative *ascent* to the ideal unity must be preceded by a most laborious *descent*, and the smallest fibres of the roots of things must be found, seen clearly, and noted down. The combined labours of an army of workers have given us sufficient light upon the various vertebrate types for the formation of the scheme now to be noted.

The whole sub-kingdom naturally breaks itself up into three principal groups, namely: *A.* “Ichthyopsida,” Fishy types; *B.* “Sauropsida,” Saurian types; *C.* “Mammalia,” Suckling animals.

These groups are easily cleft into secondary divisions. The fishy forms may or may not undergo transformation into air-breathers, after having a purely aquatic respiration. Thus, fishes proper have persistent gills for aquatic respiration, the oxygen dissolved in the water they inhabit being sufficient for their respiration. In them the *lung* is

* “Horns are attributed unto him because horns are broad at the root and sharp at the ends,—the nature of all things being like a pyramid, sharp at the top. For individual or singular things, being infinite, are first collected into species, which are many also; then from species into generals, and from generals (by ascending) are contracted into things, or notions more general, so that at length Nature may seem to be contracted into a unity.”—*Wisdom of the Ancients*.

rudimentary, and does not take on a respiratory function. When it exists it is merely a "swim-bladder." There are a few exceptions to this rule, as will be shown; these are, however, *linking* types of the utmost interest.

The metamorphic changes of the Amphibia carry them further: some of these, as the proteus and siren, are *perennibranchiate*, or retain their gills with their now functional lungs; whilst others lose their gills, and have for the rest of their life an aerial respiration only—these are the salamanders, newts, toads, and frogs.

The Saurian, or reptilian types, are classifiable as two very distinct "classes:" the lower scaly, cold-blooded, and having a heart but little in advance of that of the Amphibia; whilst the other group has its members feathered, warm-blooded, and with a heart of the same type as is found in the Mammalia, namely, with four perfect chambers.

Thus reptiles and birds are easily marshalled into separate troops; yet not the less is the bird but a sort of an *imago* to the *pupal* reptile. These things will become plain to the non-scientific mind as soon as the workers have properly displayed their results. Meantime, those who have patience for scientific detail may see the relations of the bird with the reptile well put in Professor Huxley's paper *On the Classification of Birds*.^{*}

The third great group is divisible into two sub-classes, not distinct classes, namely, the Non-Placentalia and the Placentalia; into those whose young are born very early and in an immature condition, no relation having been formed between the structures springing from the young and those lining the uterus of the mother, and those in which this intercommunication and implantation does take place. The lowest of these groups is principally restricted to the far south-eastern parts of the world—east of Wallace's line. They are the Monotremes and the Marsupials. Only two types of the lowest exist, and of these only one species of each type. These are the Echidna, or spiny anteater of Australia, and that other remarkable Australian form, the Duck-billed Platypus. The Marsupials are numerous, but the existing forms are all dwarfs, whilst

* "On the Classification of Birds; and on the Taxonomic Value of the Modifications of certain of the Cranial Bones observable in that Class." By T. H. Huxley, F.R.S., V.-P.Z.S.—*Proc. Zool. Soc.* April 11, 1867.

those not long extinct rivalled in size our larger herbivorous mammals.*

As for the *Echidna* and *Platypus*, they are diverse from all the other beasts to a degree that is unappreciable to any save the morphologist. In them you shall find the nature of the bird and of the reptile mixed up with all that is low and primordial in a mammal, as such. To them, as types, the end of the world has well-nigh come. Each genus has buried all its species but one, and that one is restricted to a lonely station in the uttermost part of the seas. Here the imagination fails to sweep backwards up "the gulf of time," to gain a vision of the earliest and simplest creatures that gave faint and shadowy promise of the milky mothers of the present. As the ascent is being made to the culminating forms of the placental mammifers, the number of types rapidly increases, until we find ourselves among our own grinning and jabbering kindred, the monkeys and apes. We will, however, let the reader live on in pleasant fancy that he himself, "who drew milk sweet as charity from human breasts," has only an *analogical* relation to those small hairy savages who insult and mock his form. He would despise his own image if there had not been a solemn pause in creation, before He, the heaven-born, was ushered in.

Leaving the human mammifer, and his nearest relatives, we return now to the cold and scaly fishes.

The Fish class is divisible into six orders, the taxonomic characters of which are all anatomical, or are deduced from their internal structure.† These are:—1. *Pharyngobranchii*; the vascular-ciliated pharynx being the respiratory organ. Ex., the lancelet. 2. *Marsipobranchii*; pouch-gilled fishes. Ex., lamprey and hag. 3. *Elasmobranchii*; fishes with laminated gills. Ex., shark and skate. 4. *Ganoidei*; fishes with ganoid or enamelled armour. Ex., bony gar-pike and sturgeon. 5. *Teleostei*; osseous fishes. Ex., perch, cod, salmon. 6. *Dipnoi*; double-breathers, fishes with a functional lung in addition to gills. Ex., mud-fish or lepidosiren.

* See Owen, "Report on the Extinct Mammalia of Australia," &c., in *Reports of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, for 1844. 8vo. p. 223, plates 3 and 4; and also a series of invaluable and richly illustrated memoirs in the *Phil. Trans.* since that time.

† The results of modern research are well brought together and summarised in Professor Huxley's *Manual of the Anatomy of the Vertebrated Animals*. London: Churchill. 1871. See p. 112.

1. The Pharyngobranchial Fish. The common characters by which all the vertebrata, save the lancelet, may be described, have a very limited application to that creature, which would seem to be in many respects much nearer akin to the *Ascidia** than even to the lowest of the other fishes.

All other vertebrata possess a brain which is formed primarily and essentially of a series of three vesicles in front of the spinal cord. The lancelet is brainless. All the rest have paired auditory sacs and eye-balls. The lancelet has no organ of hearing, and the merest rudiment of an eye (or eyes?). A small ciliated sac may be its olfactory organ. A median nasal sac is well developed in the lamprey and its companions; and in all the rest these are paired, right and left. The heart of the lancelet is a thin simple tube; hence Haeckel divides this creature from all the other vertebrata as the type of a group, under the title *leptocardia*. All the rest have a thick muscular chambered heart; they are the *pachycardia*. The points in which the lancelet differs from and agrees with the other, and especially the lower vertebrata, are of extreme interest. "An aperture called the abdominal pore placed in front of the anus, leads into a relatively spacious cavity, which is continued forward on each side of the pharynx to near the oral aperture. The water, which is constantly propelled by its cilia and those of the tentacles, is drawn out through the branchial clefts, and makes its exit by the abdominal pore."† This might

* The ascidians, so called because of their resemblance in form to an ancient leathern bottle, can be well studied now in our great aquaria. They are below the headless oyster in rank, and lie near the coralliform polyzoa, sea-mat (*flustra*), and its allies. The pharyngeal respiration of these creatures is very similar to that of the lancelet, and their embryos possess in their elongated tail an axial structure similar to the notochord or axis of the backbone, which is common to the lancelet and the embryos, at least, of all the vertebrata, including man. These facts have caused the liveliest interest in the minds of morphologists, many of whom are evolutionists also; and Mr. Darwin's opponents have not been slow to see that it is "a far cry" from an ascidian to man, and have pressed him from this point. A year or two since "Maga" had her good natured and humorous laugh at him in set stanzas, the refrain of each of these being—

"For man was once a leathern bottel."

Nevertheless, this greatest of living naturalists, with an imperturbability worthy of the fabled gods of Olympus,

"All their motions vain sees and derides."

Indeed, the thousand and one attacks made upon his theories seem scarcely as yet to have cost him a thought.

† Huxley's *Manual*, p. 117.

be a description of what takes place in the low ascidian.* Now there are no cilia in the branchial outgrowths of the much-cloven pharynx of forms above the lancelet; but in the tadpole of the common frog, anyone may see that the gills are mere papillæ growing from the surface of the bars between the clefts, at first externally, and then from the inner edges of the slits. These slits or clefts are all wide open at first, and soon afterwards a vallance grows backwards as a lid or "operculum," from the hinder edge of the arch that carries the tongue (*hyoid* or second post-oral arch). This fringe of skin completely hides and invests the gills of the *right* side, but on the *left* there is a small opening behind the gill-arches, and no great distance from the outlet of the digestive organs; this is the unsymmetrical representative of the median pre-anal aperture of the lancelet. The existence of *kidneys* is also in the latter doubtful; and the liver of the lancelet "is a saccular diverticulum of the intestines," the apex of which is turned forwards. This organ is scarcely more developed than in the coral-like polyzoa, microscopic mollusca that grow in a compound and tree-like manner, as parasites on sea-weeds, or hard and scale-like on shell-fish. On the other hand, the oyster amongst the mollusca, and the lobster amongst the articulata, have a very complex liver; from the lamprey upwards the vertebrata have this organ in its most complex form, although at first it grows as a diverticulum from the top of the intestines. Nevertheless, even in the lancelet, a *prolepsis*, or anticipation of our own "portal system," exists, for "the contractile trunk which brings the [colourless] blood from the intestine, is distributed on the hepatic sac after the manner of a portal vein."†

In the tentacular fringes round the mouth of the lancelet there is a cartilaginous framework, and semi-cartilaginous, rod-like bodies are placed along the back, above the

* See Huxley's *Elements of Comparative Anatomy*, pp. 29-32; and his *Classification of Animals*, pp. 30-33.

† Every tyro in anatomy knows,—every educated man ought to know,—that the blood from our abdominal viscera does not return at once to the right auricle of the heart, but passes through the gate of the liver to circulate in a slow non-pulsating manner, that therefrom the bile may be secreted. Arterial blood, in a much lesser quantity, does enter the liver by the "hepatic artery;" this is for nourishing the tissues of the organ; becoming venous during its course, it mixes with the other venous blood that came by the great gate—*vena porta*. The devout man, seeing that first diagram of the portal system in the lancelet, unconsciously says, "This is the finger of God;" yet its production was not a miracle, but the evolution of what was innate.

spinal cord: all the rest of the skeleton is membranous, yet showing the segments of the body by partitions; and the muscular masses between those partitions are arranged in the same zigzag manner as in the ordinary fishes—an arrangement which is beautifully displayed in the salmon, and never seen better than after cooking: every one must have observed this exquisite arrangement of the fleshy flakes.

Before passing on to the brain-bearing types, it is necessary to speak of what is called the *dorsal chord* (notochord), not the axis of the nervous system ("myelon," or spinal marrow), but a simple rod-like tract of tissue which always appears in the vertebrate embryo, immediately below the groove which separates the paired ridges that, growing upwards, meet and form the tubular nervous axis, or spinal marrow. The possession of this structure, which is composed of thin-walled, gelatinous cells, like the pith of a young twig in an ordinary tree, puts the lancelet into the vertebrate category; this and the axial nervous system over it are the "*primæ lines*" of this sub-kingdom. In all that follow this notochord never reaches the frontal wall of the head; it does in the brainless lancelet; in the others it stops behind a bag which hangs from the postero-inferior surface of the foremost vesicle of the brain: this bag is called the "*pituitary*" body; it was so named by the ancients under the notion that the *pituita*, or phlegm, of the nasal labyrinth was discharged from it, thereby cleansing the brain.

The amphioxus, or lancelet, may well be pointed at both ends, seeing it has no division, distinct, into *skull* and *spinal column*; all other vertebrata have this distinction, and in them that which is a series of joints or rings as far as to the head, is unjointed in the head, even in the *post-pituitary*, or hinder part.

Now we stand on the battle-ground of the "transcendentalists" and the "embryologists:" the former, ignoring the evolution of the individual, sees vertebræ running along to the frontal wall—all is *vertebrate*, everything except the sense-capsules (nose, eyes, ears) must be dragged into the vertebrate category."

* It was of the utmost consequence that anatomists should learn to look at the skull as a modification of the rest of the skeletal axis. When, however, this was first propounded to the French Institute by Professor Duméril, Geoffrey St. Hilaire tells us (*Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, t. iil., 1824, p. 177) that "even the moderate and very obvious illustrations of the general homologies of the cranial bones, which M. Duméril deduced from the anatomy of the occiput, excited an unfavourable sensation in the bosom of the 'Académie,'"

Festina lente, let us be slow that we may make the more expedition: what does the embryo reveal as to this matter of vertebrae in the skull? If the most convenient of all embryos, that of the fowl, be examined during the first few days of incubation, it will be seen that after the dorsal ridges have begun to close in above the notochord, to form the spinal marrow and brain, certain paired patches, squarish in form, appear on each side of these ridges. These were called by the Germans "urwirbel," or, as we now say, "proto-vertebrae;" they are the first body-segments, or "somatomes," and their clear interspaces are the "meta-somatomes." After the great surveyor, or territorist, Nature, has marked off these plots, she gradually grows them into vertebrae, and the muscles and nerves that are correlated to the vertebrae. But we said that in all the types above the lancelet the nerve-mass divided, in the region of the head, into three vesicles, instead of remaining as a mere even tube of nervous substance. This is even so; and the axis round which the proto-vertebrae grow to form the vertebrae—namely, the "notochord"—grows no further forwards than to the hinder face of the "pituitary" body: it stops there, and turns up into the interspace between the last (3rd) and middle vesicle. This fore end of the notochord also gets an investment, as two "parachordal" bands of a tissue, manifestly a continuation of the substance which is so neatly plotted out behind the head. Yet here the chalkings of the surveyor become obsolete; there are *potential vertebrae* under the hinder part of the brain, but not *actual*. Also let it be noted that the substructure of all the foremost part of the skull is developed in a manner totally diverse

and that the phrase '*vertèbre pensante*,' which a facetious member circulated, not without some risibility, along the benches of the learned during the reading of the memoir, reaching the ears of the ingenious author, the dread of ridicule checked his further progress in the path to the higher generalisations of his science, and even induced him to modify considerably many of the (doubtless happy) original expressions and statements in the printed report, so as to adapt it more to the conventional feelings of his colleagues." (See Owen's Report on the "Archetype," 16th Meeting of the British Association, held at Southampton, September, 1846, p. 244.) This may be paralleled by what we have been informed took place at the last meeting of the Institute for the election of foreign members—namely, that Mr. Darwin had two votes, and his distinguished countryman, Dr. Carpenter, *twenty-two*: all honour to the latter, who well deserves the distinction; but it is evident that the doctrine of evolution excites an "unfavourable sensation in the bosom of the *"Académie."* Why does no such feeling arise in the Teutonic breast? In Germany Mr. Darwin is looked up to as one worthy of *apotheosis*.

from the hinder part, and in a way absolutely unlike to what the transcendentalists dreamt.

In the lancelet there is no commencement of the parts, then, distinct enough to give any light; in the next a huge gulf has been passed, and passed in silence, and no whisper can be heard as to how the lamprey *became* what it is; through what slow modifications the cranium became differentiated from the spinal column, the brain from the spinal chord, and the "facial arches" * from the ribs.

2. The Marsipobranchial Fishes.—Lamprey, Hag, *Bdelostoma*.—We now arrive at forms that possess many attributes in common with us. The common axis of the spine (notochord) ends behind the "sella" (saddle), on which rests the pituitary pouch; there is a brain in a skull, a single nose-sac, opening on the top of the head; ear-organs, and kidneys,—not the same as the human kidneys, but agreeing with their embryonic predecessors, the "Wolfian bodies." The heart is thick and muscular, and has an auricle and a ventricle; but there are no limbs and no movable mandibles (lower jaw); the large, leech-like sucking mouth is strengthened by thick lip-cartilages, which here attain their uttermost development, although they re-appear again and again in an ascending survey of the tribes. There are seven respiratory purses on each side, which open externally by as many apertures; these are neat, round holes; they communicate internally with a long canal, which lies beneath the gullet; this is closed behind, but opens freely into the mouth. Those kept alive by us showed no very distinct respiratory movements whilst swimming; this latter movement being done in a very rapid and headstrong manner; but when they were attached to a glass plate, or to a stone, the fourteen pouches worked in a rapid, panting manner, the water being evidently pumped through the pouches by the muscles of respiration. The skeleton of these fishes is wholly cartilaginous, and along the spine that tissue is very sparsely distributed; the main support of the back, to the end of the tail, being the gelatinous "notochord," which, however, is enclosed in an extremely stout and elastic fibrous sheath. Between the respiratory pouches

* The facial or visceral arches are developed between the clefts of the pharynx; the mouth is the foremost of these clefts, two, right and left, being in it, continuous at the mid-line; the duct through which the tears run into the nose is a secondary cleft, divided off from the mouth, or oral cleft.

there are a sort of ribs, and these cartilaginous bars are united together by transverse and oblique secondary bars; the whole is a most exquisite basket-work, as may be seen by inspection of the preparation in the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons.*

8. Elasmobranchii, or fishes with a plaited gill-membrane, inside sacs that open both on the outer and inner side.—Sharks, *Chimæra*, Skates.—In ordinary sharks, as in the rays or skates, the slit-like apertures of the gill-pouches are freely exposed to the water; but in the chimæroids, a large opercular fold of membrane grows backwards over these, and opens outwards behind them. Here the skeleton is composed of solid cartilage, which is, however, hardened still further by the deposit of phosphate of lime around the superficial cartilage-cells; this calcification takes place in small sub-hexagonal territories, giving a tessellated appearance to the dried cartilage. The bony deposits that take place in the skin are not correlated to the skeleton, but merely serve as defence. Shagreen and spines are the form the exo-skeleton assumes. The spinal column is now greatly advanced, but varies in structure in the different families; it exhibits a great diversity of structure; "from persistent notochord exhibiting little advance upon that of the *marsipobranchii*, or having mere osseous rings developed in its walls, to complete vertebræ, with deep conical anterior and posterior concavities in their centre, and having the primitive cartilage more or less completely replaced by concentric or radiating lamellæ of bone. In the rays, indeed, the ossification goes so far as to convert the anterior part of the vertebral column into one continuous bony mass."†

In these types the adult has the form of the embryo of an osseous fish, such as the perch or salmon; the very numerous vertebræ continue to the end of the tail, and this long *spine* may turn upwards, a lower, smaller lobe being formed of a fold of the skin; or two such equal folds may exist with the extremity of the tail between them evenly. Thus we have *heterocercal*, and *diphycercal* tails; odd-lobed or even-lobed. Their heart has a thick, muscular "aortic bulb," with many valves, and their short, wide intestine has its surface immensely increased within by a very elegant *spiral valve*.

Another important character in these types is this: if

* See *Osteological Catalogue*, Vol. I. p. 12, No. 34. † Huxley, *Manual*, p. 136.

the reader will watch a living skate or shark in an aquarium, he will see a large hole, or "spiracle," just behind the eye on each side. This blow-hole in the sting-rays—to be seen in the Brighton Aquarium—is very large; it is observed to open and shut; within it there is a plaited fold of membrane, a "pseudo-branchia" or false-gill. This is the unclosed upper end of the first cleft behind the mouth. In man and his mammalian relatives, this is utilised to form the drum cavity of the ear, and the duct which communicates between the fauces and that cavity, the eustachian tube. Indeed this takes place wherever there is a properly formed drum and drum-membrane.

The false gill was once a *true*, external, transitory gill, growing back from the pier of the lower jaw arch of the embryo; these mandibular branchial filaments are exquisitely seen in the embryos of dog-fishes taken from their horny purse when they are the size of a common pin, or from that to the dimensions of a darning needle. At the same time, whilst about four small filaments grow from the pier of the jaw, from the arch of the tongue (hyoid), and from all but the last of the proper gill-arches, a dozen, at least, of long threads grow from each bar, on each side.

These become as long as the head and neck together of their owner; they each contain a single looped *capillary* blood-vessel, and if the living embryo be removed from the horny egg-shell (a pillow-case shaped purse with long tendrils at the angles for catching and holding on to seaweeds), a most ravishing sight can be beheld under the microscope. A low power, an inch or, at most, half an inch object-glass shows the whole circuit of the blood from the veins home to the auricle; from thence through the ventricle and arterial bulb to the body, but, especially *first*, to these temporary branchiæ, a single current, and mostly a single file of oval corpuscles is seen. Yet in these small embryos the permanent gills are forming, looking at this time, as they form puckers on the inner faces of the visceral arches, like the cogs of a very minute wheel. This distinction into *outer and inner* gills is of consequence to remember: we shall meet with these parts again.

The nasal sacs are double for the *first time*; the eye-balls are cartilaginous boxes, fixed on to a strong pedicle, as is the case with the *compound* eye of a lobster. The ear-balls are imbedded in the substance of the head, are completely confluent with the walls of the skull, and are

thoroughly covered and buried beneath the skin and flesh. No modification of facial rods has formed any outworks to them. Even in the inner labyrinth that which is essential is present, but there are no refinements of structure, spiral galleries, &c., such as exist in us, and also, indeed, in our familiar friends the ox and the ass, the dog and the ape.

We said that the embryo skate or dog-fish was to be found in horny pouches attached to seaweeds. Not in all dog-fishes (sharks), however, for in some the yolk-sac forms an organic connection with the mucous membrane of the oviduct, as was discovered by Aristotle, the father of all such as handle the forceps and scalpel.*

In this very simple and elementary sketch—a bare sketch it is of set purpose, so that he whose mind is full of other studies may catch some of the outlines of a vertebrate creature—we have dwelt at length upon the simple fore-fatherly types, types that are not *ideally* related to the higher, later, more specialised and accomplished kinds, but that are “the very words of the world,” in which the life-history of the higher sorts is written.

If it be thought that the way upwards is long,—lancelet, lamprey, dog-fish, skate, newt, frog, blindworm, snake, and a thousand other creatures which to the non-zoological mind are “common and unclean,”—yet, let it be remembered that we are written with their writing, and that, to the eye of science, we merely read off as a more advanced language. Is not the earth “the hole of the pit from which we were digged,” nay our very mother?—

“Common mother, thou,
Whose womb immeasurable, and infinite breast,
Teems, and feeds all; whose self-same mettle,
Whereof thy proud child, arrogant man, is puff'd,
Engenders the black toad and adder blue,
The gilded newt and eyeless venom'd worm,
With all the abhorred births below crisp heaven,
Whereon Hyperion's quick'ning fire doth shine—.”

Yet are none of these births of nature to be abhorred; they all are “very good;” and the vulgar prejudice of untrained minds is well illustrated by the fact that the so-called

* For a description of this structure in certain sharks, and for references to Aristotle, see Müller's *Physiology*, by Baly. London: 1840. Vol. II. p. 1597.

blindworm is a most exquisite footless lizard, is neither blind nor *envenomed*, nor is it a worm, but one of us, a vertebrate, and one more than half-way up that ladder where, scorning our slow ascent, we sit in pride; there placed that we may "have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

4. *Ganoid Fishes*: those covered with enamelled armour—Sturgeon and Bony Garpike, &c.—The richly gifted and admirable Hugh Miller, and the late lamented Professor Agassiz, may be mentioned as two great pioneers in the labour of unearthing these magnificent types—types that lie, zoologically, exactly between the last group, the cartilaginous sharks and rays, and the ordinary modern bony fishes.

"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" A ready answer would have been in the mouth of many a modern Englishman: "Nearly ready to appear; for my Scripture, the letter of my Scripture,—I throw my whole weight upon the *letter*, and would gladly die defending it—shows me that the Creator was as one of us; weary with twelve hours' labour in the clay and in the fire, making and setting up His various types of pottery, and glad, most glad, of a sabbatical day."

But "He fainteth not, neither is weary," and the times, and the seasons, and the ages are but fractions of a moment to Him. These kingly fishes with buckler and shield and habergeon, drank water in river, lake, and estuary, long ages before our great fuel-forests grew. We have a few of their descendants, a waif and stray here and there; the stragglers of an exceeding great army that no man can number.

The general *embryonic* characters of the sharks and skates, the elongated tail, the open "spiracle," the intestinal spiral valve, and the many-valved "bulbus arteriosus," arising from the heart: all these things are shared by the ganoids with the cartilaginous types. Here, however, the gristly skeleton seeks and finds great increment of strength from the "strong pieces of shields which are their pride," and with which their body is covered on the outside. This *exo-skeleton* grafts itself upon the *endo-skeleton*; the bone is married to the gristle, and the plates thus correlated to the inner framework can now in many

cases be identified as the true morphological representatives of the bones that roof in the skull and wall in the face of the human species.

When the morphologist, religiously seeking to make a harmony of those old records of nature, once fairly sees the *frontal*, the *nasal*, the *temporal*, or the *molar* bone, he begins to be at ease; his hieroglyphics shine out with new meaning; that "book in which all his members were written" is already half deciphered. Happily for him, time has carefully conserved some of the more generalised types. Such are the sturgeon and paddle-fish (*Planirostra*); the former is not merely the "king's-fish," he is descended from the old kings of the ganoid dynasty, the famous nations and mighty kings of the "Old Red Sandstone."

This fish, the sturgeon, not only fastens his *ganoid* scales on to the elastic cartilage below, he, *for the first time*, develops deeper strata of bone below the skin; and these plates are either applied, like surgeons' splints, to the flat face of a large cartilaginous tract, or they may be developed as *laminae profundæ*, and thus en-ring the finger-like rods of cartilage in the deeper parts of the face and body, ready to convert, and often converting, the very body and substance of the rod into solid bone. This is precisely like what takes place in the joints and limbs of our own children; when this is complete, they are ready to displace our own lower races in another hemisphere. Thus not only does the pattern of the skeleton become gradually evolved during time, but the various territories and strata of tissue only slowly, in the ascent, become differentiated. Once differentiated, then the most remarkable instances of *organic affinity* appear; part is grafted on to part, element combines with element, morphologically speaking; and new compounds of organisation are developed, answering to and correlated with fresh refinements of structure and higher powers of being.

5. The Teleosteans, or fishes with a well ossified skeleton.—*Salmon, Perch, &c.*—For the most part these *new* fishes have *round* or *comb-like* scales developed in the skin; they are "cycloids," or "ctenoids," and these are altogether independent, as a rule, of the profound and intermediate *laminae* that go to form the skeleton. The tail is short and fan-shaped, many embryonic vertebræ becoming absorbed and their remains ensheathed in a single bony

style—the “urostyle.” The spiracle is filled up; the bulb of the great artery (aorta) has only one row of valves; there is no spiral valve in the large intestines; no external branchia have been observed in the embryo; and the rudiments of gills, even on the second arch behind the mouth (“hyoid”), do not develope, but remain as a “pseudo-branchia.”

These fishes do not lead any further upwards; we must return by the way that we came if we would advance; this is what zoologists call a “culminating type”—the highest fish, as such, but the farthest out of the general wake.

These teleosteans, being studied in their embryos, have been observed to undergo a series of metamorphoses—the writer is here the responsible person for these assertions—and these transformations take place in the order which has been observed in this ascent, namely, primordial type, shark-like type, and a type like that of the ganoids; finally they become truly teleostean. Like the more solid kinds of *radiated animals*—star-fishes, sea-urchins, &c.—these higher fishes develope numberless calcified plates of scales and bones, and it is only after the pattern of the creature is understood that these can be even classified, to say nothing of their being counted.

Besides the bones of the skeleton proper, skull, face, vertebræ, ribs, &c., and of the skin proper, as the scales, the skeleton has a row of ossified cartilages, which lie between and among the spines of the vertebræ, both above and below. To these *interspinous* bones, and to the small bones that form the *roots* of the limbs, or *paired fins*, a double series of bony rays is attached, and these rays not only split up freely, as they radiate outwards, but they are composed of rows of short blocks, and each little block is a separate bone.

By these forms principally are the lakes, rivers, and seas peopled; yet it is doubtful whether these *teleosteans* existed before the time of the deposit of our English chalk. Their number is immense in proportion even to the sharks and skates (*Elasmobranchii*); but the ganoids and sucking fishes (*Marsipobranchii*) are very few, comparatively, having for the most part become extinct.

6. But the most impoverished group of fishes, next to that of which the lancelet is the representative, is the order called Dipnoi, or fish with double respiration, the *Lepidosirens* and *Ceratodus*. In the same year one fish of

this order was found in the river Gambia (Africa) and another in South America (swamps of the Amazon). The first of these is *Lepidosiren annectens* (Owen), and the latter, *L. paradoxa* (Natterer).^{*} Much more recently, namely, in 1870, the Hon. William Forster discovered in Queensland, Australia, another and very magnificent fish of this type. Mr. Gerard Krefft, curator of the Australian Museum, Sydney, communicated the discovery to Dr. Günther, F.R.S., sending, besides the description, a photograph of this new treasure.[†]

These fishes are relations to the *fringe-finned* gamoïds of the Old Red Sandstone on the one hand, and on the other to the lowest forms of the Salamandrine group—of amphibia with tails and persistent *external* gills, such as *Proteus* and *Menobranchius*. The equanimity of naturalists has never been more pleasantly disturbed than by that double and this single discovery; for in these forms the characters of the so-called *naked reptiles* (amphibia) are mingled with those of the fishes proper. In fishes proper, the nasal sacs do not open into the mouth; in this type they do: in those the heart, as we have seen, has but one auricle; in the Dipnoi it has two. In the fishes just described, the air-sac is a floating instrument, or swim-bladder, but in these newly discovered, but really very *ancient*, types, functional lungs co-exist throughout life with functional gills.[‡] Astep more, and we are on the high road, among types more and more metamorphosed, until we land, on our own shores, amongst the numerous sub-species of the *animal bipes implume*. We said that these were *ancient* types: the massive tooth-plates of *Ceratodus* and related types have long been known to geologists in the secondary strata, especially in the chalk. The name, indeed, was given by Agassiz to an extinct type, known to him first by its teeth; and it was soon seen that this Australian fish was a waif of that genus—a genus related to many other similar types, known to us only by their teeth; the skeleton was very soft and destructible.

These types are *generalised* to an unusual degree, just as the teleostean Perch is highly *specialised*. Indeed, it is

^{*} See *Funny Cyclopaedia*, Art. "Protopterus." This article is vitiated by Professor Owen's mistake in describing the nasal sac as *blind*.

[†] See Günther on *Ceratodus Forsteri*, *Phil. Trans.* 1871, Part I. pp. 511—571, Plates 30—42.

[‡] Two in *Lepidosiren*, and one large symmetrical lung in *Ceratodus*.

difficult to say to what group they are most related, to that above or to that below; they are evidently an outcropping or a "new leader" of the old ganoid type; they are also evidently akin to the *Chimeras*, an ancient and almost extinct kind of sharks. But they possess an additional auricle to the heart; and this, with their functional lungs and internal nostrils, makes it tolerably certain that the extinct species ran close upon those huge salamanders that delighted in the swamps of the carboniferous epoch—the Labyrinthodonts. Yet much of their skeleton is, at most, cartilaginous, and the notochord, or primordial axis of the spine, retains its embryonic condition—a long rod of gelatinous tissue ensheathed in gristle. Moreover, the structure of the skull and face is on the same low morphological level as in the cartilaginous fishes; it is intermediate between a chimera and a sturgeon in this respect, and thus is wedged in between the lowest kind of shark and the lowest kind of ganoid. If a *genealogical tree*, giving the uprise of all the vertebrate types could be given, it would be a plant-form, branching and tillering from the bottom; also, above, its height would be among the thick boughs. One strangely formed creature would peer out from above, a naked-skinned, forked worm, with an internal skeleton, curiously monstrous, as compared with other forms, in having the limbs as long as the short arrested axis, and top-heavy, with a huge bony box, filled full by neatest packing with a huge cauliflower-like mass of brain.

We come now to the second group of Ichthyopsida, the amphibia, salamanders, frogs, &c.

By metamorphosis these become quasi-reptilian, yet their whole developmental history proclaims them to be essentially fishy-types. No one can be unacquainted with the fact, that a hen's egg during incubation is lined with several membranes not seen in the fresh state; then there is merely the *membrana putaminis*, or leathery lining of the shell. Afterwards a richly vascular skin is seen lining the leathery skin, and within that a most delicate bag containing a clear fluid in which the embryo lies. The vascular skin is called the allantois, and the clear skin within that the amnion: these membranes are developed in the next great division, the Sauropsida and Mammalia, but not in the Ichthyopsida; save that a rudiment of the allantois appears in the frog. This is consonant with other

great metamorphic changes undergone by the frog, a creature rich in anticipations of nobler forms, "shadows of good things to come" in the higher life of the more modern types. Even in the lowest forms of amphibia, such as the *Proteus*,* *Menobanchus*, and *Siren*, one step is taken in a series of most exquisite modifications of facial parts, that in the higher forms make the outworks of the organ of hearing. In the tail-keeping types, the vibrations that cause sound play through the skin and tissues upon a plug in the inner labyrinth which is cut out, by a living process, from the cartilaginous ear-sac; this does not exist in fishes, even in the lepidosiren. In other respects they have much in common with that fish; all breathe by gills at first, but the lower forms, proteus, &c., are dipnoi like the lepidosiren retaining their gills whilst they acquire lungs. Others, as the newt and spotted salamander, lose their gills after the lungs are ripe. One thing is very remarkable about these tailed types, namely, that they never have any representatives of the persistent gills of the true and proper fishes; they merely have feathery, free, external gills, the homologues of the filamentary productions of the early embryo of the shark and skate.

Another most instructive and suggestive fact is this, that a large Mexican type, the axolotl, usually grows to the size of a herring, or thereabouts, and retains its large black, pinnate gills. A small per-centage, however, of specimens that have been kept and watched in the Jardin des Plantes at Paris were found, when half-grown, to lose their gills, and become veritable salamanders (caducibranchiata).

The gill-bearing individuals are freely prolific, although larval in relation to their more metamorphosing sisters and brothers. This will remind the reader of those garden nuisances the aphides, the larvæ of which are so irrepressibly prolific. The limbs in these types, even in the lower, are much more suggestive of the five-forked members of man. They are set on to a shoulder-girdle and a hip-girdle which are very clear fore-shadowings of our own. The proteus has only three fingers on each hand, and two toes on each foot.

As we ascend the tail-bearing types grow more and more like the tailless frog and toad; our common newts are

* For an excellent article on this blind albino inhabitant of the subterranean waters of Carniola, see *Penny Cyclopædia*, Art. "Proteus."

most charming subjects for the naturalist and morphologist, and are better as true openers of the eyes than euphony or ruse.

In nature all evidently takes place by severe Draconian law, and yet there is no end to modifications. The newt is slowly developed from a delicate egg, which the sunning and careful mother enwraps in a folded leaf; the salamander, a very near relation, develops her young in the oviduct; all the transformations take place there, and the feathery gills live, grow, and die before they have had a chance of usefulness to the swimming creature.

If the fishes, salamandrine types, and frogs all spring from one root, that root must have *tiller*ed considerably: the newts and the frogs have a long time been diverging. Many things go to show that the specialisation of our native lamprey is much greater than for such a type to be parental to the lower sorts of tailed amphibia: the possession of the simplest kind of skull ever seen—especially is this true of the *protos* and its congeners—and the fact that their gills are such as only exist in the early embryo of cartilaginous fishes, go to show that they fetch their ancestry from a “dark backward and abysm of time” that cannot be fathomed or measured. Metamorphic stages only hinted at in the tail-bearing forms occur, and become marvellously perfect in the frog and his companions.

Here the development takes place as in the fish; and Nature, who generally hides her secrets in close corners, that her children may be tempted to search them out, in this case, still further to draw out the inquisitive mind, gives open illustrations of her method, “which is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working.” The cleavage of the yolk from one into two, from two to four parts, and so on, until a mulberry mass is formed; then the smoothing over again of the yolk, as though nothing had happened; and then, after that, the gradual evolution of that never-enough-to-be-admired creature, the tadpole: all these things “are done under the sun.” But all is “ceaseless changing—a restless strife,” and the *morphological force* is in unwearyed action until the perfect quasi-human amphibian is developed. First, external gills; then internal: then lungs; the kidneys also have to be improved, and the heart buds from a two into a three-chambered organ. The intestine is far too long—a coil like a sleeping snake; it is *taken up*, as careful mothers say, and, with just a

twist, serves the perfect frog. The nose, from being a little fold of the outer skin, gets bored through into the palate; the nearly blind eyes of the early larva develop every exquisite membrane; and the ears, by the most unlooked for metamorphosis of the arch of the tongue and the parts adjacent, become only a little less perfect in the refinement of their apparatus than those of the mammals, to which we, the *fire-makers*, belong. The easy and painless way in which *curtailment* may take place is here also admirably shown. Your shepherd, who has no philosophy, and is a bad observer of facts, will tell you that the tadpole's tail *drops off*: not so; the capillary blood-vessels—a sight to see in their living state, with their living contents, when the tail is young—these vessels suck away its substance and carry it elsewhere, for other uses: not, however, until the buds—two pairs of them—that had weeks before appeared, have become legs; the foremost of these hidden under the gill-cover until ready for use, and the hinder pair which were developed in sight. When those of the *four thousand* young (from each mother) which have escaped their many "born enemies" are ready for land-life—tail gone, lungs blowing, eyes, nose, ears, and legs all perfect—these now developed and noble forms at first abound as though they had been showered from the skies, from whence thousands of untrained observers have *seen* them fall.

This imperfect sketch can only be made to include the first of the three great divisions of the *vertebrate sub-kingdom*. The types that never possess gills, and that in their embryonic life always have an amnion and allantois; these forms, from the snake to the eagle, the *Sauropsida*, and from the duck-billed platypus up to man, the *Mammalia*, must be left for the present.

ART. VI.—*The Life of James Dixon, D.D., Wesleyan Minister.* Written by his Son, RICHARD WATSON DIXON, M.A., Assistant Minor Canon in Carlisle Cathedral Church, and Librarian of the Cathedral Library. Wesleyan Conference Office. 1874.

FOLLOWING close upon the autobiography of Thomas Jackson, comes this charming filial tribute to the memory of one of his most illustrious compeers. The difference in the make of the two minds was obvious and vast. The one, plain, practical, and unimaginative, owed the comprehensiveness of its conquests to sheer force of will and dogged tenacity of grasp; the other, lofty, soaring, and contemplative, achieved its successes in the domain of thought through an inborn sympathy with all things noble, that took fire at their contact and fused them into the ever wealthier substance of its own being. Equally marked was the contrast in their temperaments. The benignity of the former amounted to sunniness, but behind there lay a background of imperturbable gravity and self-respect: the moods of the latter betrayed a leaning to melancholy, but they concealed habitual feelings too deep to be disturbed by momentary storms and too sacred to be displayed on slight occasions. It is more profitable to dwell upon their affinities. Both started upon their course of long and eminent service under serious disadvantages, against which the only set-off was the unspeakable blessing of a godly home; both, by great diligence amid exhausting public duties, attained—each in his own kind—a serviceable acquaintance with literature, and if the one excelled as a reader, the other excelled as a thinker: both were honoured by a full recognition of their merits in enthusiastic elections to the highest offices of their Church: both survived to enjoy in extreme old age the affection and respect of tens of thousands who had personally or vicariously benefited by their ministrations, and, jointly with another "brother beloved," received a formal testimony to their worth: and both have recently been laid to their rest amid much lamentation.

Methodism has never been without such links with a former generation, and, to her credit be it spoken, she has not yet ceased to hold them in honour. "The glory of" our "young men is" still "their fathers." While every opportunity is afforded for the early development of native ability, a juvenile leader in the Methodist Conference is as rare as a William Pitt in the House of Commons; and in neither case is the homage to seniority paid to seniority alone. It has been the fortune, or, rather, the privilege of the Methodist Church, no less than of the nation of which she forms a part, never to have lacked her complement of the men "who know what Israel ought to do." And her great men have resembled all other great men in this, that they have been great to the last. They have fallen to the sickle of the remorseless reaper, "like as a shock of corn cometh in his season," without having first died at the top. To this rule the names now mentioned form no exception.

It was not a simple accident of his longevity, or consequence of his possession of a well-knit frame, that the three periods into which one might divide the life of most men who reach the ordinary term, should in James Dixon have been unusually protracted. It seems characteristic of the man. He was long in coming to maturity. Cicero counted himself an *adolescens* when he attained the consulship at the age of forty-four, and the genius of this Methodist philosopher and orator did not burst into full efflorescence till his return from Gibraltar at the age of thirty-seven. For another period of thirty-seven years he retained the position before the Methodist and general public which his ripened character and proved abilities at that time won; and then, compelled by bodily infirmities which included one of the sorest deprivations that can fall to the lot of man, he for nine more years patiently suffered that will which it had been so long his delight actively to fulfil.

James Dixon was born at the hamlet of King's Mills, about two miles distant from the little market-town of Castle Donington, in Leicestershire, on the 29th of October, 1788. In those days education was of little account, even among respectable families like that which all unwittingly nurtured in its bosom this intellectual giant. Ten years of age saw him set free from the drudgery of school only in order to be yoked into a heavier service at his uncles' paper

manufactory. Whatever leniency Malachi may intend to imply in the promise to spare Israel, "as a man spareth his own son that serveth him," it could surely have found no parallel in the experience of this apprenticeship by his uncles' nephew. Those were not days when men's love of ease so far overcame their love of independence as to occasion a strike for eight hours a day. Four in the morning was the hour for commencing work, and there is no need to inquire when it left off. Undoubtedly the system killed many, but it made the rest, and among them James Dixon. His prodigious powers of work were being developed then. Inheriting a good constitution from his ancestors, he became strong to labour, and like most young men who possess great physical strength, was not unwilling to put it to the test. One doughty antagonist was a certain James B——, who, in later struggles of a different kind, was destined to take opposite sides with James Dixon, and in either case was worsted. But a different arena was preparing for him. Mental culture was not so utterly neglected as the above statements might seem to imply. Something may have been due, as our author says, to the picturesqueness of the scenery, and the great hall with its aristocratic associations; but more, we opine, to the periodical appearance in the neighbourhood of His Majesty's mails, bringing tidings of the great outer world, and ever and anon rousing the enthusiasm of the country side, as De Quincey has so forcefully described, by the news of "another glorious victory." For those were days when politics were politics indeed, and the fate of Europe seemed trembling in a balance that was swayed at will by the energy and genius of one unscrupulous man. The newspaper was as precious then as it was rare, and still more so the faculty of deciphering it. The limited accomplishments of the young villager were, therefore, soon called into requisition, and the future defender of the interests of the slave and investigator of the economy of Methodism became "a politician at ten."

There were religious influences at work also that were not slow to make themselves felt. Is it simply a coincidence, or is it not a link in the chain of causation that connects in one line of spiritual descent the names of James Dixon and that sturdiest of all Wesley's coadjutors, John Nelson? The maternal grandmother of the former was one of the latter's converts, and it is very plain from the

brief hints given that she imported into her household the precious merchandise in its most pure and unadulterated form, when she determined to buy the truth and sell it not. This best of all heirlooms was handed down unimpaired to her children's children, and it is a significant token that, on joining the Methodist society in 1808, it was to his mother that the final determination of James Dixon was thus expressed, "If I am to be a Methodist I will be a Methodist." Religious convictions sometimes come to maturity so gradually, that the transition from the carnal to the spiritual, however well ascertained by its results, is not to be assigned to any date. But this is rarely the case with characters such as that we are now considering. A preliminary agony is the condition of every great career in the individual, as well as of every important movement in society. And it ought not to be surprising that this should be as true of the spiritual as of the intellectual nature. In James Dixon the birth-throes of the spiritual man were also those of the intellectual. All that preceded was but a period of incubation; the true birth of this great soul dates from Whit-Sunday, 1807. The twofold character of the crisis may be seen in the fact that though sin was his burden, it was a doctrinal difficulty which poured vinegar and gall into his wounds. In this also his experience resembled that of the venerable man to whom we have alluded. On thousands, indeed, of would-be pilgrims has the gigantic phantom of eternal reprobation gleamed pale and dreadful as the Apollyon whom Christian saw "straddling over all the way." But few have emerged so triumphantly from the conflict as James Dixon. That for him the ghost was fairly laid, is manifest from the terms in which long after he speaks of his conversion. "I often think," says he, "as I sit in my chair, of my early days, of the sovereign call of God on Whit-Sunday, 1807, the sense of pardon He gave me by His blessed Spirit, and the ecstatic happiness I enjoyed." Here is plainly marked a strong belief in the sovereignty of abundance, unalloyed by any fear of a sovereignty of restraint.

We confess that we do not fully sympathise with the reticence the biographer has thought fit to observe concerning this period of internal strife. We can understand the filial reverence that shrank from garnishing every other page with extracts from a spiritual diary never meant for publication. But the experience of such a man at this

formative crisis, if recorded, was worth preserving. It would have afforded encouragement to many as illustrating a principle so dear to Methodism, that its separated ministrants do not proclaim an unfelt Gospel, and as demonstrating that the loftiest minds are not exempted from those spiritual conflicts through which the humblest have to pass. It was a true instinct, after all, that led John Wesley to require from his lay-helpers minute accounts of their conversion for publication in the Magazine, and that still demands oral statements of experience from candidates for ordination. They serve this purpose among others, to rebut the calumny that condemns all spiritual histories as cast in one mould and therefore purely human, and to exhibit by way of counter demonstration the diversity of the one Spirit's operation who worketh all in all.

We must pass over the detailed account of the gradual unfolding of Dr. Dixon's genius and character. Suffice it to say that this gradual unfolding is portrayed. Herein we note one excellence of this biography, which some that we could name do not possess. Most people know how the great men of the day spend their years of hard-earned notoriety. Our modern heroes live amid a dazzling publicity compared with which the common tale of the Spartan citizens was enviable seclusion. What we do not know is how they came to be what they were. Thus the revelation of Charles Dickens's early life attracts the chief interest of the story, and communicates meaning to the rest. How Dr. Dixon climbed the first rounds of the ladder by which he reached his pinnacle of fame is well described in the four chapters that carry us down to the critical epoch of the return from Gibraltar. Gibraltar was the Doctor's Georgia. His soul glowed with sympathy toward that great enterprise which soon after his entrance on the ministry began to take shape and form under the plastic hands that moulded alike the Methodist home and foreign organisation. Mere advocacy of missions could not content a man like this. Conscious of vast reserves of power, which even the toil of a ceaseless itinerancy could not diminish, he emulated the bands of devoted men whom he saw successively drafted off to the conversion of the world, and he longed to be among them. But James Dixon was not fully appreciated as yet. It was no new thing to him to be underrated; he had found difficulty at the outset in passing his own

quarterly meeting. And this suggests the remark, how imperfect after all are the best tribunals that can be erected to judge of the qualifications of Christian men for service in the Church, and how needful it is that the old concomitants of fasting and prayer should still attend every judicial act in which uninspired men are virtually called upon to say, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Of all her merits as a system, one of the chief that distinguish Methodism is the jealousy with which she has fenced the approach to the Christian altar. But in those days the system was not perfect. And so James Dixon, who had received fire from heaven by no unworthy means, and longed to scatter it broadcast among the nations, was chained like another Prometheus to a barren rock with a vulture to prey upon his vitals. But let us not be mistaken. Both the quarterly meeting that passed him into the homework, and the missionary committee that sent him abroad probably underestimated James Dixon. But he did not know it. The vulture that preyed upon him was neither disappointment of a larger field nor discontent with a mere local chaplaincy. An attack of yellow fever brought him very low, and the climate proved so unfriendly to his family as to render continuance at the station impossible. Like John Wesley, he was destined to serve the interests of foreign missions mediately through the energy of his home ministrations. But Gibraltar to the one, as Georgia to the other, proved the best school at this juncture of the history. Upon his return a blaze of popularity was about to burst upon him, such as few can endure whose spirits are not chastened by adversity. And this year of distant solitude and sorrow, like St. Paul's three spent in Arabia, tempered his spirit to withstand the seductions of popular applause, and formed not less really, if less obviously, a preparative for those last great trials which with such consummate fortitude he endured unto the end. Henceforth he was, though not yet called so, the Dr. Dixon familiar by actual acquaintance to a long generation of Methodists, and by tradition to a younger generation which has heard of his former might.

Richard Watson, then one of the secretaries of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, was the discoverer of James Dixon's genius, and it was through his recommendation that, on his return from Gibraltar, the latter received a call to the Wakefield Circuit, the first of a

long series of appointments to the most important towns in the kingdom. London, Liverpool, Sheffield, Manchester, then London again, Birmingham; Liverpool and Manchester, each for a second time, and finally Bradford, were the successive fields of labour which occupied his energies. In a moment of despondency the Doctor once complained that Methodist preachers left their mark on none of their circuits, but it would hardly be an exaggeration to affirm that he left his mark on all. Throughout his course the demand for his services as a public speaker, whether in the pulpit or on the platform, was very great. And he was always ready. But though in such request, the interests of his own immediate sphere did not appear to be neglected. We cannot follow the author through the scenes of this variously exercised ministry. Our readers will welcome, however, a few extracts which will revive their reminiscences of the Doctor, or at least serve to place him before them better than a mere summary. They will also illustrate the excellent style in which the book is written. Speaking of him at the time of his appointment to Wakefield, Mr. Dixon says:—

“It is evident from all that has gone before that we are to consider the development of a great spiritual person, of one to whom the commands and requirements of the Gospel were no dead letter, but the very law of life; to whom religion meant nothing less than a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, and was a thing not only to be understood but to be felt and experienced, and not only in general but in every particular. How touching those aspirations after holiness and Divine communion which have been read in those early letters, the struggles of a high-strung nature to answer fully to the call of God! Hence resulted a perfect simplicity and integrity, the public and the private character answering to one another in every respect. He called upon the people to obey no law which he had not obeyed, to undergo no experience which he had not undergone, to expect no blessing which he had not enjoyed. His ministry was therefore marked by a peculiar boldness, fulness, and power, an impassioned fervour and a breadth of spiritual knowledge which have perhaps scarcely ever been surpassed. The Christian economy seemed known to him with a wonderful familiarity, known as a living whole; and as he expatiated in the midst of the unseen realities in which he lived, the souls of his hearers were carried along with him, the small obstructions of the world seemed to fall away, and they felt that they also were dwellers in the spiritual kingdom of God.”

In reference to his ministry at Sheffield, he says :—

“ As superintendent of the circuit, he succeeded in maintaining among his brethren, and throughout the society, a healthful and cheerful tone of feeling. He was so far above all littleness and bitterness, that those feelings seemed incapable of manifesting themselves within the circle of his influence. His character invited the confidence and drew forth the minds of his colleagues ; and the meetings of the preachers at his house, instead of being mere assemblies for the despatch of business, were hours of religious communion and hearty fellowship. . . . The ministry of Mr. Dixon is still remembered in Sheffield. Some of the older members of the society there consider that in his time the prosperity of the circuit reached a height unequalled before or after. There was more spirituality, a more present sense of the reality of religion, of being carried forward by a great religious force, of being embraced in an economy actively administered by the power of God, than is usually attained.”

Of one of the most important topics on which Dr. Dixon dwelt, and on which his convictions were deepened by what he had seen abroad, the biographer speaks as follows. The passage also shows his own soundness in the faith :—

“ Another subject which greatly occupied his attention, was the spread of Popery. He held Popery to be the danger of England, and this was a conviction which nothing could shake. He hated that system as a constitutionalist hates despotism ; as a religious republican hates a hierarchy ; as a man of spiritual discernment hates superstition. . . . At this time the great Oxford movement was in its first vigour. Mr. Dixon studied that movement closely, and became familiar with the writings of its great leaders. Not all the excellence of those writings, the spiritual-mindedness, the earnest devotion manifested in them, nor the resemblance which in some respects the movement bore to Methodism in the beginning, could blind him to the fact that it all rested on the narrow foundation of what he called “ exclusive Church principles,” involving claims and admitting appeals which might any day bring on a collision with the constitution of the realm. Can it be said that he was wrong ? ”

The following paragraph from the Doctor's *Letters on the Duties of Protestants* is still in season :—

“ One thing must have struck the attention of every one who has visited Roman Catholic countries ; it is, that in the midst of the employment of poetry, painting, music, sculpture, and scenic

preparations of every kind, even to profusion, the emotions of happiness are scarcely ever appealed to. We find no imagery of joy. The tones of their organs, the structure of their melody, the sonorous voices of their priesthood, are all struck in a deeply pensive and melancholy key. The ceremony of high mass is only calculated to inspire awe towards the priesthood, reverence and fear towards some abstract, hidden, and mystic power connected with the service, and to win over the trembling homage of the people to the system. In the performances of the mitred high priest and his retinue of dependents; the blazing light of innumerable candles; the incense and perfume of the censer; the utterances of hymns and prayers in an unknown tongue; and the elevation of the host: everything seems constructed to inspire dread. There is, even in the highest service of the Church, nothing to call forth the sentiments of confidence and joy. The pictures which adorn their churches, and the images which they either adore, or at least look upon in order to excite their devotion, are all calculated to awaken emotions of fear and dread. Relics of the cross, of dead men's bones, and innumerable other imaginary remains of ancient and departed piety, carefully preserved and exhibited in their shrines, are intended to awaken sombre feelings. The very household gods, so to speak, of these people, all serve to inspire terror. I have seen myself, very often, in one of the most perfectly Popish countries of modern times, lighted candles stuck in human skulls, placed in the corners of the streets of a large town, kept constantly burning; while pictures of purgatory, popes, priests, and devils, were so intermingled, as to teach the efficacy of the system, while they struck the mind with awe. Oh no, there is no joy in this religion; how should there be? Superstition only dwells with the horrible, never with the happy. She throws a midnight darkness over the territory she occupies, and then calls up the furies of her pandemonium to perform the evolutions of mimic power, to silence any murmurs which may arise, and fascinate her deluded followers through the impulse of their fears."

As a public man, we must first characterise the preacher, and here also we shall avail ourselves of the felicitous sketches which are scattered through the book. Preaching is still the standard by which Methodists judge their preachers. Feebleness in the pulpit is an effectual bar to public favour. And we do not envy the individual or community by whom any other qualification should be willingly put in its stead. So long as intellect retains its pre-eminence among the faculties, so long as truth is the crowning character of revelation, so long as testimony is the appointed means by which that truth must be diffused,

so long the foolishness of preaching must be the wisdom of God. Judged by his merits as a preacher, Dr. Dixon ever and deservedly ranked high. It would be impossible adequately to describe the multiform moods of a mind so original although assimilative, so versatile in its tastes although immutable in its principles, as Dr. Dixon's. His manner, spirit, and treatment of his subjects, were as various as their range. Psalm, doctrine and interpretation, all were in his line; the meditative, the discursive, the practical, were mental attitudes he equally became; the hortatory, the denunciatory, the pathetic, he could ring the changes on them all. Yet at the back of these manifold phenomena lay his own unchanging personality, that individuality which every great man possesses without being able to impart, and which all beholders recognise without being able to describe. This capacity of variation within certain limits, combined with fidelity to a fixed type is the perfection of beauty in the world without as well as the world within. This is the one law of identity in diversity which governs creation and gratifies by its discovery the answering principles of the love of unity and the love of variety in the mind of man.

That which was common to all these manifestations was a certain largeness of conception concerning his great central theme. Dr. Dixon resembled all his brethren in the tenacity with which he held the twin doctrines of free grace and free will: wherein he surpassed them was in the power to discern their multitudinous applications, to unfold their connection with the fundamental elements of our nature, and to trace their intertwinings with all the interests of human life. To him the holy book lay open continually as at once a celestial and terrestrial chart, wherein man's place on earth is fixed by reference to the skies. Man's greatness inferred from God's and God's greatness revealed in the Gospel—this was his never-failing argument and inexhaustible theme. Not from him assuredly were ever gathered such hard, narrow and mercantile views of redemption as converted James Mill into one of its bitterest assailants, or those sentimental platitudes or rather parodies of Evangelicalism, the recoil from which drove Frederick Robertson into a region of doubtful speculation. The truth which had saved him from the bondage of Calvinistic fatalism he delighted to proclaim to those who might be in like danger from

its snares, and to the advocacy of it he devoted all his powers. He was metaphysical, but not a metaphysician; he was oratorical, but not a rhetorician: massive in theology, but not a formal theologian; powerful in appeal, but not a bare declaimer. He was all and more than all of these: he was a preacher of the Gospel.

The following passage well describes the general character of this preaching:—

“From the beginning of the sermon, it was scarcely possible not to notice the absence of much that ordinarily goes to the making of a sermon. There was no criticism, no description, nothing circumstantial, no recital of the occasion on which the text was originally written. Whatever the text, it was evidently regarded simply as a key to unlock the infinite treasury of Divine truth, and used as leading directly to this. It was part of the Word of God, intended, like everything else in the Divine Word, to unlock truths of universal and everlasting importance to man. If it were part of a narrative, then the narrative was used in giving an example of the general dealings of Providence, of the general experience of the people of God, or of the general development of the religious life. Some of his most beautiful and powerful discourses were founded on the histories of the patriarchs and saints of the old Old Testament, thus applied; or were drawn from the religious sorrows and aspirations depicted in the Psalms. If the text were doctrinal, then an astonishing power was displayed in laying forth in wide and harmonious view the great spiritual truths of Christianity, the various parts of the covenant of grace, the kingdom of the Holy Spirit. Whatever it were, the whole was a living thing; part followed part in easy and natural succession; the expatiative mind was felt to have touched everything before it was spoken; there were no make-shifts or hackneyed expressions; all was full of meaning.

“As the speaker proceeded, the voice grew full and animated; the head was raised, and the face directed hither and thither (at one time casting speaking looks); the eyes were full of beautiful light, and sometimes there was a sort of flash in them. A sort of fusion or fervour pervaded the whole person, but there was not very much of actual gesture,—only now and then an irrepressible movement of the arm, something like a blow half delivered and recalled. When he was fully wrought up, he was perhaps the most impassioned orator that ever spoke from the pulpit. At least it is hardly possible to conceive of one more impassioned. Bursts of overwhelming pathos came from him, which vanquished and bore away the hearer. Yet in the midst of all he was ever manly; he never lost his directness, his self-command, or his grandeur. His pathos was, so to speak, of an intellectual

character; it sprang from the intense realization of great and affecting truths, from the contemplation of human destiny, of human misery, of the struggles of the human soul; or from the deep sense of Divine love, compassion, and mercy. His intellectual pathos may be regarded as his most remarkable gift. . . .

"No man probably ever preached from so great a multitude of texts. He very seldom preached the same sermon twice. During the fifty years of his ministry, he usually preached twice on a Sunday, and three or four times in the week, and throughout that long period he preached new sermons. These sermons were always purely original, very seldom containing any traces of specific suggestions from others, though of course their general tenor was in agreement with Wesleyan theology; and in youth he had become familiar with the great writers by whom that theology is represented. His sermons were always his own; every one of them had its own individual growth and character. They were of course stamped with the peculiar qualities of the mind which produced them; but they were not mere repetitions of the same thoughts in different guises. Religious emotion, religious meditation, was at the birth of each of them. Each of them had a vital structure which could not be transferred to another; as the trees in a pine forest are all different from one another, though they are all pine trees."

The immediate emotional effect of Dr. Dixon's preaching has not been at all overrated in the above extract: the most cultivated and the most untutored minds alike bowed beneath its power. And that power was always, in a greater or less degree, accompanied by the "grace that bringeth salvation." It was, in fact, as the biographer says, "the outcome and resultant of his spiritual nature."

The production of such sermons must have cost, and did cost, severe mental toil and spiritual agony. Nothing less than the combination of the two could have given him the wonderful influence he wielded in the pulpit. It was probably because he himself was conscious of this that he so strongly denounced memoriter preaching. Both the verbal composition and the verbal delivery of sermons appeared to him to present obstacles to the free inflowing of the Spirit's grace.

"Dr. Dixon held that the mind of the preacher must be filled with the substance of the truth, that he must feel that he is there to declare the vital blessings of experimental religion, and that these must have entered his own mental constitution, and become part of himself. In that case he held that, with proper prepa-

ration, thought, and reflection, words would not fail, and a glow would be produced which would give birth to a truer eloquence than all that could be effected by cold-blooded elaboration. 'In a mind well-furnished and disciplined, the deep emotions of the soul will lead to the finest perceptions and the clearest logic; to an instant combination of truths, facts, and principles, with a ready and appropriate choice of words.'

It must be admitted that nearly all the greatest preachers, and particularly the first Methodists, have in this sense been extemporaneous preachers. Where it is not abused, the gift is of unspeakable value, and no pains should be spared by young men to improve it by fearless practice, if they possess it, and if not, to strive after its attainment. How far this method still obtains among our rising ministry it is difficult to say. The tendency appears to be towards the memoriter style. Whether this is due to a general demand on the part of congregations for a more finished style, or to an overstraining of the nervous system on the part of those who address them, we cannot tell. But it does appear to us that memoriter preaching should not be condemned in the mass. Some men could not by any painstaking command in public an easy flow of language, who yet by previously committing their thoughts to paper are enabled to perform their part with comfort to themselves and profit to their hearers. Others can never think so connectedly as when they have a pen in their hands, and all their premeditation would be unproductive if they were debarred its use. It by no means follows, moreover, that because a man has written his sermon he is obliged to repeat it word for word. We should say to all beginners who fear to launch immediately into extemporaneous exposition of Divine mysteries, Write your sermons, but do not depend on what you have written: commit the outline to memory, but not the sentences themselves. Thus will be combined the freedom and power of the one method with the elegance and precision of the other.

But Dr. Dixon was not a preacher only. Few Methodist ministers are. The pastorate of every Church involves judicial functions, requires administrative ability, and taxes the resources of the best instructed mind. This is especially true of Methodism, whose every circuit is a diocese and every society a parish, whose most arduous posts are continually changing hands, and whose highest dignities go by

merit. Every Methodist preacher becomes in a wider or narrower sense, and with reference to his own community if not to any other, an ecclesiastical politician. In the widest of all senses and in the best of all acceptations this term may be applied to Dr. Dixon. A much better word, however, to express the meaning is that which the biographer has found in Milton's prose, and resuscitated for the purpose of describing his father: he was a "statist." Not a statesman: this would imply an active share in party moves and spiritual strategy to which he always was repugnant. Not a mere administrator of existing laws: this he was, and with what effect let his superintendency at Liverpool in 1835 and at Birmingham in 1849 bear witness. He was a statist: his mind was always revolving great Church principles, which his tongue or pen might give utterance to, but other men were left to apply. In matters of detail he was not much at home, but the same largeness of conception which marked his pulpit ministrations was a conspicuous feature of his ecclesiastical musings. Neither in time nor space could the bounds of his Connexion restrain him: he loved to identify its aims and principles with those of the Catholic Church in every age and of every place. To expect a rigid consistency in all the views of such a mind would be utterly to mistake its character. The world of thought is too vast for the loftiest intellect that traverses it to perceive all the harmonies which it contains. Discrepancies that refuse reconciliation must continue unresolved: the buttresses on either side must be permitted to remain until they can be connected by the arch that shall span the impassable stream. It may appear a prosaic application of this principle to talk of Toryism, but we must nevertheless make the descent. Some men are liberal in general politics, but staunchly conservative in all that concerns their own communion. These we can understand. Enjoying perfect freedom within their own immediate circle, they would like an extension of the privilege that should confer upon them religious equality as men no less than as Methodists. Others are liberal throughout, and are for "altering everything," as the Doctor used to say when he visited old friends in a new home. These, also, whatever we may think about them, we can at least understand. But that a man should be a Tory in the nation and a Liberal in the Church,—here we come to

the edge of the gulf. He must be a bold man that would leap that chasm. But Dr. Dixon did. Nay more, he actually bestrode it, and, like some vast colossus, with one foot on the rock of Toryism and the other on the Liberal sandheap, remained immoveable, while the devouring torrent raged below.

Let us hope it is a venial temerity that prompts the attempt to explain the inexplicable. Some might refer to the times on which the Doctor fell. The period that elapsed between John Wesley's death in 1791 and Jabez Bunting's first Presidency in 1820 is called significantly by Dr. George Smith — we hope not too significantly — "the middle age of Methodism." It was a period of immense spiritual progress and power, for in those thirty years the numbers nearly trebled; but it was also for Methodism a period of comparatively loose organisation — comparatively, that is, with the absolute monarchy that preceded and the constitutional government that followed it. In some aspects it resembled the era of the Judges, between the times when Moses was "king in Jeshurun" and those in which David was raised to the throne. To such a mind as Dr. Dixon's, the new spirit of organisation that came in with Dr. Bunting might appear a spirit of innovation, and, fretting under the restraints of modern action, he might be disposed to say, "The old is better." But we think we can perceive a deeper foundation for his dislike of a certain line of policy than a mere Tory preference of old to new, viz., in his profound spiritual instincts. As a political Tory, he liked strong government, gradation of rank, and subordination of men to office. As an ecclesiastical Liberal, he liked individuality, equality and independence. Why did he not like strong government in the Church? Not because its bonds chafed his spirit or limited his action. He wanted strong government in the Church too, but that government supernatural and Divine. He feared lest any approach to supremacy on the part of one man or order of men should interfere with the Church's loyalty to her Divine Head. He feared lest the competition for the petty prizes of place and power should check the rivalry for eminent usefulness. He feared lest the red-tape of routine should be substituted for the bond of charity, and lest reliance upon system should destroy the faith that worketh by love. These instincts are right, and the dangers they suspect do exist. But we do not

believe the latter threaten very seriously the life of the Church. Some organisation we must have, if we are not to be content with the extreme of quaker informality. Organisation may be made the embodiment of the Church's spiritual unity and the expression of her living charity : there is no need that it should lead to their extinction. The best answer to the Doctor's argument is to be found in his own position. He did not, like so many others, owe that position to the administration of which he was the contemporary critic ; and yet whose name commanded more respect in the Methodist senate ? Did organisations and committees and resolutions destroy his individuality, or enervate his spirit, or hamper his action ? Others might be mentioned whose attitude was equally independent. And if it be asked, "Then why not all ?"—the obvious rejoinder is, "Because all men are not Dr. Dixons."

From the above remarks it will be seen that Dr. Dixon's position was widely different from that of the men who in those days raised the cry of radical reform. His aims through life were spiritual ; and political pettifoggery, of whatsoever kind, was abhorrent to his inmost soul. Hence in every ecclesiastical crisis he was found on the side of order, and refused to be seduced into opposition by any appeal to his liberal views. He never espoused a policy : the influence he wielded in the Conference and out of it was due, not to management, but to the purity and elevation of his character, and to his general nobleness of mind. Dr. Dixon's name can never be quoted by men whose objects are simply political, or whose liberalism is sheer love of change.

How Dr. Dixon shone as an orator ; how he served Methodism outside her borders as her representative at home and abroad, and inside them by enormous labours parochial and extra-parochial ; how boldly he stood up for her defence in such works as his essay on the *Origin of Methodism*, and how effectively he ministered to her edification in such biographies as those of W. E. Miller and David M'Nicoll ; how for two generations he went in and out among his brethren like a veritable Agamemnon, a "king of men," we must leave his biographer to tell. Suffice it that we here briefly trace the secret of his greatness to the mental, moral and spiritual constitution of the man himself. Largeness of conception we have

already mentioned as a chief characteristic of his thinkings: it was inseparably blended with largeness of aim. Religion furnished the mainspring of his action, and made the infinite and the eternal a familiar source of stimulus to his energies of mind and heart. It must be acknowledged, however, that religion here moulded a mind originally capable of vast expansion, and a will spontaneously aspiring after great things. The deathless Roman fire glowed within, *alta petens, aliquid immensum infinitumque*. Activity is natural to some men in a sense in which it is not to others: we all know the "profit" of labour, but for some there would seem to be a repeal of the attendant "curse" that so largely qualifies the blessing. Under the guidance of Christianity, this boundless activity was neither wasted upon the frivolous nor exhausted upon the impracticable, nor disgraced by the pursuit of what is selfish or baneful to mankind. Its sole ambition was to bring heaven down to earth, and to lift earth up to heaven. Except in times of outrageous popular prejudice, when every good man's fame suffered a temporary eclipse, the majesty of such a character could not be misunderstood.

When we come to particular features, we find an harmonious blending of opposites which is not only possible but even sometimes necessary, to probationary man. Intolerance of evil must subsist side by side with the love of the right and the good. They are not contradictory, or mutually exclusive: they are opposite developments of the same principle, and each is the complement of the other. And this was but one of the harmonies of Dr. Dixon's character. There was a dignity that could wrap itself in impenetrable reserve, combined with a tenderness that ever and anon darted gleams of unmistakable sympathy through the mysterious veil. There was a dogmatism that held its own to the last where convictions were concerned; but it was united to something not unlike docility, which knew how without loss of self-respect to admit the possibility of error. Nor must we forget the union of the contemplative with the practical. To this was due both the development and the restraint of the emotional nature. The meditative man must be emotional, but his emotions are too deep for words or even tears. The active man may also be emotional, but his emotions obtain relief and regulation in his activity. If activity swallow up contemplation, the feelings die, and the man, acting from habit only, becomes

a mere machine. If contemplation encroach upon activity, the feelings degenerate into sentiment, and the man becomes a selfish visionary, whose ideals are ever farther and farther removed from the possibilities and actualities of life. We know to which extreme modern society is drifting. There are many thinkers and many workers, but there is a barrier between the two, and the workers, as they suppose, are killing off the drones.

The age wants men who can think and work too, and such a man it found in Dr. Dixon. He blended the two tendencies, and proved that they are not incompatible. His contemplative life was as conspicuous in its effects as his practical. It consisted not in the mere busy play of the imagination or reason, which is itself activity of the intensest kind; it consisted in steadily keeping before the mental eye the great realities. It was pure perception, the quiescence of all the other faculties under an absorbing intuition of invisible things; it was the repose of a spiritual meditation that braced the conscience to the enforcement of self-denying resolves and strung the will to their most diligent execution. Hence arose his high-minded contempt for what he deemed the fussiness of officialism, for the self-conscious and self-measuring importance that covets the pettiest elevation above others, if only by the step of a dais or the stairs of a platform, as well as for the scant energy and unspiritual nature that could need to be stirred by such means. Hence also the force of his sympathies, whenever they could be permitted to overflow; his acceptableness, not to his equals only, but to the young, who courted his society, and to whom he accommodated himself with such genuine grace. Hence, we must add, the hue of melancholy that tinged his innermost life. All great minds are more or less affected by this, especially those that ponder the great mysteries. Lesser minds can more easily console themselves; but for these the shadow, however shot with sunshine, does not wholly disappear. Sin and death and hell for them are facts, and they cannot forget them, though they fly for refuge to the thought of grace, forgiveness and eternal life. An illustration of the coexistence of the two, the sublime discontent with the created and the repose in the uncreated, is one that is not given in this book. A friend was speaking of various kindnesses he had received from his flock. "It is all a shadow," said the Doctor, and then,

after a brief pause, added, "but it is the shadow of a glorious substance, and the substance is in heaven." His melancholy was not that of a joyless because wasted life; it sprang from a sense of disproportion between the grandeur of his aims and the possibilities of his existence; nay, between the grace of the Gospel and the Gospel's actual effects. It was Solomon's sorrow over the vanity of life without the ingredient of Solomon's remorse.

Of course the equipoise was not always perfect: if it had been, we should have had a perfect man. But the character was ever approximating to a perfection that man may scarcely hope to attain. The tremendous energy of such a mind required an inflexible will to control it; and the will was there, yet sometimes possibly its vigilance might slumber, and the intolerance that should have spent its ire on erroneous principles might scathe the persons who professed them. But the position was, notwithstanding, one of stable equilibrium, and after every displacement the body returned to its normal state of rest.

We will not attempt to exhibit another harmony, though it undoubtedly obtained, that namely between the physical and the spiritual man. If ever power and tenderness were blended, it is in the exquisite piece of sculpture in the Didsbury College library, which shows how wonderfully nature may fashion the body to the very image of the mind and art idealise without exaggerating nature. "A finer, more luminous face," says the writer of an obituary article, "was never seen than his. His head was altogether massive and Jove-like; and the fine, pure white, flowing and curling locks, which festooned his noble head, were an unrivalled feature in his appearance."

In 1862, having completed exactly half a century of unremitting toil, he became, to adopt Methodist parlance, "a supernumerary." Seldom has the term been less appropriate. Though smitten with blindness, he was still a favourite preacher with Methodist congregations, and not only in Bradford where he settled but in distant places he still preached, spoke, and lectured as far as growing infirmities would permit. Even in a social sense retirement for him did not mean self-seclusion. He was still accessible to those to whom he had previously sustained the pastoral relation, and denied himself to none of those—and they were not a few—who could appreciate

his great conversational powers. One ardent admirer of the Doctor took copious notes of his conversations with him, and their fresh fragrance exhales from the pages of the biography in the "Jottings" of the Rev. Joshua Mason. His last illness was sudden and of brief duration, but it did not come upon him unawares, or find him sleeping. He died on the 28th of December, 1871.

A few questions naturally occur upon a review of Dr. Dixon's whole career. One is, How much had Methodism to do with its evolution? Three distinct sets of causes appear to combine in the production of men's characters—original endowments, the state of society, and then their own moulding will. The occurrence of the first is among the mysteries of nature. Natural selection will explain a good deal, but not the genesis of genius. What theory will account for the intellectual exuberance of the seventeenth century and the comparative poverty of the eighteenth? Why was Sir Isaac Newton born just when the discoveries of Kepler wanted such a mind to explain them? Why was he not created in the days of Ptolemy, to counteract his influence on the fortunes of science? To this and a thousand similar questions the answer must be that given in Daniel ii. 20, 22. For the sparse or plentiful scattering of superior intelligences we are shut up to the wisdom of God. For the moulding influence of his own will, whatever our theory of causation and whatever our doctrine of election, each man must be held responsible. But there comes an intermediate link between God's gift of genius and the possessor's use of it. That link is the state of society into which he is born. We need not say anything, good or bad, of the state of society which Methodism in Kingsmill or elsewhere found: we speak only of that which she established. Methodism gave Dr. Dixon a godly parentage: had Thomas Chatterton enjoyed as much, he might have been as great a blessing to the world. Methodism provided Evangelical ordinances, when in the Church that names itself of England there were none. Methodism presided at the birth of this great spiritual and intellectual nature, and gave it meat to eat and room to grow. Methodism taxed to the uttermost the gigantic powers it had discovered, by imposing tasks ever increasing in severity, which a conscientious mind could not forego. Methodism furnished the stimulating companionship which her noblest minds deny not to

her humblest. And even in the seeming mistake of the Gibraltar appointment Methodism only confined energies that might else have run to waste within the sphere on which they should henceforth be concentrated. Methodism did all this then; she did it partly by that which the Doctor himself so needlessly suspected, her organisation, but partly also and chiefly by the abounding of her own first love. The statement suggests a crowd of topics pertinent to the subject and all-important to the interests of the future. We will not ask, Does God give such intelligences now? An obvious reply would be that, whatever may be said of history, its great men do not repeat themselves. The men of this age do not resemble those of the last, nor these their predecessors. They are called to a different work, and they develop in a different direction. James Dixon was the son-in-law of Richard Watson, but we cannot hold with his biographer that he was "in some sense" his successor. Neither of them had, or could have, one. They were adapted to their age, and the men of the present are adapted to this. And this remark does not disparage either age, or either set of men. The Buntings, the Watsons, the Adam Clarkes would have made the world conscious of their presence in any generation, simply because they would have understood its needs and fashioned themselves accordingly. They would have been foremost in the present age if their lot had been cast in it, but they would not have been precisely what they were. And if it were possible to judge fairly of contemporaries, we believe it would be found that, despite the advance in the general standard, there are those now who in moral and intellectual character maintain a certain pre-eminence, and need not shrink from a comparison with any former age. From these remarks it will be seen how far we agree and how far we differ with the biographer in his closing sentiment that "the condition of society at large, and of the Methodist body in particular, is no longer favourable to the development of such a character as James Dixon."

Our business is less, after all, to inquire whether God still gives superior intelligences than to consider whether we are doing our best for those that are given. Methodism, undoubtedly, laid the mould in which James Dixon's character ran. Does she lay the same moulds now, and does she fuse the mental substances she works

upon so that they shall answer the best ends? The question divides into two—one respecting her means and appliances, the other respecting her spirit and power.

Concerning the former but one opinion can be given. Her organisation was never so complete. There is no need to appeal to statistics for the proof. If there be any opening at the joints of the harness, it is probably in a lack of the care for her own baptized children against which the itinerant system has always so grievously militated. We are glad to see that this subject is receiving Connexional attention, and if it be only taken up by ministers with as much spirit as is generally thrown into any question of great public importance, for example the recent one of augmenting the missionary income, the best results cannot but accrue. One of the recommendations of the committee to whom the business is confided, is the revival of the Saturday afternoon meeting for children in places where it has been abandoned. It is a mode of action that Dr. Dixon strongly recommended himself. Some of his letters disclose strong views upon the subject of the Christian instruction of the young. As it is one that must shortly be discussed in the highest ecclesiastical assembly of Methodism, we may be pardoned, perhaps, for dwelling a little on the suggestion of the committee above referred to. Let it not be discredited for its simplicity. We know the difficulties that beset the arrangement; how precious Saturdays are; how often they are invaded by demands to provide supplies for pulpits that must otherwise be neglected; and how natural it is to suppose that the Sunday-school, particularly with the more or less regular afternoon address delivered by the minister, should suffice for this branch of service. For ourselves, we can only record the personal benefit derived some thirty years ago from such a series of Saturday meetings, conducted by one whose name will appear in the obituary of the ensuing Conference. We attended Sunday-school twice, and public worship three times on the Sabbath; we constantly came into contact with ministers at home, and used to tremble in Sunday-night prayer-meetings: but all these opportunities lacked an element of influence that was supplied by the Saturday meeting. Apart from this, the minister appeared to our youthful imagination simply a man that came and stayed and went in regular rotation with his brethren. He formed no part, to our mind, of the Method-

ist organisation: the Sunday-school teacher was a more important personage, for he did speak to us about our soul. But when the strange man, whom we saw Sabbath after Sabbath ascend the sacred desk and solemnly address the congregation, became so condescending as to gather a few of us into his majestic presence (and in this case also it was majestic) to commune with us face to face about salvation, then we understood his mission, and, had we dared, would have opened to him all our heart. Similar and even more decisive results are, no doubt, constantly flowing from this practice, and we wish it could become universal. Perhaps an equally beneficial arrangement might be for the minister—instead of wearying himself for the evening service by the delivery of a formal address to an audience peculiarly difficult to manage—to take the children apart, one by one, and converse with them, a class every Sunday, till the number was exhausted. Were this experiment everywhere made in the interval between the two next Conferences, who knows what blessings might not follow?

In another department the organisation is more complete, though of course it cannot boast perfection. We refer to the training of the ministry. If any of the original opponents of this institution have not as yet become defunct, we can imagine that to such the name of Dr. Dixon must be a tower of strength. Here, they may say, was a man wholly destitute of early educational advantages, and see what eminence he attained as the result of his own exertions! Certainly, no man ever attained eminence in Methodism apart from his own exertions. But that every man could because Dr. Dixon did is a conclusion unwarranted by the premises. Not all surely of Dr. Dixon's contemporaries in the glorious days of old were laggards in the race: why then did so few keep up with him? Simply because he was a giant, and many of them ordinary men. Besides, it is utterly futile to suppose that because the Doctor was so great, good early training would not have made him greater. We believe it would. He would himself have abhorred the thought that any other lesson could be learnt from his life. The hard mental discipline to which he subjected himself throughout the course of his ministry did not and could not accustom him to the patient and painstaking research, the cautious and long suspended generalisation and the

consequent philosophical precision which were exactly what he needed to compete with some other intellects that might be named. Training will never transmute cairngorms into carbuncles. But it polishes all, and it will polish most the minds that are the richest in their grain. It does not reduce men to a soulless uniformity. Never was there a more groundless charge than that training checks originality, and brings all men to one dead level by elevating mediocrity and cramping genius. Eccentricity undoubtedly it scandalises, but originality never. It reduces those discrepancies which result from distortion, but it develops an ampler variety of good proportions simultaneously with a closer conformity to the model. The great personages of society are still to be distinguished from its humbler members despite the absence of wigs and silver buckles; and so in the intellectual republic. Never was training more necessary than now for those who are to confront the picked champions of heresy and superstition; and we can but pray that those whom God raises up to receive the mantle of their fathers may be able to improve to the utmost those advantages the lack of which was so deeply felt and so laboriously supplied by men like the one we have been describing.

It remains to consider the second branch of the above question, viz., as to the spirit and power of Methodism. Have these in any degree departed? That Methodism is not so worthy as she was once of Dr. Chalmers's description, "*Christianity in earnest*," is frequently asserted, not only by her foes but by some of her friends, among whom we must reckon the biographer and, if we are to credit him, the subject of his biography. Remembering the latter's temperament, and also his habit of stating all that could be said for any argument, we are not disposed to attach too much value to his pensive anticipations. They occur just as frequently at the beginning as at the close of his career. Relatively to other bodies, indeed, the zeal of Methodism cannot rank so high as it did. Means and appliances may be, and sometimes are, material helps but spiritual hindrances. There is a danger of regarding, not the world more than the Church, but this world more than the next. The present advantages of religion may be dwelt upon to the comparative exclusion of those which are to come. If this habit should ever be characteristic of the Church, she has declined from

Dr. Dixon's standpoint, and begun to realise his fears. But surely matters are not come to this. The standard of ministerial purity as well as attainment is higher than ever. The most deeply spiritual ministry is the most heartily appreciated. The anxiety to lay hold of the masses is increasing every day. The liberality of the Church is beyond all precedent, and her internal harmony was never so profound. Nay more, there are signs of genuine revival, and the sound of abundance of rain. Let us hope that we are on the eve of such an era of blessing as Dr. Dixon longed for far more than he did for the resuscitation of the political party with which he deemed the glories of old England to have for ever passed away. No one would have persuaded him that such a piece of political good fortune was about to fall into the lap of that party as we see to day, yet it is a fact, and willingly or not we must accept it. Shall we not much more hope for the revival of a pure Protestantism, of an influential Evangelicalism, of a soul-seeking and soul-saving Methodism?

We must not conclude without thanking the biographer for his valuable contribution to the already wealthy hagiology of Methodism. He has achieved the task laid upon him in a manner that might perhaps be equalled, but certainly not surpassed. Here is no absurd glorification of the departed: here is no unseemly lifting of the veil that should be drawn over the privacies of domestic life, and no multiplication of details only interesting to a few. What we have is a just tribute of affection, conceived in a truly philosophic spirit and executed in a style worthy of the son of James Dixon and the grandson of Richard Watson. As a member of another Church, we cannot but also express our admiration of the candour and respect he displays toward the body to which Dr. Dixon belonged. He has spoken fearlessly and without flattery. Yet he has caught the cue of the Methodist public, and has proved how possible it is for sympathy to overleap party walls and for charity to override rubrics, by the production of a volume which will doubtless be read long after the generation has died out that knew the grand old figure here depicted.

ART. VII.—1. *The Personal Life of George Grote ; compiled from Family Documents, Private Memoranda, and Original Letters.* By MRS. GROTE. London : Murray. 1873.

2. *The Minor Works of George Grote.* Edited, with Introduction, by ALEXANDER BAIN. London : Murray. 1874.

WE scarcely know a more delightful book than Mrs. Grote's life of her husband. "*My life*," exclaimed he, when, in 1867, he found her busy arranging materials for a sketch of it ; "*my life ; why, there is absolutely nothing to tell.*" "Not in the way of adventures, I grant ; but there is something nevertheless. Your life is the history of a mind." "*That is it,*" he rejoined, with animation. "But can you tell it ?" She has told it, not merely with the liveliness which we should have expected from her other writings, but with a power of loving insight rarely attained, even by the most appreciative biographers. "You are the only person living," added Grote, in the conversation quoted above, "who knows anything about me during the first half of my existence ;" and she who had this exclusive knowledge has enabled others to trace how the man grew to be what he was, and to exercise a personal influence which was even greater than that of his writings.

One striking feature of Mrs. Grote's work is its reticence. Women are proverbially more impulsive than men ; but in this woman's book there are absolutely none of those strong (almost rapturous) expressions of affection and protests about unanimity which we remember in Mr. Mill's autobiography. And yet, for all that, every page bears ample testimony to the thorough oneness of the Greek historian and his wife. It is not only that she helped him in his work, learning Greek in order to be able to make his quotations for him, advising him as to both style and matter, but she was one with him in thought and will, going on as she began, with a thorough instinctive fulfilment of the true wife's duty. She was a help-meet who, in St. Paul's words, "*cared for the things of this world how she might please her husband.*" At the very outset she performed what, to

one brought up as she had been, was an heroic act of self-denial; she went to live at the bank, in a close court off Threadneedle-street. "Mr. Grote had said it must be so, and she endeavoured to make the best of it." The bad air nearly cost her her life; but what she calls "the miserable circumstances of her slow convalescence" drew husband and wife even closer together, and secured their perfect oneness. Mr. Mill tells us again and again how much his wife helped him by suggesting ideas and giving tone to his mind; at times it almost seems as if he is too emphatic in his assurances of what a debt he owed to her. Mr. Grote's debt to his wife was of a different kind. She was always a true woman, and he was her hero, worshipped with a quiet but unfailing worship. No doubt she influenced him, keeping him clear of the extremes into which some philosophical radicals have run; but the influence was indirect. Moreover from the first their minds ran in much the same groove; they thought and felt together on most things, each preserving something distinctive—she caring for natural scenery even in a more demonstrative way than he did, much as he enjoyed it (see her graphic accounts of foreign travel, reprinted from the *Spectator*, in *Collected Papers in Prose and Verse*); he devoted to Greek legends and to the ballot in a way which she could not thoroughly enter into; but wholly at one on all main points, and (more important, as well as much rarer in married life) growing in likemindedness as life goes on. With husband and wife this is not always the case, even when they have begun harmoniously. Most young couples imagine they agree in everything—in fact, they do for a time, thanks to the unconscious compliance of love. : Too often, by-and-by, they both choose their own line, and find, to their dismay, that the divergence between them has become startling. Perfect unanimity, in those rare cases where it exists, must be mainly due to well-regulated temper on both sides, and especially on the wife's. That this was Mrs. Grote's special excellence is manifested by the whole tenor of their lives. His friends are hers; his glory is hers; she finds her whole pleasure in enhancing his fame, in setting forward his plans, in ministering to his comfort. Emphatically they are together, from the time when (in 1821) he wrote his first work, the *Essay on Parliamentary Reform*, by his wife's bedside, as she was recovering from her terrible illness, to the sad days when, fifty years after, dying of renal disease,

induced by a chill caught while sitting for his portrait to Mr. Millais, he has his daily rubber with wife and sister, and for the last time gathers a committee of the Senate of the University of London under his own roof, prepared and fortified to meet them by the same tender care which had watched over him, not then only, but throughout his married life.

Like many other notable Englishmen, Grote was of foreign extraction. It is one of the glories of England that it assimilates instead of isolating those who establish themselves among us. Whether or not the old Britons were mainly exterminated as well as subdued, the incoming English developed a character quite distinct from that of the Continental Teuton; and this character soon became impressed on the incoming Norman. From that time Flemings, Edict of Nantes French, Germans of all kinds, have, in the second generation, become thoroughly English. Andrew Grote, George's grandfather, came from Bremen, and set up shop as a general merchant in Leadenhall-street. Thriving in this, he started a "money shop," in 1766, in partnership with George Prescott. He did not trust to trade, marrying, in 1745, Miss Adams, an Oxfordshire heiress, at the death of whose brother he got a large landed property near Henley. One son, Joseph, was sole issue of this marriage; but Andrew married a second fortune, and lived in grand style at "the Point House," on the top of Greenwich-hill, one of the finest sites in Europe. The eldest son of this second marriage, with a Miss Culverden, was the historian's father. Andrew was clearly a man of good moral sense as well as a shrewd business man. Mrs. Grote remarks how his letters to Joseph on his travels contrast with those of Lord Chesterfield to his son. George he sent to the Charterhouse, and then put him into the bank; and in 1793 the young partner married the daughter of the handsome Dr. Peckwell, one of Lady Huntingdon's chaplains. Here was another strain of foreign blood introduced into the family; for Dr. Peckwell's wife was a De Blosset, one of a Touraine family, connected with Chardin, the Oriental traveller, and (as they claimed) with Corneille the poet, which at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes had passed into Ireland, and, after the battle of the Boyne, had acquired part of Lord Fingal's estates in Meath.

In 1794, George, the historian, was born at Beckenham, and christened according to what, Mrs. Grote strangely says, "was the custom in those days," in his father's

drawing-room. He began work early; at five and a half he was sent to Sevenoaks school, having already learnt, besides reading and writing, a little Latin from his mother. Next comes (at ten) the Charterhouse, where his schoolmates were the two Waddingtons, Connop Thirlwall (the future bishop), Havelock, Cresswell Cresswell, &c. At sixteen, instead of following his bent and going to college, he had to go into the bank, the partnership in which was almost all his father's share of Andrew's great fortune. Had he received an university education, it is doubtful whether it would have been an advantage; it could not have made him more devoted to truth or more indefatigable in his search after it. By his history he will always be chiefly known, and through it his influence has been and will be widest. But his own inclination was to logic; and certainly Oxford in those days had nothing to offer which could have stood instead of or in the least assisted the self-directed studies which made him a worthy critic of Sir W. Hamilton, and enabled him so cordially to appreciate John Stuart Mill's great work. Nor would Cambridge mathematics, had he taken up with them, have done any more for him than Aldrich. Professor de Morgan is perhaps the only instance of a man combining high excellence in both logic and mathematics. Indeed, Grote's was a mind independent of university culture. It is remarkable that some of the men who have most deeply moved the age have been trained not in academic halls, but in business. Grote at his bank, Mill at the India House, were strengthened instead of being worn out by hard routine work; the metal was tough enough to profit by the seemingly unsuitable tempering.

George Grote, senior, did little at the bank; hunting, shooting, riding, and acting as J. P. for Kent and Oxfordshire, and leaving the main business of the firm to Mr. Prescott and to his son, who had (besides hard work) plenty of physical exercise, riding to and from London almost daily with his father, and running about as a "walk clerk," presenting bills, &c. George's study time was when he had to take his turn in the city to "stay and lock up." He read hard, learning the violoncello by way of relaxation. By this we have a delicious picture of wife and self "playing duets on two violoncellos" (p. 41). He soon learned German, the value of which, in his logical and historical reading, was inestimable; and Ricardo's treatises early led him to take

an interest in "the dismal science." His home was not a particularly pleasant one. Mrs. Grote was a rigid Calvinist, and "almost laid an interdict on domestic entertainments. Mr. Grote held but slender communion with her on any subject, allowing her, for the sake of peace and quiet, to govern her household in her own way," and keeping up a small establishment in Threadneedle-street, where he received his male friends. Hence a twofold effect on the young historian's mind; from his mother he got that distaste for general society which led him heartily to endorse the views of his friend Sir G. C. Lewis, that "life would be tolerable but for its amusements;" from having felt the want which existed in his father's household, he determined that the first essential of his own married life should be thorough oneness. Yet young Grote did not want society. The neighbourhood of Beckenham was full of young people of both sexes. The Normans, the Edens, Lewins, Berens, Camerons, &c., all lived thereabouts; and (says Mrs. Grote) "it would have been difficult to find twenty-five couples wherein beauty, grace and form, were so largely present as in those who wound up our frequent cricket meetings with a dance." His chief friends were G. W. Norman and Chas. Cameron, of whom the first encouraged him to write poetry ("his faculty at this period was incontestable;" why have we not some specimens?), the latter led him into metaphysical speculations. Norman introduced him to the Lewins, and with Miss Harriet Lewin he soon fell desperately in love. The course of love did not run smooth. A neighbouring clergyman, who had much influence over young Grote, and who was himself attached to Miss Lewin, persuaded him that her heart and hand were pre-engaged; and before the treachery was discovered, the young banker had solemnly promised his father that he would never propose marriage without parental sanction. It was to no purpose that Norman wrote (August, 1815), "E. is a villain and Harriet completely exculpated," for the elder Grote held his son to his compact; with banks and business-houses failing all around, it was not the time (he urged) to set up a second marriage. Driven from love, the son takes to literature, reads Lucretius, whom he appreciates ("much superior to Virgil in every quality, except chastity and delicacy of taste, wherein the latter has reached the utmost pinnacle of perfection"); reads Aristotle's Ethics ("I feel so anxious

for a more intimate acquaintance with him") and Hume's *Essays* ("which do not improve, in my view, on further knowledge"). His letters to Norman are very interesting. He talks of "my dead friends in calf and Russia;" and tells him how he has begun (1819) to dine with Ricardo and to meet Mill at his house. "What I chiefly dislike in Mill is the readiness and seeming preference with which he dwells on the faults and defects of others, even of the greatest men!" At this time, when boy-like he emphasised his periods with notes of admiration, he was hardly capable of feeling James Mill's power of fascination to the extent to which he afterwards realised it. Mrs. Grote evidently regrets the way in which this influence was exerted. "Grote's own nature was gentle, charitable, humane; but his fine intellect was worked upon by the inexorable teacher with so much persuasive power, that he found himself inoculated as it were with Mill's conclusions—his hatred of aristocracy and of the Established Church, almost without a choice."

It is to James Mill more than to any other contemporary that we owe our modern ideas of duty to mankind at large, of philanthropy; and with him duty was not what it is for so many, a mere vague expression, it became a powerful motive for action, an "enthusiasm of humanity," as the phrase is, "kindling generous impulses towards the popular side, and leading his young hearers to regard the cultivation of individual affections and sympathies as destructive of lofty aims, and indubitably hurtful to the mental character; he fired them with patriotic ardour and bitter antipathies, and braced them up to wage battle, when the day should come, in behalf of the true faith." Hence it comes to pass that, in 1830, we find Grote giving £500 to help the French revolutionists, and for many years spending money and time in sending about the country models of ballot boxes and voting cards, so as to prove to every voter the superiority of the method which his yearly speeches advocated.

Bentham, who lived close to and kept house for the Mills, began also to exercise a strong influence on Grote. Indeed it is through its practical results on him and on the younger Mill that the popular ideas about Benthamism have been of late much cleared up.

Nearly three years after their separation, young Grote meets Miss Lewin, and describes, in a gushing letter to Norman (what gushing there is in this book is all his), how

"her features still retained the same life and soul which once did so magnetise me. Something kept me all the time in such a state of tremour and uneasiness, that I could hardly utter a rational sentence. Relations are a chain which drag a man on by means of his sense of duty. Happy is he who has fewest!" However, Grote *pere*, at length, consents to his marrying after a further delay of two years, and Miss Lewin, "appreciating the son's character and its suitableness to her views of the value of literary communion and culture as an element of conjugal life," acquiesces in the harsh conditions. The sentence just quoted is the key to their happiness, and to Grote's success in every walk of life in which he moved. How fully they were one, those few words suffice to explain.

During the two years George bestowed a great deal of pains on Miss Lewin's mental improvement, guiding her reading, urging her to analyse what she read, and keeping for her behoof a very minute journal. Some of the minuteness might have been spared us, e.g. "Rose at seven, went over to Hollies (the Lewins'), *shaved there*, and read Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, till eight." "Rose just before nine, breakfasted, and read some *Edinburgh Review*, but was little fit for anything, being so miserable at heart. This lasted till I received my dearest H.'s letter at one, which quite revived and comforted me. I could not help writing her an answer to tell her so."

They are married in March, 1820, Mr. Grote stipulating that they shall live at the bank, and restricting them to a very small allowance, although he was now very rich, having, besides a large Lincolnshire mortgage property, come in, through his wife, to the Irish Blosset estate. As we said, Threadneedle-street was nearly the death of Mrs. G. Grote. By a premature confinement she lost her only child (the "three Groticles" of whom we read later on were adopted, two of them his brother's children), and no doubt the seeds were then sown of the nervous affections from which she so often suffered all through life. Here she, who had numerous aristocratic friends, and whose inclination would have led her to visit among them, gave up, out of deference to Grote's anti-aristocratic tastes, all except her blood relations, the Plumers of Gilston-park, Herts. Her only complaint is, that "while she cut herself off from her friends, rather than displease her somewhat intolerant partner, Gilston-park, delightful as it was, possessed no charms for George

Grote, beyond the pleasure of his wife's presence, and he never went thither save with a certain reluctance." A characteristic letter is given, in which Grote, regretting her absence, says—"I can only fall foul of the great people whose visits you are expecting." This was certainly a weakness, a "survival," we may call it, of the coarse old German burgher nature, so wanting in that adaptability which is such a marked feature of some races. Grote never was wholly cured of it, for James Mill's teaching fell in here with his natural tastes; that he did to a great extent get better of it was due partly to his being drawn into public life, but mainly to Mrs. Grote's quiet influence. There certainly is little enough in these days, and there was less fifty years ago, in what are called "county families" to attract a man who felt himself in every way but one infinitely superior to the pedigreed nobodies who might think themselves licensed to patronise him. The very highest kind of man accommodates himself to all surroundings; he can even amuse and be amused by the ugly, ill-dressed, poverty-pinched old gentlewoman who when he talks of Mr. Wood asks if he's one of the Woods of Hampshire. Grote could not; he was intensely eclectic, satisfied with none but "kindred minds," and therefore (as usually happens with such men) he got on better with French than with English people of rank. The former are always more ready than the latter to put rank aside and to fairly meet talent on its own ground; to claim kinship of mind, even if they have no real title to it. It is much easier to be stiff than to be accommodating; to play the cynic, who is nothing without his rage and his tub, than to imitate Aristippus, who could one day consort with kings and satraps, and next day come down unrepiningly to water and a crust. Grote never became quite an Aristippus, but he certainly was no cynic; though "this winter ('89) we dined abroad but once, and then it was with Mr. Grote's mother," shows how very little, even when he had entered Parliament, he cared for "society."

Business London was, in 1822, very different from what it is now. Grote's bank, for instance, was a nest in which each of the three partners had a separate residence, and where twelve or fifteen younger clerks slept and were boarded at the expense of the firm. One of the partners was bound to open and lock up the safes; so that for several years Mrs. G. Grote had to live for a part of the year in the confined situation

from which her health so much suffered. Riding twice or thrice a week in Finsbury Riding-school, walking on Southwark-bridge or in Draper's-hall-gardens, "amidst a grove of trees black with soot," must have been to her but poor compensation for a country life. It was at this time that Grote took a very active part in founding the London Scientific Institution, his presidential address at which, in 1846, is printed amongst his Minor works. It was specially meant for young men living in the City; and, in his own words, "the idea was to enlist the sociability of commercial and professional men in favour of better enjoyment, instead of worse; in favour of mental progress and elevating recreations, by having a brotherhood ready organised to mingle and fraternise with." Omnibuses have to a great extent shifted such institutions to the suburbs; but Grote's remarks may well be taken to heart by the young men of the present day; they were never more needed than in this age of increasingly perilous amusements.

Grote's own habits during this time were wonderfully studious. His wife made him an early riser: "a bell was fixed in our bedroom, and rung at 6 a.m. by the private watchman." Here is the diary of a December day, one of many in 1822—"Rose at 6; employed all my reading-time upon Diodorus; got through 80 pp., taking notes. A few articles in the *Diction. Philos.* filled up odd moments."

In the autumn of the next year he began to collect materials for his history. To Mrs. Grote belongs the credit of giving his studies this particular bent: "You are always studying the ancient authors; here is a fine subject for you." He had before treated of "the myth," in several letters to Norman; and, as this was his strong point (he may almost be said to have invented the word), and the subject of the preliminary essay (in the *Westminster* for 1849), it may be as well to say a few words about it in this place. Is there, or is there not, a groundwork of truth underlying the old stories about Hercules, Jason, Agamemnon, and so on? No; said Grote. Here the curtain is the picture; "the myth is not merely a falsification of facts; but a narrative created to suit a strong feeling, and therefore believed in; it is the record of a past that never was present." This process he illustrates from Goethe's apocryphal story about Byron. Evidently (says the great German) in *Manfred* the poet is describing the terrible workings of

his own conscience. Astarte, too, is a real character. "The fact is, young Byron had loved a Florentine lady, whose husband, discovering the amour, killed her. The next night he was found dead in the streets; no one but Byron had any motive for killing him. The double murder accounts for the state of mind which produced *Manfred*." Of course the story was (as Moore in his *Life* points out) a pure fiction from beginning to end. It just suits Grote's definition of "the myth." Byron was in every one's mouth; everyone thirsted for an explanation why the Furies should thus have singled him out. Somebody invented the Florentine tale, which dropped into its place like the keystone of an arch. Homer's airy-tongued *doxa* spread it abroad; few cared to raise a question of authority, for its evidence was its plausibility (it was *ben trovato*); the poet's lacerated feelings were no longer an enigma; and it is his highest glory to have caused an *æstrus* for creating, and an appetite for believing, such a tale. Grote applied this principle, not merely to the romantic legends of the Greek hero-ology, but to such prosaic matters as the equal division of the Spartan bands by Lycurgus. Laying down the principle that "the age which does not register its present can have no knowledge of its past; and finding that, as matter of fact, this equal division never existed in historic times, he thinks the idea grew up during the abortive revolution of Agis III. That revolution claimed to be a going back to the ideas of Lycurgus, while one of its striking features was an equal division of lands. Therefore, of course, this division would be attributed to the pre-historic lawgiver.

Of course there was ground enough for Mr. Grote's scepticism in the credulity of grave chronologists like Fynes Clinton, who actually treats of Æolus, Homer's Æolus in his brass-girt floating island, as a real person. But still we think he goes too far. The plausible fiction no doubt fills up a great deal of so-called early history; but not to the total exclusion of the exaggerated and distorted matter of fact. "In an early age the feelings provide a substitute for knowledge;" true, but there must have been something to give those feelings their peculiar shape. The Florentine story would never have been invented of any poet but Byron; the *Iliad* would never have been composed had there not been a Trojan war, as indeed Dr. Schliemann's discoveries seem to prove. In

regard to Rome Grote admits this; reviewing his friend Sir G. C. Lewis's *Credibility of Early Roman History*, he feels that Sir George rejects too much. So, we think, he himself does in regard to Greece. We cannot go all lengths with Mr. Gladstone, who is as convinced as Hipparchus the astronomer, or Polybius, or Strabo, that Homer is the father of geographical science. Yet neither would we say, like Eratosthenes, that "it will be time enough to look for the whereabouts of the places in the *Odyssey*, when we have found out the name of the currier who stitched Æolus's leather bag." We cannot hold with Euhemerus and the early fathers, that the heroes are all deified men; neither can we admit, with Max Müller and Mr. Cox, that they must one and all be explained away as cloud or sun or wind-myths. Ajax and Achilles are certainly more personal than Prometheus or Pelasgus, and these than Ares or Here. Mr. Grote himself allows that Arion was a real personage, in spite of the dolphin. He very truly says that the element of the marvellous made their early legends more credible to the old Greeks than they would otherwise have been; he fails to prove that this marvellous element makes the whole legend unreal.* Wallace was a real man, though many of the stories told by Blind Harry and others are merely inventions of an age in which the romantic took the place that the supernatural held in pre-historic times.

No doubt the sceptical spirit which had been cultivated by James Mill shaped Grote's ideas about legendary Greece, just as his own strongly democratic feelings coloured his account of Athenian history. In an eminent degree, his great work is a picture of his own mind;† its unrivalled narrative interest recalls the schoolboy who used to devour novels; its defence of Cleon is only one of many ways in which are displayed the author's intensely popular sympathies; his logical and metaphysical faculty (in

* Grote instances what he calls the parallel case of the Jews. Millman lost credit by "economising the supernatural;" and Rabbi Maimonides, for thinking that Balaam's ass was a vision, is called to account by Le Clerc, who says the ass was used by God or His angel just as the organ is by the organist.

† So it is also with our great living Hellenist, Mr. Gladstone; as Grote was prospective, so he is retrospective. The former went so far as to assert that good, bad, &c., had little or no ethical meaning before the time of Socrates; the latter traces a gradual decline in Greek morality from his Homeric ideal.

which, among historians, he has few rivals but Hume and James Mill) comes out in his subtle expositions of the springs of political action and his masterly analyses of the different schools of Greek philosophy. There was no hurry, no "scampering," in his preparation. More than twenty years intervened between the impulse given by his wife and the publication of the first two volumes. So little was he prepared for the brilliant success which awaited him, that he said to his wife, "I suppose I shall have to print it at my own expense." Mrs. Grote managed all the negotiations with publishers, "such was Grote's aversion to business matters, except where he felt a personal obligation, as in discharging his duties as partner." Murray's referee (happily for Murray) had the insight to see the value of the book. "Sir," said he, "you've got hold of a *good thing* here, and one likely to produce an effect upon the scholar world." The first instalment appeared in March, 1846, and took the literary world by storm. The strongest testimony in its favour is that, at the Universities, those strongholds of Toryism, the radical book of a radical banker at once assumed its place as "the authority." Mitford was straightway dethroned, and disappeared as wholly as Milton's heathen gods who fled gibbering at the news of the Nativity. Mrs. Grote gives, among other letters, a valuable one from the veteran Hallam, which, while full of commendation, takes that view of the mythical period which we have endeavoured to maintain. The Nibelungen Lied (he remarks) has an historical basis; so have all mediæval romances, except Geoffrey of Monmouth's acknowledged invention—the tale of Brute. The saints, too, were real men, though exploits as impossible as those of Hercules are ascribed to some of them. It must have delighted Mrs. Grote to watch her husband's feelings under all this praise. "I became, for once, witness of a state of feeling approaching to gratified self-love, which, at times, would pierce through that imperturbable veil of modesty habitually present with him." She was, as we have said, his critic, "often suggesting changes, sometimes excisions. He usually manifested respect for my remarks, and eventually came to regard my humble assistance as indispensable." Meanwhile, she was taking care of "the Groticles," and relieving her husband of all business obligations, "so that he absolutely enjoyed the leisure of a lodger in his own establishment, whilst exercising a general authority over

its course as its lawful head." We all know how the work went on from good to better, until, as a whole, it fully deserved J. S. Mill's praise: "There is hardly an important fact in Greek history which was perfectly understood before he re-examined it."

But we have been anticipating, and must not leave out the twenty-two years of preparation. During these, Grote was proving how well classical studies, rightly undertaken, correct the one-sidedness of our modern life. He was relatively poor—his father allowing him only just enough to keep him out of debt, his wife adding a little to the income by articles in the *Westminster*; but there was always money enough for horse exercise, of which husband and wife were equally fond, and most of their holiday trips were either rides or drives through the picturesque parts of England.

Father and son, moreover, were opposed in politics as well as in tastes. Son was from the beginning in the Council of the London University; father subscribed £100 to the rival King's College. The death of the elder Grote in 1830 left the son full freedom of action, and he soon became one of the heads of the Reform movement, and in 1832 was a successful candidate for the City of London, heading the poll with a majority of 924 votes. Mrs. Grote says, "I doubt if I shall ever again experience the intense happiness of those inspiring moments when I looked down on the heads of 4,000 free citizens in Guildhall, cheering and echoing the sentiments which for years we had privately cherished, but which were now first fearlessly avowed."

Foremost among these sentiments was a belief in the importance of the ballot. This had come out in his earliest work (*The Essentials of Parliamentary Reform*), in which he had argued, against Sir J. Mackintosh, that while property must be the basis of the franchise, this basis should be the very widest: "The many would respect property; even the labourer has property, and wants protection for it. . . . The people are sometimes misled by a particular exception, but instances of spoliation are far commoner among irresponsible governments. . . . The Whigs are consistent in refusing universal suffrage, for when they have been in office their aim has been to keep up their salaries, and to spend the twenty-two millions for their own advantage; for whoever rules does it for his own interest as far as he is

permitted. Therefore, let the ruling body be as large as possible."

On the ballot Grote made his first and greatest speech, in April, 1833—the speech of which Lord Broughton said: "I who have been all my life in Parliament, and have listened to Canning and the giants of old, never heard but one to equal it, viz., Macaulay's on the copyright question." "The ballot," said Grote, "is necessary, for a voter has as great a trust as a juror, and should act as coolly. . . . When you want a man's private unbiassed opinion you had best make his communications strictly confidential. . . . If a voter breaks his promise, it must be because it was given contrary to his feelings; he must lie—to his country, if he keeps such a promise, to his superior, if he breaks it. . . . In open voting the true influence of wealth, which should be all that unconstrained freemen are willing to pay to it, is lost; for the worse a man is the more he'll use his wealth to extort votes. . . . The ballot would abolish mob-intimidation among the rest." Lord John Russell's plea that "the ballot would remove electors from good and improving influences" was so pitifully weak that it gave Grote an opportunity which he did not fail to use. Of course he did not see the other side, the possibility of even more wholesale bribery with the ballot than without it, and the tendency of men to do in secret what they would be ashamed to do openly. Then, when intimidation was the landlord's chief weapon, when the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University turned away his gardener for refusing to vote under dictation, the certain good of secret voting was more apparent than its possible evils. "Better be elected for Old Sarum than by a fear-stricken community."

From 1833 till he left Parliament, when in 1841 "the Conservative reaction" brought in Sir R. Peel, he brought the ballot forward with the same regularity with which it was afterwards brought forward by Mr. Grantley Berkeley. The numbers in the voting fluctuated; but the public soon ceased to take an interest in the subject. In 1837 Grote had sunk to the bottom place among the successful candidates, "boots to the metropolitan concern;" and the *Times* was triumphant over "one who has made himself the frontispiece of a revolutionary code, who has become the organ and representative of whatever is most chimerical in theory, most reckless in experiment, most fatal and revolting in hostility to our national institutions." Possibly

the thirteen hundred sinecures, which Grote had to deal with when Lord Althorp asked him to be chairman of the Sinecures' Committee, were in the view of the *Times* of that day an essential part of our national institutions.

The *Times* is quite true in saying that Grote had not gained ground with the Liberals; neither did Mill after his election for Westminster. But that they failed to do so is to their credit. They were philosophers, and neither demagogues nor party men. They looked to the far-off fruit of the measures which they discussed; electors generally think most of immediate results. Yet Grote filled his position well. "That showy speech-maker," as the *Times* most unfairly calls him, always had the ears of the House. Against Irish coercion Bills; on "the overbearing influence of Russia in the Turkey trade;" on the deplorable want of conciliatory measures in dealing with Canada; on "that great ecclesiastical enormity of Europe, the Irish Church, which costs the Irish thirty shillings a head, while in France under Charles X. the State cost of religion is under one shilling a head;" on the Established Church "Bill," in the debate on which he opposed the vote of £15,000 for the Archbishop of Canterbury, while a curate, "perhaps not differing greatly from his Grace in intelligence," gets £100. He spoke, and spoke well on all these questions, his last acts being to protest against the high-handed conduct of the Foreign Office in the Eastern question and to second the proposal for a loan to South Australia, an incident which reminds us that since that day a new English world has passed out of childhood into full manhood.

Here is another little circumstance which shows how much we have changed in other ways during the same period. Lord W. Bentinck meets a Mr. Duer at dinner at the Grotes'; a few days after he tells Mrs. Grote that he had never before met an American in society. "Well, but when you were Governor-General of India you must have seen Americans out there." "Only ships' captains; I asked them now and then to my great dinners, but I never spoke to any of them."

Of Grote's careful attention to Parliamentary duties, the Carlow Election Committee, of which he was chosen chairman, offers an instance. It sat for eleven weeks; with any less scrupulous chairman, people said, it would have been up in a fortnight.

Then came two years of travel; and then Grote retired from the bank, regretted by the clerks, to whom he had always shown great kindness; and then (as we before said) appeared the first instalment of the *opus magnum*.

Hard work at history; music with Jenny Lind and Mendelssohn; "disputations" at Pencarrow with Sir W. Molesworth, Charles Austin, Monckton Milnes, &c.; trips to Switzerland (out of which came pamphlets on Swiss politics); sojourns at Château Tocqueville and the homes of other French friends; private theatricals at Windsor Castle (naturally this caused in his circle the "wonderment" which amazed Mrs. Grote); farming in Lincolnshire on an estate which had fallen to his father by mortgage; planting at Burnham, where a little house called "History hut" was built out of the profits of the earlier volumes; going to Paris, in 1849, in order to have the pleasure of living under a republic. Such was his life up to the time of the *coup d'état*, which, of course, he felt almost as a personal outrage. His remarks on the way in which the French, by their fear of the *spectre rouge*, had been playing into the President's hands by putting themselves at the mercy of the executive, even for their own personal safety, are almost as applicable now as in December, 1871. The "red spectre" is, indeed, as useful as ever to the men who, like M. Beulé, are intent on crushing out all liberty in the name of the Republic. Now, as then, "the political cowardice of the French is excessive; no one thinks himself safe, unless soldiers or gendarmes are within call The government force, too, civil and military, is perfectly enormous—so great that the mass not included in that *joint-stock-governing company* appears to exist only like herds or flocks for the purpose of being ruled and fleeced. The overwhelming force of the executive is the capital fact in French politics; it has been easy, and will again be easy, to tread out all political liberty by its means." These remarks are as pregnant as anything that Grote ever wrote. They prove how well-grounded were the fears of those who put Strafford to death; the growth on the Continent of armies and of bureaucracy gives little hopes of betterment in the politics of the future.

By 1855 hard work had begun to tell; the twelfth volume had cost very great mental labour, and Mrs. Grote (whose own health had repeatedly suffered, so as to force her to leave their London house in Saville-row and to take refuge abroad),

noticed "a certain change in my husband's general condition." The change comes to most men, but in few wives are the eyes so love-sharpened as to note it. The *opus magnum* was, however, complete, and its publication was celebrated by "a bowl of punch at History-hut," and Mrs. Grote made a speech to which he listened "with unmistakeable signs of inward satisfaction." More travelling abroad, and then work, mostly "over the back of his Spitz-dog Dora," at his Plato—of which Socrates, when Lord Amberley lately met him at a *séance*, confessed, much to his discredit, that he had not heard. Strangely enough, it is Grote here who is the believer, for most commentators, including Professor Jowett, hold that a number of Plato's Dialogues are spurious. Grote's argument is, "You cannot gain unity by rejecting any number of dialogues. If they are forged, the forger contradicts all the leading doctrines of the author whom he ought to imitate. It is safer, therefore, to look on Plato's mind as many-sided, and to think that he often indulged in a negative vein, unsettling without intending to re-settle, feeling perhaps, like his master, that the grand thing to be argued against is the false persuasion of knowledge." The intolerance, moreover, displayed in "The Laws" may well be a mark of Plato's senility. The fact, too, that Plato started the first lecture-room (the Academy), and left a school of followers, seemed to Grote to warrant the assumption that his own "Lectures" would be traditionally preserved. We cannot think that Grote has proved his point. On a question of authenticity on which scholars differ we shall offer no opinion; but surely forgeries have often been palpably unlike the works of their reputed authors, nor does the fact of a Platonic school secure the non-intrusion of fabricated dialogues. Rather it increases the probability of fabrication, for Platonists who had "views" would be anxious to shelter their developments under their master's name.

To Platonic literature Grote made yet another contribution some years after. The question was, did Plato teach the revolution of the earth on its axis? "No," say Boeck, M. Martin, and others. "Yes," says Grote. Nodoubt he believed in the revolution of the starry sphere, but in some fanciful way he was able to maintain both, and did not feel the inconsistency of so doing. The words occur in the *Timæus* (the earth is *εἰλομένη* [ἰλλομένη] *περὶ τὸν διὰ παντὸς πόλον τεταμένον*, the cosmical axis, which Plato probably conceived

of as a solid cylinder whirling the earth round with it), but the idea occurs also in more poetical language in the *Phædrus*.

Next to Plato came Aristotle. Of Grote's fondness for metaphysics we may form an idea from his having kept together, in 1827—1829, a morning class (8 a.m.), in which he and J. S. Mill, and Charles Butler, and Roebuck, and others, used to read Whately, James Mill, &c., discussing as they went on. He had been reading Aristotle all his life; his letters to Sir G. C. Lewis often complain what hard reading it is. But not till he was seventy years old did he put his notes into a connected form, and the result, though only a fragment, is really wonderful. What a contrast, for instance, between the dull routine of an "ethics lecture" and the interest with which he invests the meagre facts of the "Macedonising philosopher's" life. The express train is not more in advance of the stage-waggon than Grote's treatment of his author—bringing out, as he does, the significant fact that several Platonists established themselves as "tyrants" of their respective cities, and that, as soon as Alexander died, Aristotle was tried at Athens for his "impious hymn to the slave-tyrant Hermeias, his old fellow-pupil—is in advance of the traditional Magirus, and such like commentators, till lately in use at Oxford. He points out the general misapprehension respecting the twofold character of Aristotle's writings. Some (the *Topics*, for instance) are "exoteric," in the sense of being conducted as a dialectic debate, discussing *pros* and *cons*; others (as the *Analytics*) may be called "esoteric," but only inasmuch as in them the syllogistic march goes steadily on to demonstration. Sir W. Hamilton claimed the Stagirite as an intuitionist; Grote, on the other hand (wrongly, his editor thinks), assumes him to draw everything *à posteriori*; so hard is it, even for those who hold with Professor Ferrier that "philosophy is reasoned truth," to avoid seeing through their own glasses those metaphysical matters which, for people in general, are as non-existent as animalculæ are till the microscope has revealed them.

One of the most interesting papers in Professor Bain's collection is the review of Mill's examination of Sir W. Hamilton. It embodies a brief life of James Mill, whose intellectual relation to his son Grote compares with that of Socrates to Theætetus; and it summarises the distinctive merits of Mill's *Logic*, a bringing together the rationalistic side (the exclusive province of the schoolmen, and more

recently dealt with by Dutrieu, and others) and the inductive (Bacon's), which had hitherto been kept quite apart. Mill shows the real import of the major premiss (Book ii. 298), that it is merely a precautionary test for avoiding mistakes in the inductive process,—a different view from Whately's, "that induction is the syllogism with the major premiss suppressed." Then follow remarks on Sir W. Hamilton's famous dictum about the relativity of human knowledge, of which Mansel, of St. John's College, Oxford (afterwards Dean of St. Paul's), became the champion. We all remember the dispute about the Absolute and the Conditioned. It began from Mansel's attempts, in his Bampton Lectures, to reconcile the existence of evil in the world with God's goodness: the evil is a fact, and God could remedy it; therefore His goodness cannot be of the same nature as ours, for a good man under such circumstances would seek to remedy it. It is merely one more instance of the impossibility of being logical in matters of religion; the attempt straightway lands us in almost blasphemous absurdity. Mill on the one hand, Maurice on the other, fell foul of Mansel, who was (as Grote notices) only saying what Pascal had said before. Maurice said such a Gospel was no glad tidings, and Mill, in the most impassioned words he ever wrote, urged that Mansel, to be consistent, must assert that the relative attributes of an Unknowable being are unknowable also, and that "if such a being can sentence me to hell for not calling Him good, to hell I will go." At the same time Mill himself predicates of God: what are really but figures of speech, as when he says, "the eye must have been made by one who sees, the ear by one who hears." Nay, morally, too, he speaks of "the veracity of God"—as wrong a use of words as for Mansel to call Him good while declaring that His attributes are unknowable. To be broadly general, the difference between Mill and Hamilton (with whom is Mansel) is that the latter, in dealing with the facts of consciousness, adopts the introspective, the former the psychological method. Space, for instance, Mill thinks (and the case of Platner and others born blind and afterwards cured supports his view) is originally looked at not as the aggregate of simultaneous parts, but of successive sensation. It is due (he says) to "the law of obliviscence" that we fail to realise this and similar elementary processes, and so get false notions as to "innate ideas." By-and-by, when ladies become metaphysicians,

light may be thrown on this recondite question by their studying the habits of babies ; till then we can only say, in Grote's own words, *amicus Hamilton, magis amicus Mill, amica ante omnes philosophia.*

Next to this, in Professor Bain's volume, stand two hitherto unpublished tracts—one on the primary truths of science, in reply to Taine's *De l'Intelligence*, the other on the mode of perception of the outer world, i.e. the vexed question of subject and object. Grote (differing here with Professor Ferrier) says our present self is never the object of our consciousness ; it is always our past or future self. The fact is that at first the body is thought of as subject ; but it is soon seen that the body is both subject and object in one.

One word more about Grote's other writings. He supported the admission of women to matriculate in the London University, on the ground that in their hands is great part of the teaching of the country. He welcomed in a genial review the grand edition of Hobbes, put forth by his disciple Sir W. Molesworth, whose "conversion" by the first ballot-speech Mrs. Grote tells with such gusto. Hobbes, he says, has been maligned ; he does not deny the affections because he says they are *derived* : he has been abused by Churchmen because he says there can be only one supreme power in the State, and this must be the civil ; he has been cried down by "Whigs" because he will not sanction the enthronement of any favourite class calling itself a check on the supreme power, but really fraternising with it and perverting it for its own purposes. In fact, Grote is disposed to think Hobbes, the father of the French economists, has been as much unjustly depreciated as Bacon has been unduly extolled. The facts of Hobbes's life are curious : at forty years of age he began mathematics—came suddenly upon Euclid at 47, and was wonder-stricken ; he came to be Charles II.'s mathematical tutor, but when the *Leviathan* was published the royalist refugees in Paris thought it was in praise of Cromwell, and (as he tells us in his quaint autobiography in Latin elegiacs) he had to run off to England to escape assassination. There he found that the Protector allowed everyone to study and write as he liked, provided he lived *more loci*.

It remains for us to notice the review of Sir G. C. Lewis "On the Credibility of Early Roman History." Sir George, the annihilator of the Druids, the Phœnicians, and other

popular personages, successfully proved that Niebuhr is often rash as well in assertion and denial as in reconstruction. The *old annalists* of whom he and Dr. Arnold talk exist only in imagination. Before Fabius Pictor and Cincius there is absolutely nothing except the pontifical tables, the entries in which were rather about red rain and speaking cattle than about political events. Yet they formed (says Grote) a "substratum of notation;" and he distinguishes between the Republican period, for which we have at least this scanty authority, and that of the Kings, for which there is nothing at all. On this ground he holds that his friend pushes scepticism too far in looking with suspicion on all antecedent to the war with Pyrrhus. If the contradictions of historians like Livy and Dionysius are to invalidate facts, we might reject the whole war in La Vendée, the marvellous contradictions about which Michelet has so feelingly pointed out; nay, we might refuse to believe in the Tirhoot famine, seeing that the *Friend of India* and the *Calcutta Englishman* take such opposite views of it.

But we must leave the works and return to the life, much of which had been spent in preparing these essays of which we have spoken. Most remarkable of all is his bye-reading; for instance, in '57 he sends Mill two French works—*Thomas sur l'Administration provinciale de la Bourgogne*, and *La Vie de Daunou*, one of the *Conventionnels*, scarcely known by name to the best read Englishmen. All this makes us feel what a mass of notes and comments so careful and methodical a reader must have left. We are not much in favour of publishing common-place books; neither Southey's nor Buckle's did much to heighten the fame of their authors; but we confess we should like to see some further results of Grote's reading. Mrs. Grote has given us his personal life; Prof. Bain has collected his minor writings; but his note-books must still contain a rich gleaning.

Early in 1858 Grote is at last persuaded to join "the Club" (of Dr. Johnson, Goldsmith, &c.); he stoutly refused till his wife said to Lord Overstone—"Slip a shilling into his hand and enlist him." This was done in shaking hands at leave-taking, and Grote was left chuckling and exclaiming, as he looked down at the coin—"How very absurd!" That summer they spend at St. Germain's, seeing much of French life, and deploring the growing

influence of the priesthood in education: "the Emperor is doing all he can to encourage them." His conviction that Italian regeneration was a delusion, so long as the Pope's ascendancy should continue, forms the text of some very sad reflections on "this subtle agency, which has its roots in the credulity and the fears of mankind, and has just drawn this week £65,000 'Peter's pence' from the United States."^{*}

Unhappily, the weakness of advancing years is fostered by want of air and exercise; he had for years ceased to keep his horses in town: "it was intolerable to attempt riding in Hyde-park amid a crowd of idlers, or in the suburbs amid a succession of cabs and omnibuses." Long walks, with a genial companion, he much enjoyed; solitary walking jaded him terribly; and the skin began to show a distempered state of the blood. His conscious want of power led him to decline joining Mill and his step-daughter in their visit to Greece in 1862. *En revanche*, he paid visits to Lord Wrottesley, to Lord Lansdowne, and other great folks, having by this time entirely worked out the anti-aristocratic leaven.

By-and-by Bishop Colenso's book appears, and Grote finds "the most interesting part the extracts from orthodox expositors; the artifices by which they slur over or blot out contradictions." It is curious to read his views on the American war: "England's perfect neutrality seems to me almost a phenomenon in political history. . . . The way in which the Northerners have requited such forbearance is alike silly and disgusting. I never expected to have lived to think of them so unfavourably as I do at present. . . . They have shown little of those qualities which inspire sympathy or esteem, and very much of all the contrary qualities." What seemed to him most incomprehensible was the financial side of the case, the Federals borrowing enormously, and yet the price of this unsecured stock keeping up in the market.

Then comes the visit to Dean Stanley at Oxford, peculiarly pleasing because the historian was the eye-witness of the marvellous effects which his work had wrought.

In 1865 Mrs. Grote's health so broke down that their lives were necessarily sundered, and Grote divided himself between his books and his public duties; he was made

Master of the British Museum on the death of Hallam; and was on the Council of the London University (where he succeeded in preventing James Martineau from being made Logic professor), and also on that of University College. Unfortunately, he took no care of his health, often spending twenty-two or twenty-three hours out of the twenty-four within four walls. In June, 1889, his French doctor, De Mussy, sends Grote to Homburg. But work at Aristotle did not agree with "the waters," and he got worse, and left Homburg (where all the world was being drilled, no one but Bismark then knew why) for Metz: "Right glad we were to find ourselves on dear French soil once more." In Paris he was almost cured by reading the daily articles of the newly emancipated press against the Emperors—"coarse, superficial, hackneyed, trashy diatribes," Mrs. Grote called them: "Yes, my love; but the pleasure I derive from all this flood of abuse is from the bare fact of its publication without its writers being marched off to *Bicêtre*."

Soon after his return to England, Grote refused a peerage; he had not time for the "dissipation of intellectual energy" involved in a seat in the Lords. He could not undertake anything without carrying it out conscientiously. It was a startling affair. Well might he say: "I am never tired of wondering at the mere notion of my passing from the Radical to the House of Lords at this time of day." Yet, as he quickly added, "the so called Radicals of to-day don't hold my views of thirty years ago, views which I still hold substantively. I could have got on well in the Upper House, where are many able men, moved by the purest impulses towards good legislation." In one point he was wrong; his own views had modified on many points, notably on the ballot, which, since the extension of the suffrage, he regarded as of little importance. Indeed he had come to the conclusion that "the English mind is much of one pattern, take whatsoever class you will. . . . Cut a section of society from top to bottom, and examine the composition of the successive layers. They are pretty nearly alike throughout the scale. Thus the choice between one man and another signifies less than I used to think it did."* Another conviction, not by any means so well grounded, was "that it will never be possible to govern Ireland otherwise than as a conquered

country." Nay, "such was the homage he rendered to reason" (as his wife expresses it), that he gave up his exclusive faith in republicanism. "It is no check (he said in 1867) on the vulgar passions of the majority. Supreme power in their hands may be exercised quite as mischievously as by a despotic ruler. The conduct of the Northern States has led me to this conclusion, though it costs me much to avow it even to myself." Such was the change which "the lessons of practical wisdom" had wrought in the philosophical Radical of forty years before. The effect of time and experience on J. S. Mill was almost wholly in the opposite direction; his faith seemed to grow stronger as years went on in the fallacy that progress depends on political changes. Of course some political changes are indispensable to progress; and such were many that have taken place since 1832. Hence, at a period like that when Grote was growing up, all earnest unprejudiced men must be Reformers; whether they continue so or not after the crying evils have been remedied depends on individual temperament. Mill showed more vehemence at the end, because his warmth was so checked in early life by the circumstances of his education.

There is little more to add. It was a proud day for Mrs. Grote when she smartened up her husband's official gown with gold lace, that he, as Vice-Chancellor, might make a suitable figure when the Queen opened the new London University buildings in 1870. Then followed the chill caught in Millais' studio. Repeated colds followed; he would go out during the bitter winter of 1870-71, and then, after gleams of hope, came the end in June 1871. He was buried in the Abbey, which was crowded with distinguished mourners, and (in the words of the editor of the *Quarterly*, Harry Reeve), "everything was done to mark the close of a great, glorious, and useful existence."

Of points of difference between ourselves and the historian of Greece, we have not spoken and shall not speak. Politically, he in the main commands our sympathies; and as a historian we feel he has inaugurated a new era—the era of careful research and analysis, superseding that of bold assertion and denial, just as this had superseded the era of tradition.

But were the points in which we can heartily praise Grote far fewer than they are, our pleasure in reading his life would scarcely be lessened. It is a model book, proving in every page that she who wrote it was a model wife.

ART. VIII.—*Etudes Bibliques*. Par F. GODET, Docteur et Professeur en Théologie. Deuxième Série. Paris : Sandoz et Fischbacher. 1874.

MISCELLANEOUS theological essays like these are fast becoming the main vehicles for the introduction of whatever is new and striking in scientific theology. Those who have any original thoughts, good or bad, on any subject, or have lighted on anything old and forgotten that is worth reviving, are sure to find their way to the public through the medium of an essay or review. Hence the freshest and most popular theology is to be read in volumes like the present. There are very few to be met with, however, which can compare with these essays of our old friend Dr. Godet. They escape the error of many similar productions by evidently making truth and not startling effects their object. They are reverent and full of that indefinable thing we call *unction*. They are as instructive to the mind as they are edifying to the heart. But they are not quite sound. We took up this volume, intending to give it such a brief notice as the predecessor received ; but point after point of grave moment arrested our attention, and multiplied our notes until they outstripped the limits of a short notice. The topics which we refer to are such as warrant longer notice and prolonged attention ; for they involve some important aspects of the doctrine of the person of Christ.

Our author, in common with all writers on this sacred subject, takes his departure from the testimony of Christ to himself.

Whatever additional light may be thrown upon the mystery of the Incarnate Person by the Apostles, it is obvious that He Himself is His own original revealer ; and His witness must here as everywhere be supreme. Our Lord speaks of Himself as *the Son of man* : this is, so to speak, His habitual and elect designation of Himself, and it expresses His veritable humanity, His absolute relation to our race as the perfect realisation of its type, the normal representative of its true character as conceived by Him who gave it being. But He also termed Himself, not unfrequently, *the Son of God* ; and by this appellation He de-

clared His relation with the Divine Nature, or rather with the Person of His Father. The two terms are by no means synonymous. They are not one in the middle term Messiah, with which, as such, they have no affinity. They are obviously used in a relation of contrast, as may be seen by anyone who studies the connections in which each is used respectively, and notes the fact that only the Lord uses the human designation, and that it is discontinued when the humbled estate of Christ had reached its end. But nothing is more obvious than that Jesus Christ speaks, in the duality of relations and of natures, as one Person. There is obviously a superior unity in which the twofold consciousness is one: a personality in which the Divine personality is supreme, but which does not include the human, a Divine-human personality which is the peculiar mystery of the Christian faith.

The human nature of the Redeemer always takes the lead in French theology: Christ is not *Le Dieu homme* but *L'homme Dieu*. The verity of that nature and its origin are very vividly sketched; and the salient points touched in a masterly way, though not without an intermingling of error from which we recoil. The miraculous conception is shown to be quite consistent with the reality of our Lord's manhood. No objection can be urged against it which would not lie equally against the true humanity of the first parent of the human race. He was man in virtue of a mode of formation different from that of his descendants. The Saviour's body was, through His mother, drawn from the already existent humanity. But it was, as in the case of Adam, the breath of the Almighty, the power of the Omnipotent Spirit, which called the latent life of that germ into development. Here, then, the law of traducianism was suspended: the human spirit of our Lord was the fruit of a Divine and new creation, and that framework of human nature which was taken from the Virgin, and made a living soul by the Divine Spirit, was therefore absolutely and altogether man, but sinless man, even as Adam was absolutely man and sinless man. But it may be objected that if Jesus was created thus sinless, to carry to perfection the interrupted destiny of man, He was not really free, for He could not sin. Dr. Godet replies that, "this mode of generation did not itself involve the impossibility of sinning any more than the analogous mode in the case of the first man. It only restored to Jesus that faculty of not sinning, which

man possessed before the fall, and which we have lost through the breaking of the bond that united us to God.

The relation between the miraculous conception of Jesus and His perfect sanctity is misconceived, or, rather, only partially stated when the Divine personality in the Redeemer is omitted. The words of St. Luke scarcely have justice done to them in connection with this subject, if they are regarded as bearing on them the full weight of the argument. The announcement to the Virgin that "the holy thing born in her shall be called the Son of God," includes two distinct references to this matter. As the holy result of the quickening power of the Spirit the Humanity of our Lord was perfectly sinless. The Divine intervention was as much a new creation as the original creation of Adam was; and as the first Adam was sanctified to God when he came into being with the image of God impressed upon him, so also was the second Adam, and for precisely the same reason. God originally breathed the breath of life into a human organisation ready for it, and it was very good. So when the human race took its new beginning the Holy Spirit gave the fulness of pure human life to the germ of a human personality which at the same moment was taken into indissoluble union by the Eternal Son. The office of the Spirit was not to effect the incarnation, but to vivify a perfect human personality, whose personality, however, was to be lost in that of the Son of God: a human consciousness ever, but never a distinct human personality; one agent in a career of acts and sufferings which required a double consciousness, but not a double person. Now, if the miraculous conception ensured the absolute freedom of Christ from the taint of our nature, it was the assumption of that nature by the Son that insured its future necessary sinlessness. This great truth, the indivisible unity of the one Person of Christ, demands the necessary sinlessness of Christ; demands it so imperatively that all the arguments persistently urged by modern divines, some of them exceedingly strong at the first glance, must give way. It is a case in which *a priori* considerations positively forbid the construction of theology on any other basis than that of the *non posse peccare* on the part of our Redeemer. Two or three theological principles that seem to be sacrificed to the necessary sinlessness of Jesus, may be received by a careful examination of the question. We shall find them in the words of our

author, and limit ourselves by his statements ; this being by no means a discussion of the whole question.

“ What is the relation between the miraculous birth of Jesus and His perfect sanctity ? The latter does not necessarily follow from the former, for sanctity is matter of the will, not of nature. How can we give a true meaning to the moral struggles in the history of Jesus ; to the temptation, for example, if absolute sanctity was the natural consequence of His miraculous birth ? But this was not the case. The miraculous birth was only the negative condition of the spotless holiness of Jesus. By this method of entering into human existence He was placed in the normal state of man before the fall, and placed in a position to finish the career originally proposed to man, which would conduct him from innocence to holiness. He was simply set free from the obstacle which finally hinders us all, by virtue of the mode of our birth, from realising that original task. But to change this probability into reality, it was necessary that Jesus should every moment use His liberty, and place Himself unreservedly at the service of the law of God, and of the task imposed to keep the commandments of His Father. The reality of the struggle was by no means excluded by the miraculous birth, which involved nothing more in Him than the *liberty of not sinning*, but did not exclude that of sinning.”

We should be content to leave the question to be settled by the reader's Christian instinct when he reads these last words. The feeling of revulsion which they produce shall decide. Let those who adopt this view—and they seem to be the majority—reflect what is meant by the words : “ The Saviour of mankind might have sinned ! ” But, not to press this, let us mark the unfairness, or, rather, the onesidedness and inconsistency of the above observations. First, if sanctity is the negative innocence that is here spoken of, it cannot be altogether matter of will ; if matter of will, it cannot be so negative a state. According to Dr. Godet, these inconsistent characteristics of holiness met in Jesus. He is in this theory regarded as undergoing a purely human development. “ We find here, again, the three elements of a normal development in man : a sound body, growing into the stature of perfect man ; a soul drawing an ever-increasing wisdom from God ; that is to say, the sense of good and the good sense, in their profound unity ; and, finally, the constant influence on this being of the Divine grace. Here is the hierarchy which constitutes the healthy condition of human life : the Spirit of God directing the soul and the exercise of its divers faculties,

and that sanctified soul governing the body with its multiplied functions." But it must never be forgotten, that the negative possibility of sinlessness asserted above had as its counterpart more than the mere positive direction of the Spirit of God. As the new Head of the human race, the Redeemer had that Spirit, indeed, without measure from the beginning. He was sanctified, when he was sent into the world, as the Son of God. The Holy Ghost was upon Him as the Son of Man; as the Son of God He was the Giver, and not the Receiver, of the Holy Ghost. Hence, however true it is that the Spirit directed the liberty of the Redeemer's will into the freedom of a necessary holiness, it must be remembered that behind and beneath this there was the personality of the Son of God incarnate. This was the eternal guarantee and absolute necessity of His sinlessness. There is danger lurking in a sentence which we find in the same connection: "*The grace of God resting on Him indicates the religious principle which was the profound and holy stimulant of this double development of soul and body.*" Grace was not the same thing in Christ as in us: the boundless difference, which the very words "*the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*" indicate, ought to be saved from the possibility of being forgotten. We may compare these words with those of the same author in his *Commentary on St. Luke*:—

"We see that Luke is in earnest with the development and, therefore, with the humanity of Jesus. It was the normal growth of man physically and morally viewed. This was realised now for the first time without interruption. Thus the satisfaction of God rested on this Infant, in whom was realised the Divine creating thought. This is what the last proposition of verse 40 brings out: *Grace*, the Divine favour. This word is in contrast with *Hand*, in ch. i. 66. The accusative, '*on Him*,' marks the energy with which the grace of God rested on the Infant, penetrating him throughout. This is in contrast with ch. i. 66, '*with him*,' which expressed only a simple co-operation. This picture is partly borrowed from that of the child Samuel (1 Sam. ii. 26); but Luke omits here the idea of the favour with man, which he reserves for ver. 52, where he will describe the Young Man, and no longer the Infant."

Here, also, there is a certain confusion. The favour of God which rested upon the Incarnate in His "altogether lovely" development is confounded with a secret energy of grace which in all others is the spring of sanctity. In

reality, the word only signifies that unmeasured complacency which was expressed at the baptism, and which, now and then, rested upon the Divine-human development, and not the human alone. The human alone, indeed, cannot be thought of: it is a notion foreign to the New Testament Christ. The personality of the Eternal Son must never be sacrificed to the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Representative of mankind. Though we are anticipating a future topic, reference may be made to the difficulty in which our author involves himself by forgetting this. Here are his words in the *Commentary*: "The mother is the representative of the human nature: she transmits it to the infant. The seal of *personality* comes from the father. This last element might, then, fail in the unique case of the appearance, in the way of birth, of a pre-existent personality." Not dwelling now on the question of the genesis of personality, we may observe that this pre-existent personality brought into human nature by the incarnation ought not to be excluded from the process of development. Whatever His self-limitation as the Son of God might be, it could not be a limitation of His necessary holiness. At least, it must needs ensure to the development of the child Jesus a perfect sinlessness, and distinguish between His process of obedient consecration and that which was the merely normal and interrupted process of humanity.

This leads at once to the baptism of our Lord, the second of the theological truths which are supposed to be obscured by the doctrine of our Saviour's necessary sinlessness. Here, again, we shall deal only with our author. He lays too much stress upon "the profoundly human trait" that the Lord's baptism took place when he was thirty years of age; when, therefore, the faculties of His human nature were precisely perfected. Hence he regards it as the term of the human development: a notion which has no support in Scripture, and none in the nature of things. If any such term needs to be assigned, we should be much more disposed to fix it at that earlier epoch when the youthful Redeemer became a "Son of the law," when He passed from childhood to the verge of what, in His higher order of perfection, was the verge of maturity. He then formally assumed "His Father's work," apart from which He had none of His own, and had no further goal of His proper human development. Then His human mind was fully

conscious of His Divine-human personality; and that was His consummation. That was to Him what maturity is to us. It is true that He was "subject to them" in Nazareth; that is, He afterwards exhibited perfect filial devotion and submission until He left them for His mission, which began long after the age of maturity. He grew in stature as He grew in age; He increased in wisdom, from that time onwards, without limit; at least without any limit of so-called maturity. He grew also in favour with God and man; the Father's complacency grew more manifest in its expressions as to His Person down to the last; though when His Person and His atoning work were united in one, that favour seemed to be withdrawn from the representative of human sin. He grew in favour with men—not like John the Baptist in the deserts—until the union of His Person and His work made them hide their faces from Him. This is a point of no deep significance. Development there was before and after the period of His twelfth year. But the entire narrative of St. Luke—who once lifted the veil on the mystery of Christ, hidden for so many long years—seems to exhibit to us the real term of our Lord's maturity of Messianic self-consciousness.

This is not the place for a discussion of the important question of the Saviour's temptation. But we may boldly lay down a proposition which subverts what has been given above: That the Redeemer of mankind was tempted really and truly, and learned the secrets of human temptation, so as to add sympathy to His other High-priestly qualifications, without the possibility of falling under the pressure of assault. Here, once more, we must note some points in our author's Christology, without committing ourselves to a discussion of the general question.

"To be above temptation belongs to God alone; to tempt is the propriety of the devil; to be tempted is the position of man." The first of these propositions is above challenge; but the others must be taken with some reservation. There is a sense in which temptation is trial: in that sense, God Himself may tempt, using or not using Satan as His instrument; and in that sense temptation may be only the means of approving or rather demonstrating an impeccable condition. Through the avenues of the thought and sensibility attacks from without may be addressed to the will, attacks demanding the utmost

strain of resistance even on the part of the sinless Being supposed to be incapable of sin. To be tempted, finally, is the destiny of man for a season ; but only for a season ; it has its purpose, and limits ; and is at the utmost an accident. In the case of our Lord the temptation was part of His submission, endured to exhibit His sinlessness and as the beginning of His sacrifice. But if He was tempted on all points as we are, it was *without sin* : that is, it was temptation such as a sinless being may undergo who could not sin.

There are many modern theologians, however, who assume that our Lord took the nature of man with its germ of sin in it, and that He literally condemned our sin in His own flesh, in *sinful flesh*, and not merely in the *likeness of sinful flesh*. It is common enough to connect this strange misconception of the Gospel with the names of Menken and Edward Irving, or others, and so dismissing it. But it is an error exceedingly prevalent in the theories of many who utterly renounce it practically, or, rather, who adopt it only in theory, and never allow it to influence their views of Christ's character. Their conception of the work of the Redeemer includes the notion of His triumphing over sin in Himself before He triumphed over the sin of the world. The current expositions of the temptation of our Lord are much infected by this idea. Hence the application of the term "struggle" to the Redeemer's contest with Satan in the wilderness ; and the general tone which seems to describe the achievement of His victory as a driving back of Satan from a territory which he had usurped, the restoring our nature from the dominion of sin, instead of remembering that it was the shielding that nature from the incursion of sin by a power mightier than that of man. No theology can be more reverent than that which is represented by Dr. Godet, and none can be more faithful to the essential doctrine of the sinlessness of our Lord. But let the tone of the following extract be noticed :—

"A third trait in the baptism of Jesus, which reveals the reality of His human nature, is the prayer with which He descends into the waters of Jordan. In this prayer was expressed, for the first time, in a manner perfectly pure, the sigh of guilty humanity for pardon, as also the thirst of pure humanity for the life of heaven, the Holy Spirit, without whom the human soul no more than vegetates. Prayer is the cry of human indigence ; Jesus prayed in

the feeling of this indigence, which was therefore common to Him with us."

Before continuing the quotation to the point specially referred to, let us pause to mark the force of these words. The writer does not mean that our Lord prayed the prayer of contrition seeking pardon; for he has just been dilating upon the fact that "if there was a human sentiment foreign to the heart of Jesus—there was one and only one—it was that of penitence." Then why use language which may bear that meaning? It will be answered that our Lord's sympathy with the sinful race was so perfect that He confessed its sins and uttered its aspirations. But this is a view of the Redeemer's representative character that the Scriptures do not sustain. It is true that the Baptist pointed to Jesus as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;" and that He was "numbered with the transgressors" and "made sin for us." No truth is more profoundly true than that our Lord, by what the French call *solidarité* and we His union with the race as its representative, assumed the responsibility of the sin of mankind which was laid upon Him. But it is not in harmony with the teaching of Scripture to represent Him as having confessed in His own Person the sins of the world. There is no trace of such language anywhere; not in those passages which would have required it to be stated if it had been admissible. Here, in the first recorded instance of the prayer of Jesus, it is not said that "He descended praying into the waters of the Jordan," but that His prayer was intermediate between His baptism with water by man and His baptism by the Father with the Holy Ghost. It was His first Messianic appeal to Heaven; not the cry of "indigence," but the earnest of what became afterwards the "I will" of the filial confident demand of all that belonged to His office. This remark will apply to the long procession of the prayers in which the incarnate God held communion with His Father. "Ask of me, and I will give thee," is an assurance which has a very different sense when referred to Christ from that which it has when referred to man generally; in the only instance of the Redeemer's supplication that might seem to contradict this we have the very words of His petition preserved for us. In Gethsemane His agony of prayer was part of His passion, and belongs to that awful *obedience unto death*, the mysterious pressure of which

proved that He was man, but man whose will was the will of the Son of God incarnate who could not "fail nor be discouraged." That was only, as it were, part of the high-priestly prayer in which He sanctified Himself, but in which the High Priest never uses the language of confession on the part of mankind. The thought to which we have been referring is full of beauty and pathos, but it is foreign to the spirit and words of the New Testament.

It is altogether too human a view of the Saviour's temptation which regards Him as having "learned what it was He had to avoid." We must quote the whole passage, as expressing with much precision a notion which is with the same inconsistency, but in a much more mystical style, current in much of our English theology:—

"And why, then, does God deem it necessary to surrender to the test of temptation the Being to whom He has just accorded such great graces? Precisely because of those graces themselves. He must learn, in the school of temptation, to consecrate to God alone the gifts which He has received. Will not Jesus be very often tempted, in fact, in the course of His public career, to employ His miraculous power in ameliorating His own personal and terrestrial condition, which would involve the denial of His true human condition? Will He not have occasion, many times, through the enthusiasm of the people, to play the rôle of a political Messiah and glorious sovereign, which would be no other than the denial of the rôle of a redeeming Messiah such as God conceived it, and such as the real needs of humanity demanded? Will He not frequently, moreover, be exposed to the temptation of arbitrarily and without moral necessity making use of the omnipotence entrusted to Him, which would have been a supreme indiscretion in the face of God His Father, and the denial of His filial character? To avoid these rocks in the course of His life, it was needful that He should have learned to know them beforehand; like the captain of a ship, who, before committing himself to the ocean, must needs have studied on the chart the reefs sown in the seas which he has to navigate. This was the service which the temptation in the wilderness rendered to Jesus. In His baptism He had learned what He had to do; by His temptation He understood what it was necessary that He should avoid. Thus the Father instructed Him, thus the Father gave Him warning. Is not such an education as this appropriate to the human condition? Is it not such as was demanded by the work of the Man who had received the task of bruising, in the name of entire humanity, the head of the serpent?"

Dr. Godet is not a Nestorian in his Christology; he is rather, as will be seen, a Eutychian, making the presence

of the Divine Son of God a real power working in a perfect man. In fact he is neither; his views are not consistent with any ancient or modern theory. For the whole of the above statement deals with the Person of our Lord as undergoing a human discipline, or merely human discipline apart from the inseparable existence in Him of a Divine nature. We must not examine the passage, as other topics await us. Suffice that the subjection of our Lord to "the test of temptation" says enough. He was necessarily approved of God, and must also be approved of man; not found wanting when the utmost temptation of trial was applied to Him. Before the trial and after it we hear, "This is My beloved Son!" It was not to teach Him what He must avoid, but to teach the tempter, and all men through him, who this New Man was. And as to Christ Himself He learned indeed much; for He learned in His human consciousness what is the nature and what the pressure of the temptations which beset mankind. More also He learned, for He was tempted behind the veil which is not lifted; but the secrets of His interior Messianic temptation—how upon His Divine-human consciousness the infinite weight of His atoning vocation fell—are as unfathomable to us as the mystery of His one indivisible Person.

Dr. Godet insists that the sanctity of Jesus was human, as being progressive and as being developed in struggle. For the former, he appeals to the words of the Hebrews:—"He learned obedience by the things which He suffered." But he omits what is essential, "though a Son," which implies that He learned the mystery of a special submission—The Obedience—which was not that of human nature alone, but that of His Mediatorial Person. It was that obedience which was unto death, which was the Divine parallel, counterpart, and much more abundant compensation of Adam's disobedience, and rendered by the second Adam, "the Lord from heaven." It has no relation to the personal sanctity of our Lord, being an obedience of which that sanctity was not a part, but the absolute preliminary and necessary condition. He appeals also to the words of St. John, "the Evangelist whom they charge with most tendency to deny or diminish His humanity:"—"For them I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth." But this sanctification is strictly a sacrificial term. It is thought by our author to signify the gradual and

progressive consecration of all the natural faculties to the task imposed by God. Applied to Jesus, it is made to indicate that He applied to God's service in redemption every energy, and denied to every natural taste every gratification that might impede His work.

"Jesus possessed all the qualities of heart which rendered Him apt to enjoy the amenities of life and of family joy, all the faculties of intelligence which are the objects of literary or scientific education. The parables prove that He might have been an eminent poet or painter; many of His discourses reveal in Him the incomparable popular orator; the most profound philosopher appears in a large number of His moral sentences. But to surrender Himself exclusively to one or the other of these aptitudes would have been to renounce, or at least to invade, the commission which His Father imposed on Him; and progress or sanctity in Him consisted in the exclusive application of all the virtualities included in His being to His mission as Saviour of the world. Precisely in virtue of this character, so profoundly human, of His sanctity He could say, 'I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth.' This sanctification of the human life, which He accomplished in His own Person, He proposed, in fact, to reproduce at a later time in all those who should be united to Him by faith. Their sanctity was to be that very same which He realised in His own person at this moment, and which the Spirit would communicate to them when the time should come. How decisive a proof of the really human character of His holiness!"

To this passage of the final prayer we must apply the same principle that we apply to those words, "Your God and my God." He who does not see the distinction between the high-priestly consecration of the Divine-human life to the expiation of human sin, and the consecration which, through the truth, should be wrought out in believers, will at all points mistake the relation between Christ and us. As to all the rest of the detail, it is enough to suggest that a certain feeling is evoked by such representations in every loyal Christian, the very presence of which condemns the theory and the expression that it adopts. This may be said also of the next idea, that of struggle, as essential to the human sanctity of our Lord. Here there can be no doubt that many hard sayings of the New Testament seem on the side of our author. He points to the whole life of Christ, from the struggle it cost Him in His twelfth year to leave the temple, down to the scene of Gethsemane, as showing an incessant struggle. All we can say—it is only a repetition of what has been said

above—is that the struggle was never to win, or secure, or maintain a human holiness which never could have been in question, but to accomplish a Divine-human sacrificial obedience requiring a submission of the human will that cost unspeakable agony, but never could be doubtful. The struggle was real, and cost unspeakable agony, but never could be doubtful. The struggle was real, and expressed itself in the human nature, but it was the struggle of infinite endurance, not the struggle to induce the will to endure.

Omitting many other illustrations of the veritable Humanity of our Lord, we must dwell on the striking account of the Transfiguration. The key to this event our author finds in the original destination of man to pass by a royal road from innocence to sanctity, and from sanctity, through physical and spiritual glorification, into glory. It marks the point of transition from the active to the passive work of Christ. That crisis was reached when the Saviour, having accomplished the work of duty in which man had failed, should show the path of life by which it was intended that man should pass to his eternal destination. The Transfiguration was the first step in this glorious way. The glorification commenced; the cloud which encompassed Him was the chariot in which He should go up; and the two messengers from the other world were sent to escort Him thither. Now here comes the explanation. Two opposite ways of departing from this earthly life offered themselves to Him. One, that to which His sanctity gave Him right, and which, thus viewed, was to Him the normal issue: the glorious transformation originally destined for man not separated from God, and of which this Transfiguration was the prelude. Jesus might have accepted this triumphal departure, and God may be supposed to have offered it, for it was the recompense due to His sanctity. But, had He thus gone into His glory, He would have entered it alone. Humanity unreconciled would have remained upon earth. Side by side with this method of departure was another which Jesus contemplated—that which was “accomplished at Jerusalem.” It was this which He decided on, and His decision was communicated to the two great representatives of the Old Covenant. After having accomplished the task of innocent man, Jesus, instead of laying His hand on the crown which was the price of His

victorious career, turned aside in view of another task which He had to fulfil—that last and indispensable work which He must perform if He would ascend, not alone, but surrounded by a numberless host of the new and redeemed mankind. But what He refused on the Mount of Transfiguration He would receive finally on the Mount of Ascension.

“We are then justified in concluding thus. Jesus was true man, and this true man was perfect man, at all points accomplished as to destiny. From the manger to the cross, from the cross to the throne, the spectacle of His life extorts from us the cry, the full meaning of which Pilate, who gave it to us, knew not: ‘Behold the man!’ Behold man, accomplishing his normal development; man succumbing under the weight of the judgment brought upon him by our sin; man rehabilitated with honour; man exalted at last into all the dignity of his destiny, much as it was perfidiously anticipated by the enemy when he murmured into the ear of humanity at the outset, that word which formulated the term of his history, ‘Ye shall be as gods!’”

But it ought always to be remembered that the man who thus represents mankind is not simply our representative in the integrity of His manhood. He is assuredly the last Adam; but as such is expressly termed “the Lord from Heaven.” Those who lay such stress upon St. Paul’s testimony to the parallel between the second and the first Adam, and so anxiously maintain the identity with us as to nature of our Redeemer and Saviour, ought not to forget that the Apostle left on record that other testimony to the last Adam. Nothing is gained by the jealous solicitude of these authors as to the reality of our Lord’s manhood. The Nestorian Christ cannot be the Saviour of the world. The manhood of our Lord was only the organ of His Divine-human personality; nor must we conceive of anything in Him that did not belong to the “Lord from Heaven.” His relation to our race is not that of a brother only, but that of its Creator allying Himself with the work of His hands. His sanctity was a necessary sanctity, wrought out in human nature, which was not saved from sin, but shown to be capable of being sinless. His obedience was not obligatory upon his human nature, as if He had a human ally responsible to Himself as its Lord. His personality was not that of a member of our race. He was a God-man, Emmanuel, God with us. His atoning passion was not only in degree, but in nature, what mere

humanity could never have undergone; and His obedience was submission to a commandment written in no code of laws. The whole transaction was between the Father and the Son incarnate. In presenting His obedience the Saviour left us an example; but it was the example shown by God exhibiting a human holiness, who could enable us to imitate what He presented for our imitation.

Passing to the second designation, *the Son of God*, we find in this essay a noble vindication of the absolute Divinity involved in the words; but the treatment falls short of the full appreciation of the eternal generation of the Son in the Divine essence. The stress is laid upon the fact that our Lord knew Himself to be the object of the Father's love. "Before coming down to live below, as man, He enjoyed above, as the Son, the riches of the love of the Father and of the Divine estate. And when He came to the term of His terrestrial existence, He asked back again the glory which He possessed before. This is the mystery unknown to human reason, to which He alluded when, in the Synoptists, He said: 'No man knoweth the Son but the Father.'" Now, however true it is, and however sublime the truth, that the Son felt Himself one with the Father in the bond of an eternal love, the Gospels and Epistles carry the relation into a deeper region, if possible, than that. The ethical relation is also an ontological one. In other words, the Son represents Himself as the Only-begotten in an eternal generation. What we call the Eternal Sonship is not merely a human deduction from these passages, as if it were no more than an anthropomorphic form of speech: it is the express doctrine of the New Testament, and of great importance as protecting the Person of the Son from the theory of self-depotentiation or self-lowering which this author represents. Hence it has no place in this essay. Dr. Godet convincingly shows that the name Son of God must not be made synonymous with Messiah; he proves that it imports essential Divinity. But he avoids any reference to that eternal relation of the Son to the Father which makes Him as Son partaker of the Divine nature which is absolute, immutable, and incapable of diminution or change.

Before proceeding to the indivisible Person it may be well to point out how constantly the doctrine of the eternal generation is taught in connection with the division of the two natures in Christ. Strictly speaking, it is taught in

no other way; but in this way it is taught, and that absolutely. Almost in every instance in which the Divine nature of the Redeemer is placed in antithesis with the human, the term Son is used; showing that the Godhead is that of the Son. It may indeed be said that this is quite consistent with an Arian Sonship; nor can this be doubted, if we take merely the word Son itself. But, when we consider what the Saviour and His Apostles declare to be the meaning of the term Son, we shall not hesitate to accept the great truth, that in the mystery of the Divine essence, there is one Person who from eternity bears the relation of Son. Had the Sonship been the result of the incarnation, and the terms Son of God and Son of man been therefore appropriated interchangeably to the Messianic Person, we should not have found the higher nature of our Lord so habitually defined as that of the Son. The following are striking words:—

“He attributes to Himself a relation with God of a kind unique and absolutely unfathomable by the created intelligence: a relation the Divine mystery of which cannot be unfolded to us mortals but by means of a revelation of which He Himself is the sole author. Like God Himself, He Has *His* angels who will form *His cortège* on the day of His glorious reappearance, and during the whole of the present economy the *name* under which God is to be celebrated and confessed by the Church, and which gives its character to the New Covenant, is that of ‘The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.’ This is the formula of the new revelation which henceforward completes that of Jehovah, revealed to Moses for Israel. To give in these passages to the name of Son the meaning of Messiah is a thing impossible. Let the attempt be made to substitute the latter for the former, and the absurdity of the synonym will be at once manifest: ‘No one knoweth the Messiah but the Father, and the Father but the Messiah!’ ‘Baptising them in the name of the Father, of the Messiah, and of the Holy Ghost!’ Such words would have no meaning unless there had been already attached to the term Messiah the notion of a being *Divine*!”

The argument for the Eternal Sonship could not be more forcibly put than in these words and those which follow; but it is hard to understand how the writer can adopt and advocate a theory which requires the essential diminution of the glory of the Son, whose eternal possession of the incommunicable and unchangeable attributes of the Godhead he so earnestly dilates upon.

“In the face of Jewish monotheism, so jealous of the incom-

municable rights of Jehovah, such a manner of speaking of Himself, on the part of a Jew so pious as Jesus, would be totally incomprehensible if the Fourth Evangelist did not come to our aid and explain to us the meaning of those extraordinary expressions preserved by the Synoptists, in exhibiting to us clearly the existence of this mysterious Personage before the present scene.

"What was that anterior glory, possessed before the foundation of the world, which Jesus asks back again? He Himself tells us: it was that of having been, from before all ages, the object of the Father's love. Before coming to live here below, as man, He enjoyed above, as the Son, the riches of the love of His Father and of a Divine estate. And now that He has reached the limit of His terrestrial existence, He asks back again that glory which He possessed before. This is the mystery, unknown to human reason, which he alluded to when, in the Synoptist, He said, 'No man knoweth the Son save the Father.'"

The eternal generation, that is to say, Personality of the Second Person as that of One who eternally receives His being from the Father—in this incomprehensible sense subordinate, but without any inferiority of essence or dignity—is a mysterious truth which the New Testament implies in every part. It really lies at the basis of the incarnation; though we cannot with our dim intelligence understand the connection between our nature created in the image of God and that of the express image of the Divine Person. Hence it is perpetually brought before us in the Gospels and the Epistles. Every declaration of the dignity of the Incarnate Redeemer is based on His Sonship; it is His Sonship which gives Him the name that allies Him with us; His Sonship is the central idea of His whole being, character and work. It is the term which expresses the utmost dignity, and the deepest abasement, of the Redeemer. It is the term around which all Christology revolves.

The various attempts which have been made humanly to solve the wonderful assumption of the filial relation on the part of our Lord cannot be here discussed. Every phase of scepticism, and rationalism, and theological speculation has its distinct effort at solution. We have just heard Dr. Godet's, which scarcely goes beyond this, that the consciousness which Jesus had of His Divine essence existed in Him in an elementary way from His birth. It gradually strengthened within Him; and was rendered clear and distinct by the revelation which He

received at His baptism. Nothing can be more beautiful than the formulas adopted to express the origination in Christ of the consciousness of being the Son of God. "Jesus bore in His consciousness the certitude of being this Being. What He felt behind Him, when He searched into the last recesses of His nature, was not, as in our case, the void of nothingness: it was the plenitude of the Divine life. As to Him, birth seemed not like the transition from non-being to existence, but like the passing from Divine riches to the dependence of the human life." We should be disposed to invert the order. It was not the human consciousness that became aware of the Divine. In all things let the Divine have the pre-eminence: it was the consciousness of the Eternal Son that added to itself the consciousness of a human existence and all its results.

The theory of M. Renan may seem to our readers hardly worth referring to. In England it has become obsolete: perhaps no hypothesis ever introduced to the English mind has exerted less influence. But the freshness and vigour of Dr. Godet's defence, as based upon his own Christological principles, justifies some slight allusion to one point in the Frenchman's sentimental solution of the mystery. He supposes that our Lord was the dupe of an illusion which gradually developed itself in His thoughts. He is supposed to have begun by persuading Himself that He was called to play the part of the Messiah; by degrees He fell under the influence of the enthusiasm which He witnessed among His disciples, and came to regard Himself as a Divine apparition among men. Again and again it has been shown how utterly inconsistent this idea is with the moral purity, and tranquillity, and exaltation of the character of Jesus, with the humility, tenderness, gentleness, and unvarying and inexhaustible charity which He displayed to the last. But our present author dwells upon the absolute contradiction of this theory to a positive fact, which is established by all the Gospel documents without the least appearance of concert or calculation. According to all the records, Jesus is not represented as arriving at the consciousness of being the Son of God through the mediation of His consciousness of being the Israelitish Messiah. On the contrary, He is represented as knowing Himself to be the Messiah, because He knew Himself to be the Son in relation to God. Being the Son, He alone could be the King of Israel and the Lord of the world. The

manner in which this is proved suggests some points to our consideration. It seems to us to introduce another kind of gradual consciousness which, however successful as against M. Renan, is itself liable to grave objection. For instance, it is shown that Jesus, in His twelfth year, did not express any conviction, more or less intellectual, of His Messianic dignity, but only a purely religious consciousness of His unique relation with God, as His Son :—

“ Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business ? ”

“ This term, *My Father’s*, does not as yet imply in the thought of the infant a precise dogma ; it is only a moral relation that is in question. He does not here move in the domain of theological knowledge, but in that of intimate feeling ; and it is precisely on that account that this declaration is adapted to fill us with admiration, and to inspire us with an absolute confidence in the Child that speaks in such a manner.” This we cannot accept. We cannot but transfer back from the later declarations of the New Testament to this earlier one the great truth that God was manifest in the flesh, and that it was the Eternal Son who already speaks through the lips of the Child Jesus that mystery which He perfectly knew, and which Mary His mother pondered in her heart. But this leads to the third branch of our subject, as treated by Dr. Godet, the union of the new natures or conditions of being in the indivisible Person of the God-man.

“ A woman of genius has remarked : ‘ Dieu nous a donné de quoi faire un arc, et nous en voulons faire un cercle.’ In other words : God has thought fit to place before us in His Revelation certain facts which appear contradictory ; and we entertain the vain idea that we can succeed in bringing them into harmony. But, after all, would such an effort be blameworthy ? I think not. It is important to remember, however, that in undertaking this task we pass from the domain of faith to that of theology. The faith confirms the revealed facts : faith is nourished by them, and lives by them, without investigating in what way they agree together for the understanding. Science seeks to establish that harmony by means of hypotheses which are suggested by the facts profoundly pondered, and, to employ a figure more exact perhaps than that quoted above, it seeks to construct the arch of the bridge on the two columns which faith has provided.

“ In the case before us the two facts which faith receives at the hands of Revelation and transmits to scientific elaboration, are the true Humanity and the true Divinity of Jesus Christ. The effort of science, the results of which neither confirm nor invalidate in any

degree the two facts themselves acquired by faith, must have for its object to show that there is no contradiction between these two fundamental data, but that, on the contrary, there reigns between them a profound accordance. Only it must never be forgotten that these efforts at solution are no longer in the region of faith : they belong to theology. This must be carefully remembered by the reader of the following pages.

"Man! God! What an impassable abyss at the first glance between these two terms! But it is expedient to recall to our thoughts here two great principles of our Biblical monotheism. The first is the *absolute liberty of God*. God is not, like the creature, governed by a nature which is imposed on Him from without and which must incessantly and in everything be taken into account. 'I will be what I will be,' said Jehovah to Moses : that is to say, always and at any moment what it shall please me to be. The second is the *absolute perfectibility of man*. Man was made in the image of God. He is not therefore condemned, like the beings of nature, to turn for ever in the same circle. His progressiveness—if the term may be allowed—has no limit but the absolute good to which he aspires. The emblem of human life is a spiral, not a circle."

Here we might be disposed to contest at the outset the statement that we are not interdicted from attempting to sound the depths of this great abyss. "And this unity, which is perhaps the greatest mystery of religious science, it is not forbidden to us to explore : the Church has formulated it in the title, *God-man, l'homme-Dieu*." But the attempt, prosecuted in the sense and in the spirit intended by Dr. Godet, is not to be regarded as a transgression of the limits of Christian investigation. Certainly there is a negative sense in which the inquiry may be very profitably conducted : that is, with constant reference to the errors which are to be avoided and the definitions that are not to be accepted. This, indeed, is a distinction that may be established in regard to all the ultimate mysteries of the Christian faith. No study, and no definition the result of study, will ever avail to make them more familiar in their secret to the human understanding. They are mysteries, not only in the sense of being truths long unrevealed and at length disclosed, but also in the sense of being truths which, revealed as truths, will be for ever beyond the reach of the human reason. It may be, indeed, that eternity will throw some light upon them ; we must not be too ready to bankrupt the resources of a future state, of which it is said that in it we shall know as we are known. It may be that the unsolvable mysteries of the present "time"

will prove to be mysteries in the old, familiar, Scriptural sense, that of secrets to be made manifest in eternity. We are now, however, considering our present mystery in relation to the present world.

Nothing is more remarkable, in the Scriptural treatment of this subject, than the entire absence of such statements and definitions as help theology in the solution of this question. That there is no hypothesis, nor the shadow of an hypothesis, we must not affirm; simply because the Volume of Inspiration knows nothing of hypotheses or theories, in the very nature of the case. But it may be said that there is no trace of any the slightest intention on the part of the writers to deal with the nature of the link between the Divine and the Human in the Person of Christ: there is no trace—to put the same thing in another form—of any intention on the part of the Holy Ghost to furnish helps to the investigation of what is called scientific theology. With the fact of the presence of two natures in the One Person of Christ it is far otherwise. That is declared in a wide variety of ways: indeed, there is no topic in theology which is more abundantly illustrated, nor one that may be proved by such a large array of evidence. It would not be overstating the case to assert that every writer in the New Testament gives his own independent testimony to the fact of the One Person being both God and man, while not one hints at the nature of the change which the descending Son or the raised Humanity might be supposed to undergo.

But this reserve on the part of Scripture does not discourage our Christological studies, so far at least as they have as their object the guarding of the doctrine from error. When theology, in alliance with philosophy, attempts to do more than this, and seeks to establish positive conclusions, or to discover and formulate the precise laws that govern the relation of the Divine to the Human in Christ, we cannot but think that it is doomed to be baffled for ever, if not to run into manifold errors. Now, the difference between the early Church, the Church of the Œcumenical Councils, and the Church of modern times, is very marked in relation to this question. The first four, or the first six, Councils laid down defensive definitions which protected the Person of Christ from dangerous error: more than this they did not attempt to do. The modern Church, especially the modern Protestant

Church, has not been content with the ancient defensive and negative formulas: it has prosecuted Christology as a positive problem, and spent much pains upon the attempt to discover the hidden principles which, formulated in a statement, will make the incarnation a mystery revealed or made manifest. Not with much success. If the solution of the problem could ever be supposed to be reached, and the statement of that solution made plain, it would be when an accomplished Frenchman expounds the deepest German researches. That is what we have in the present volume. With what result we shall see.

"If God is absolutely free, He is not indissolubly bound to the Divine estate. What rich man has not the right, if he thinks fit, to make himself poor and live in poverty? What king, if really free, is not free to lay aside his crown, and make himself a simple citizen? This is what St. Paul tells us: 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus, that though He was rich, for our sake He became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich.' His riches was the glory of the Divine estate; His poverty was the dependence which is the property of the human condition. He exchanged the former for the latter, because it was the only means of raising us from the latter to the former. Would His Divinity have been true riches to Him if, when His charity moved Him to despoil Himself to associate with us, He had been inseparably bound to that mode of existence, and could not adopt that which His love dictated to Him to assume? The liberty of the Divine estate itself would have become to Him a chain, an intolerable slavery. He would not have been that which He would to be, if He could not have clothed Himself with our humanity."

First let us consider the human analogies which are here used. The rich man may certainly surrender his riches and the king may surrender his crown; but the one in that case ceases to be a rich man and the other ceases to be a king. The accident of possessing riches, or of being a king, might be laid aside at the will of the subject. But that has no analogy with the possession of Divine existence, which is not an accident. This cannot be renounced: in the nature of things it is for ever impossible. It is vain to attempt a distinction between existence and mode of existence. With God existence and mode of existence are the same thing. Dr. Godet means to intimate that the Son Incarnate had no existence or manner of existence which was apart from, unlimited by, the human existence and manner of existence. His language is, that

He "exchanged" the Divine condition for the human condition. This word "exchanged" very often occurs in the theories of depotentialisation. But, as will be hereafter seen, there is no warrant for the expression in Scripture, and there should be nothing in dogmatic theology to necessitate its use. It is in this connection an offence. Whatever else is predicated of the descending Saviour, it is never said that He ceased to be in heaven when He began to be on earth, nor that He left behind Him with the Father a deposit of being which He would afterwards claim, nor that He suspended His relation to the Eternal Trinity; nor, in short, that He in any sense whatever was, as to His Essential Deity, eclipsed, or depotentialised, or lowered, by the process of the incarnation.

The two passages which are always supposed to bear the weight of this doctrine of exchange of conditions are that one which is quoted in the above extract and the classical passage in the Epistle to the Philippians. Neither of these, fairly examined, lends any countenance to such a doctrine. The language of St. Paul in both passages permits us to understand the humiliation of our Lord as running on in connection with His abiding dignity: not "who *was* rich," but "who, being rich;" not "made Himself of no reputation" by changing His state, but even while being at the same time "in the form of God" and "equal with God." The glory of our Saviour's condescension was that He veiled the perfectness which He knew Himself to possess, and, in even His relations with mankind, made His human nature the organ of His manifestation. It may be thought that this is precisely what Dr. Godet means; but the careful student of his theological principles well knows that it is not so. He means much more than the suppression of the Divine side of His Personality and the prominent exhibition of the human side. He means much more than the assumption of a human soul which is His own, in all its poverty, at the same time that He knows Himself to be "one with the Father." He means, in fact, that with the Divine "glory" and the Divine "manner of existence" the Divine Person Himself descends from heaven to earth, and is found only in the human soul of the Son of Man.

The only word of the New Testament which may be adduced in support of such a doctrine as this is the testimony of St. John: "The Word was made flesh;" this historical *becoming* being made to signify *being changed into*.

The term used by the Evangelist will not bear this meaning; and, even if it would, the immediate context of the paragraph, and the larger context of St. John's writings, forbids the interpretation. The Logos, who became flesh, displayed nevertheless the glory of the Only-begotten Son who dwelt among us. All the expressions in this sentence protest against the notions of these theologians: the terms "glory, only-begotten, the Son in the bosom of the Father, tabernacled among us," all indicate that there is, and continued to be, a distinction between the higher and the lower nature of Christ; such a distinction as the theory referred to cannot admit. The Divine Person maintains His rights: not indeed in contradistinction from a human person, but as giving to the Christ His highest name and character. If such language may be allowed, the Divinity is always the subject, and generally the active and spontaneous subject, of every act and of every change. It is not that the human consciousness becomes aware of the Divine, but that the Divine consciousness knows the human as its own. The word of life "came in flesh," "made Himself of no reputation," which implies His continuous existence as "self," and never ceased, as He could never cease, to be one with the Father in His Essential Being throughout all the infinite alternation of His states on earth and in heaven. Just as we insisted on the absolute and necessary sinlessness of the Redeemer, in virtue of the *a priori* demand of His One Person, so also we insist upon the absolute immutability of the Divine essence as a principle which must be held fast, and with which every doctrine of the incarnation must be reconciled.

Dr. Godet's theory, it ought to be stated, is only a reproduction of that of Gess, as his is only a reproduction of some fleeting views of the Scholastics. But he is an original thinker, and stamps upon every theory that he adopts the impress of his own mind. In his Commentaries, and in this volume, he has done all that words can do to reconcile us to the idea of a change of life and state submitted to by the Son in His condescension. He makes the utmost of the sayings which seem to favour his way of stating the case; omits to quote those which are thoroughly opposed to it; and evidently writes himself into complacency with his own hypothesis. But there is one proof that he is wrong continually appearing; that is, the impossibility of preserving his speech from occasionally

betraying him. A Eutyohian Christ cannot be God, neither can he be man. He is necessarily disavowed by both. Speaking of such a Christ, the advocate must needs use such language as follows: "He strips Himself now as man, just as He had stripped Himself as God, and, having reached the goal, instead of urging the claim of recompense for His just life, He takes on Himself the punishment of sinners." It must be felt how the antithesis naturally falls into what He was as God and what He is as man. "He had abandoned by incarnation His Divine life; He surrenders to death His human life." This abandoned Divine life, it is true, the Redeemer resumed on the ascension. But there is another great transfer and interchange. It is not the shining out of a Divinity through the humanity as its temple; nor the glorification of the human nature as its organ, after the manner of Lutheranism; but the Divine life is possessed as human. Here comes in the second cardinal principle of the theory.

"It is as the Son of Man that He henceforward possesses the life of the Son of God. How is that possible? Can the Divine glory dwell in the forms of human existence without causing humanity to ray it forth from all parts? 'In whom dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead *bodily*,' replies St. Paul, who had contemplated the Saviour as glorified on the road to Damascus at first, then in the third heaven to which He was caught up, in the body or out of the body he could not tell. Why should not the human nature, created in the image of God, have been destined from the beginning to be the free organ of the life of God, the agent of His almightiness, the instrument of the sovereign activity of His love? The *God-man* would in this case be no other than the *true man*, that is to say, man such as God eternally conceived and willed Him to be. Is not this the meaning of that wonderful word of St. Paul: 'Whom He foreknew [as His own by faith] He predestinated to bear the image of His Son, that He might be the Firstborn among many brethren.' Would not the problem of the double nature of Jesus, Divine and human, be thus solved? What contradiction is there between the Divinity and the humanity of Jesus Christ when it is established that what God had in view from the beginning, the ideal man, was the *God-man*?"

The latent assumption here that the *God-man* was the predestined Head of mankind, fallen or unfallen, we pass by. No student of theology has ever meditated much upon it without being impressed by the loveliness of the idea, and feeling it a hardship to be obliged to give it up. But

the fallacy here seems to be that of using the word *image* in two very different meanings in the same argument: argument, we say; for the quiet and allusive reference to St. Paul's word has all the force of earnest reasoning, and, indeed, is the only kind of reasoning that can be brought to bear on the subject. Now let us apply Dr. Godet's notion to our first parents created in the image of God, or of the Son of God. It would follow that Adam was an incarnation; or that the Divine life from which he fell, and which in Christ is restored, was, or at least was destined to be, that interpenetration of the Divine and human which Dr. Godet supposes to be the mystery of Christ's Person. Applying it, as he does, to the saints in their union with Christ, he altogether changes the principles of that union, and removes it into another sphere. It is not effected through the Spirit of Christ, whose indwelling is the only indwelling of the Redeemer which the Scripture speaks of. We are made "partakers of the Divine nature" in a sense which St. Peter never dreamed of; not of "His holiness," but of the Lord's own "Divine-human life," which is, after all, rather His "deified humanity."

It follows, and our author does not scruple to accept the responsibility of saying it, that "the Son desires to do nothing less than this, to make of each of us another Himself, a representative of this supreme type: man-God." This is what is meant by that "perfectibility of human nature," which, in the theory we are reviewing, is the counterpart of the sovereign will of God to order His own Being. The "hymen between God and man, the festival without parallel" could not be accomplished without a descent into human limitation; and that descent into human life acts as a power that raises human life itself into absolute perfection. But always we are troubled, while reading, with an uneasy feeling that goodness and life are made synonymous terms. There can be no doubt that "human nature is capable of the Divine," and may even reach the "absolute good," if what is meant is the perfection of the moral image of God. But surely that was not what the Son of God gave to the humanity, if there is truth in "God manifest in the flesh." Is it possible that the theory only means that the incarnation was the infusion into humanity of a perfectly holy principle, by which the new being Jesus was raised to absolute Divine perfection? "The moment of the abasement, that is to

say, of the incarnation, was for Jesus the starting point of His exaltation. In proportion as He developes Himself as an infant, between God and Him there is formed a relation of the most intimate and most tender nature, the analog of which we sometimes find in our own children. It finds its issue in the spontaneous expression of this word, *My Father*, which Jesus pronounced for the first time at the age of twelve years, and which was an object of surprise to His mother herself. As He continues to develop in submission to His parents, in devotion towards His brethren, in the self-collectedness of prayer, and under the illumination of the Scriptures, His presentiment grows stronger and stronger, through the contrast between His religious and moral state and the sin which He sorrowfully recognises in all those who surround Him, even the best, that His place in human life is exceptional. The unique character of His Person becomes to Him a great theoretic and practical problem: "Who am I, and what have I to do below?" It cannot but occur to the reader that there is no trace in the Gospels of any such commencement and growth of a new consciousness. Even were the dogma conceivable, or in any way practicable, it could not find its support in the New Testament. There we do not hear the Redeemer addressing the Father as simply man; never does He speak of His human Person receiving light or strength from His Divine; no word is ever heard that might indicate a gradual acquaintance with the mysteries of His own being. Whatever knowledge He gains, whatever commandment He receives, is spoken of with reference to His Divine-human Person, never with reference to His humanity as distinct.

In fact, it may be said, though we are only repeating what has been said already, that this whole theory of the exinanition of the Logos issues in nothing more nor less than a new creation of a new being in whom human nature is exalted above itself into a new kind, and not simply a new degree, of existence. A human mind grows into the consciousness that it is more than human, that it is separated from all other minds by an impassable gulf, that it is undergoing a process of deification. It is a revival of ancient Apollinarianism, without the honesty and consistency of that most monstrous error. Apollinaris suppressed altogether the human rational soul of the Redeemer, and regarded the body and animal soul of

Jesus as merely the vehicle or organ for the manifestation of a logos-life upon earth. The modern theorists repudiate with horror this notion of the Christ. They preserve the reality of the human spirit; but within it there is a *potency*, or Divine power, or principle of energy, or what else it may be termed, that gradually and surely expands the human nature into the infinity of the Godhead. In fact, they absorb into their hypothesis every ancient error touching the Person of Christ save that of the Nestorians. They do not divide the One Personality of Christ: it is their horror of doing this that has led them into the methods of interpretation that sanction, or seem to sanction, the theory to which Dr. Godet has given his support, and of which he is the ablest exponent.

Recoiling from this, another class of speculatists suggest an altogether different view of the change undergone by the Logos in the incarnation. The word "*became flesh*" may signify a certain modification in the manner of being, a *becoming* something which the Eternal Son was not before. Granted that He could not relinquish the Divine nature, nor the Divine life, nor the Divine absolute perfections, yet He might and did empty Himself of the Divine manner of being and manner of operation; that is to say, He gave up for a season the so-called relative Divine perfections in which the absolute and immanent Divine perfections manifest themselves and are known by the creature,—to wit, omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. The Son in becoming man brought down the fulness of the Godhead, but the fulness of the Godhead as abstracted from every manifestation of that Godhead in the creature. Nothing absolutely Divine is supposed to be given up, inasmuch as God is God without the relative perfections which owe their origin to the creature. But thus, it is supposed, the problem is solved. The Logos is the Son of God, the Second Person in the absolute Trinity; but, reserving that eternal dignity, He descends to the earth without the perfections that are revealed or capable of revelation. He descends into space without the attributes that refer to space; and into a limited sphere, without the attributes that refer to space, and would be incapable of its restriction. It is obvious that all this is mere trifling with words. The Divine nature cannot lose its attributes in this way. But, as this is a theory that our

author does not advocate, it need not detain us any longer.

Nor must we pause to consider a third modification to which modern Lutheranism has given birth,—that with which we might associate the name of Dr. Dorner, were it not impossible to prove that he holds any clearly-defined opinion on the subject. No theologian has written more strenuously in defence of the immutability of the Divine essence, the stability of the Divine perfections, and the impossibility of a depotentiation in the Trinity. Yet he is a Lutheran, and maintains that the *humana natura* is *capax infiniti*: he holds what on this subject is the common principle of those who on other points differ widely,—that after His ascension the Redeemer's human nature became and is the organ of the Divinity, sharing or rather being the vehicle of all Divine attributes. But, during the period of His humiliation the human nature was subject to all human restrictions. Where, then, was the Divine? United with it, brooding over it, communicating to it of the Divine fulness as it was able to bear it, gradually enriching it with all knowledge, and, if not strengthening the bond of union (which in itself is indissoluble), yet more and more endowing the humanity with such glorious gifts as were the earnest of the Divine glorification of the body of our Lord. It may be regarded as one advantage of this theory that it allows a theological place for sundry topics which the others are obliged to exclude, and that it gives at least some hints for the solution of difficulties which the others cannot for a moment contemplate.

For instance, the theology of a gradually consummated union of the two natures seems to throw some light upon that problem of theology, the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Logos in the Incarnate Redeemer. During the process of that unification the spirit shed upon the human nature of our Lord was still preparing that nature for its eternal perfection as belonging to the Son; after that process is complete the perfected Redeemer imparts that Spirit out of His fulness. Again, it seems to render more amenable to reason the temptability of our Lord, whose Divine strength was not till after the passion and resurrection fully made manifest in His humanity; and this has a special reference to the last and severest temptation, the abandonment on the cross. Generally this theory gives, or seems to give, a better account of the uniform subordi-

nation of the Son incarnate during His sojourn upon earth. But it is obvious that there is great danger of simple Nestorianism—the undue separation between the God and the man in our Saviour's Person—in this way of stating the question. There is no indication in Scripture of any such gradual union of the two natures; nor of any incarnation which was not at once and for ever perfect.

While we deny the truth and propriety of the three theories which we have reviewed, we must needs admit that each of them labours to defend one particular aspect of the incarnation from perversion, and the verity of Christian faith must be found in such a statement of the doctrine as shall accept the element of soundness in each, at the same time that it rejects their serious errors. There is a real intelligent personality in the Saviour born of the Virgin: His life was not the life of the eternal Son abstracted from the Trinity, and reappearing in a human frame. The eternal Son so joined Himself to our race as not to lose His Divine essence or any of His Divine perfections: He was not emptied of anything that belongs to our humble but true conception of God; it was the eternal Spirit of His Godhead by which He offered His sacrifice. But His human personality was so assumed into the fellowship of the Divine, that it never was nor could be for a moment independent: in all things that Divine Personality of the Son has the pre-eminence. Man did not become God, but God became man; not by change or confusion of substance, but in the unity of a higher personality, that is, so to speak, behind both natures, constituting the perfection of that one Christ, who is rather *God or man* than *God and man*. Both these formulas are indeed true; but the former is the more exact reproduction of Scripture. From the beginning of the incarnate history that Person was one; but, in the mystery of His humiliation, His personality is presented to us in its human relations. He is led of the Spirit, increases in a knowledge that has its final limit of ignorance, is subject to temptation and infirmity, and can utter His final cry of abandonment. There is no more Docetism in this than in His assumption of our penalty on the cross, and on the whole way of sorrow that led to it. To save us from forgetting that the Eternal Son retains in unshorn dignity the Divine relations of His One Personality He Himself makes many utterances recorded by His servants, which leave no vestige of doubt upon the subject. When He declared "I and the Father are One,"

and "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," He gave us to believe that His Divinity suffered nothing from His humbled estate. That he usually and habitually spoke otherwise, adopting the human language of His Personality as human is the mystery of His exinanition. That He "knew not the day nor the hour" is but one instance of what perpetually occurs; it is but the crowning and most startling expression of a truth that underlies His whole life of humiliation: that His Divine human Personality was, as it regards the work of His atonement and all that belongs to it, presented before man and before God as human. This is "the mystery of God and His Christ."

Before we close, we must give an extract which will show the effect of Dr. Godet's Christology on the work of Christ. This we do with pleasure, inasmuch as he is one of the very few of his class who have not suffered their Eutychian views of the Person of Christ to affect seriously their views of the atonement. He holds firmly the vital truths of the Gospel. He is eclectic, however, in his maintenance of them; being by turns Lutheran and Reformed, Calvinistic and Arminian, mystical and forensic in his views of the Evangelical system, yet always faithful to the leading truths of redemption. But we did not propose to include this part of his work, and shall, therefore, make only slight allusion to it. The view of the atonement which M. de Pressensé has rendered popular in France and many like him in England and America, meets a vigorous treatment here. Expiation did not consist in the perfect obedience rendered to God by Christ, in the active consecration of His Person to God by the absolute submission of His will to His Father's. The *blood* of the atonement is not in Scripture a symbol merely, if carried to its last limits: it includes and represents expiation by sorrow and by death. In Christ crucified there was not only a perfect renunciation of sin, but a judgment pronounced and executed upon sin. The reconciliation implied hostility; and that not only on the side of man, but including God also. The notion of the Divine anger appears constantly in Scripture; not indeed as the wrath which is among men so much polluted by passion, but the holy antipathy of a good being against evil, without the least admixture of personal or egotistical feeling. "The Divine anger, thus understood, is inseparable from the

serious distinction between good and evil. To deny it would be condemning ourselves to regard evil, not as the opponent of good, but as only an imperfect form of it." One and the same passage, Rom. xi. 28, proves that man may be at once hated and loved of God: hated as he is as a sinner, loved as capable of salvation. "But this simultaneousness of opposite feelings in God must needs be temporary. It is necessarily the transition to an absolute and definitive state. Man is will; that is the essence of his personality; and the will cannot oscillate indefinitely between good and evil. It must end by deciding exclusively whether for the one or for the other. The relation between God and every individual man must, therefore, end by becoming perfectly simple. Let not the immutability of God be objected. For God would change if, man changing, He did not also change in relation to him. In the end the individual becomes identified with the principle to which he is devoted; and God cannot separate them. It is the state of immutable salvation or of definitive damnation, those two antipodes of the moral world towards one of which, as experience proves, every free creature necessarily gravitates." The relation to God interrupted by sin must be restored if sanctity is to become possible. There is an initial reconciliation which precedes sanctification and alone renders it possible. "The latter, sanctification, is the passage from the state of grace to that of glory, from the economy of faith to that of sight; the former, which precedes in order of time, is the transition from the state of condemnation to the state of grace, from the life of sin to the life of grace." The reconciliation involves this, that, "on the one hand, God can contemplate the *sinner* without experiencing towards him the sentiment of reprobation which the sight of his *sin* must produce; and, on the other hand, that sinful man may be able to contemplate in God the Judge of *sin*, without feeling himself the object of His displeasure and of His *judgment*." Christ has effected this reconciliation inasmuch as He "realised in Himself the humanity which *ought to be*, and consummated before God and man a humanity arrested in its development; and not only so, but also *rehabilitated* a humanity fallen." God, the author of liberty and moral responsibility, would not be faithful to Himself if, after having deposited these great principles of all morality in human nature and conscience, He did not

pay His tribute to them by judging man after the standard set up by Himself. "There is in God a perfection which is not now-a-days in favour with the public sentiment: that of *justice*. Conformably with the received definition, this attribute consists in treating everyone according to his deeds. How can this be eliminated from the Divine character? Would not God cease to be God if He were not just?"

Very elaborately it is shown that the great act of reparation performed by Christ in His perfect obedience unto death was not the satisfaction of wrath in God demanding punishment, but the satisfaction of justice through the adequate acknowledgment of the infinite evil of sin. The pith of the author's peculiar view of the atonement is found in the following words:—

"The Divine pardon springs assuredly from His love, as all Scripture declares. Only His love met with an obstacle in His justice. Sin is a fact so grave that it has really given birth to this conflict between the perfections of God, justice demanding that the sinner be treated according to his work, and love demanding his pardon. The obstacle created by His justice must be taken out of the way, in order that free course may be accorded to the good pleasure of God of exercising in our favour His will to pardon. This is the result attained by means of that wonderful manifestation of justice to which the human consciousness has responded first in Christ Himself, and to which it responds anew in every believing soul. The Divine right asks not, in order that free scope should be given to His mercy, that it should be placated or softened, but that it should be acknowledged. On this acknowledgment depends, in fact, the restoration of him who misunderstood and neglected it by the act of sin, as before a being who acquiesces in this eternal right justice is disarmed and love can unfold its treasures. We see then why the reparation offered by Christ and the faith by which we appropriate it are found united as the conditions of our justification; there is nothing arbitrary here. Faith in the reparation becomes itself a reparation. This quality does not come from its intensity, nor even from its nature, essentially moral—characters always imperfect—but from its object, the perfect expiation of Christ. That which satisfied justice was not a certain quantum of sufferings equivalent to a certain quantum of sin; but it was, on the part of God, the complete revelation of that attribute of His nature, and, on the part of man, the adhesion to that revelation or acceptance of it without reserve. Now, it is precisely this which faith finds in the sacrifice of Jesus, and which God, on His part, finds in faith."

Here is, undoubtedly, a great improvement on the lax notion that makes the awful agonies of the Son of God merely an expression of loving testimony on behalf of holiness, which must melt the hearts of all who behold it. But our author is too much disposed to accommodate himself to the tenderness of the theory which he condemns, and to forget that the same justice which demands recognition inflicts punishment also. Hence, when he turns to condemn the opposite error, which represented Jesus on the cross as the object of the Divine displeasure and reprobation, he evidently gives much fuller scope to his free thoughts and words:—"Never assuredly was act accomplished on this earth more agreeable to God than that sacrifice inspired by the purest love to man and the profoundest reverence for the Divine holiness; and never was the Person of Jesus more the object of the good pleasure and the benediction of the Father, than at the moment when He identified Himself with the sin of humanity in order to exhaust in His Person the curse which was attached to it, and which involved the momentary abandonment of God Himself." We must needs go with him when he expatiates on the truth that the infliction upon Christ maintained the principle of justice and of judgment, and was an equivalent rather in quality than in quantity. But we do not share his confidence that the consideration of this should disarm every feeling of repugnance to the doctrine of substitution. It is easy to say that "one alone may suffer without injustice, for all of His suffering was not a compensation for theirs, but a revelation presented to all of that which all would have deserved to suffer, and of what they will really suffer whom the spectacle of this expiation shall not bring back, penitents and believing, to God." But the vicarious atonement is and will remain, if not so absolutely profound a mystery as the indivisible Person, yet no less certainly a stumbling-block to those who consent not to be taught of the Holy Ghost.

Once more, the connection between the author's Christology and his doctrine of the active and passive righteousness of Christ is remarkable. It shows how loose a hold his theory has on him, when the great question of the Gospel righteousness is at stake. If the Incarnate were only man, inspired by a depotentiated Son of God, or the Son of God reduced to only man, His obedience to the law was incumbent on Himself; and of any rehabilitation of

man's holiness in Him there could be no question. The old orthodoxy settles the question by saying that the Divine-human Son was above the law, while He submitted to it; above it in doing and above it in suffering. It can maintain, therefore, that in the whole course of His active and passive obedience—twofold, yet one—He represented mankind. He *represented* mankind; for He was bound to keep the law or to suffer for its violation. He represented *mankind*, for He was not an individual human being, but occupied the place of all in virtue of being Himself the Lord as well as the Saviour of all before He came, and the taking the human conditions of life into union with His Divinity was His method of embracing the race in His benefit. Now, Dr. Godet takes care to avoid the express statement of an active and a passive righteousness; partly, because he evidently delights to give freshness to his theological statements, partly because the terminology of the old orthodoxy would embarrass him. Jesus, in this newer style, *sanctified Himself for us*. He realised the idea of human nature, and became the source of a new and perfect life. He was *crucified for us*: He repaired the outrage done to God by guilty mankind. How, it will be seen by those who read the following words, the last quotation we can make:—

“To these two tasks belong all the salient facts of His history; to the second, His miraculous birth, in which He begins afresh from its first step the course appointed to man; His baptism, in which He effects the ascension of the natural and psychical life to the life spiritual; His transfiguration, the seal of His personal perfection; and His ascension, the absolute realisation of the glorious destination of humanity. To the first task belong His death and His resurrection; that is to say, the human reparation and the Divine absolution.

“Rationalism has a special predilection for the first side of this sublime work, that which relates to the perfecting of the moral nature of man; orthodoxy has scarcely understood more than the second, that which relates to expiation. We believe that the complete insight into the reconciliation of the world, the justification of sinners, and generally the relation of Christianity to human nature, can be gained only by the spirit of him who unites, as we have just endeavoured to do, the two faces of the redemptive work. Jesus, the *consummator* of creation and the *repairer* of the fall; Jesus, the new Adam, in whom man accomplishes his primitive task, and comes out of his tomb absolved from the fault of old humanity. This is the complete Jesus, as considered in regard to

His work for us. Every man who by faith receives Him in this double title, becomes immediately in the eyes of God all that He is Himself. For that which Jesus has been *for him*, He will infallibly be *in him*: 'that the love with which thou hast loved me, may be in them and *I in them*.' In other words, 'Thou shalt be able to love them like Myself, because it shall be Me whom Thou shalt love in them.' Such is the mystery involved in that favourite expression of Paul, *Christ our Righteousness*."—P. 194.

It is the glory of the work of our Lord that it is one, even as His Person is one. It cannot be said, as these words run, that in one part of our Lord's life He restored humanity, and in the other made reparation for its sin. He in one great obedience accomplished both. His Person is Divine-human; not so much God and man as God or man, according to the need of His work. And His work is not an active obedience, restoring our sinlessness, which is to be imputed, after the imputation of the benefit of His passive obedience. It is not an active and a passive obedience, but an active or passive obedience unto death, according as the two aspects of His work are needed. His Person is one, and His work is one, and the benefit to His people is one: Christ in us.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

BLUNT'S DICTIONARY OF SECTS.

Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties, and Schools of Religious Thought. Edited by the Rev. John Henry Blunt, M.A. Rivingtons. 1874.

CONSIDERING the disadvantages under which the constructors of this Dictionary have laboured, we regard it as a great success. The task could not have been undertaken by any "School of Religious Thought" to which, or to whom, it would have been more difficult than to the body of men whom Mr. Blunt represents. They cannot look upon all the communities and denominations of Christendom as embodying various forms of the common Christianity. They must regard all with reference to one standard; and that standard is such as they cannot themselves precisely define. The theory of this volume demands that there should be a Catholic Church upon earth: the one body of Christ, all deviations from which are sects and heresies; though within itself there may be parties and schools of religious thought. But the want of a clear understanding as to what is that one Catholic Church, gives an air of uncertainty to the whole. Failing to obtain from any part of the book a clear idea of what the one body is to which all forms of Christian organisation are to be referred, we now come to feel ourselves in a state of perplexity as to the natural relations of the truth and error, of the Church and the sects, of Christendom and anti-Christian corruption.

If such a composite as this Dictionary is to be fair to all sides, it should define clearly what is meant by a "sect," by a "community," by a "tendency," by a "school of thought." Looking at the "Classified Table of the Principal Contents," we find all the non-episcopal religious bodies of Scotland enumerated among the "sects," though they include nearly the whole of Scotch Christendom. So as to the Continent. There is a list of "sects" which begins with "Abecedarians" and goes on to include "Arminians," and "Calvinists," and "Lutherans:" in fact, making almost the whole, if not literally the whole, of Protestant

Christendom, as existing on the Continent, a congregation of "sects." It is true that the term "community" is sometimes catachrestically used, as with reference to the Scotch establishment; but the general designation is that of "sect." It seems hard to be obliged in such a book of reference as this to find ourselves, and the great majority of Christians with us, included among "sects" and "schools of thought." But, as we have hinted, the compilers must have found this a far greater difficulty than we find it. We understand the matter, and can make allowances. But the adjustment of this phraseology must have cost these writers endless trouble.

Perhaps they would have done better to make three dictionaries: one for the heresies, and another for the schools, and a third for the sects. Though many difficulties would have remained, a grievous anomaly would have been avoided. The heresies are enough for one dictionary; and the masterly way in which some of the leading controversies of antiquity are here summarised gives evidence that the volume would have been most instructive. If "Antinomianism" and some other related subjects had been handled with the ability shown in "Panthéism" and "Origenism"—which would have been the case had the subject been limited to "Heresies"—the volume would have been unrivalled. Again, "Schools of Religious Thought" might very well occupy another volume, or another branch of a volume. And then the "Sects" might come in as including the sections of the great community of Christendom, and the sub-sections into which these are divided. Each would give opportunity for statement of the relation borne by each community to its parent, and of the characteristics that make it a "sect" according to some supposed standard. As it is, the present volume will never be generally accepted. It will be useful to all who possess it, on account of the immense amount of information carefully collected and arranged—having in this respect no rival in England; but its polemical tone will alienate all but a very select circle of friends. A dictionary of this kind must, in these days, be merely a dictionary, if its work is to be well done: a repertory to which all parties may resort for facts which they can use in their own fashion.

We can imagine this most scholarly and able volume re-arranged by a neutral hand on the principle of an analytical or comparative view of the forms of Christian faith and worship: giving the genesis, development, historical relations of each community, under the light of history rather than of polemical controversy. This work is of a very different character. It views every form of faith and practice with eyes, the range of whose vision is very contracted. It applies to every development of Christian life a test which it cannot itself define or justify. If the writers were required to state in three pages what the standard is, comparison

with which reduces nine-tenths of past and present Christendom to a condition of sectarianism and heterodoxy, those three pages would cost them more pains than the whole of this volume, though it is undeniably a triumph of literary skill.

We have read with considerable interest the articles on the various forms of English sectarianism; and in particular have studied that on the Methodists. It is written with care, and is generally correct. Its spirit is appreciative and kindly: we might say conciliatory, were it not that certain sharp terms every now and then disturb the placidity of the page, and show that the writer has in reserve an abundant stock of ecclesiastical censure which this is not just the right time to expend. We have occupied so many long sheets on the relation of Methodism to the Church that we need not now discuss the position of that community or "sect." We shall rather try to extract something profitable and interesting from the article, adding a caveat if needful.

Some of our readers may learn something as to the origin of the name "Methodist." "When John Wesley first founded his confraternity he called it the 'United Society,' after the Moravians, or *Unitas Fratrum*; but the vulgar tongue was too strong for him, and the name of 'Methodists'—given in banter to a small brotherhood of Fellows of Colleges and undergraduates formed by him at Oxford some years earlier—became the world-wide designation of his followers. The lineage of that name is curious and interesting. Early in the seventeenth century it came into use in France to designate a class of theologians, '*Méthodistes*,' who endeavoured by precise and fair statements of the case on both sides to bring about the reunion of the Huguenots with the Church. Of these theological Methodists the most distinguished was Bossuet." [We must here insert the foot-note.]—"In classical times the same name was used for those who practised any study or profession, as oratory for example, according to rule: but its best known application was to the physician who treated his patients according to a scientific system (*Methodikos*), as opposed to the empiric, who depended chiefly on practical experience. This use of the word still existed at the end of the seventeenth century, being found in the works of Boyle and Hammond."—"It was probably of similar exact writers on the Puritan side that a preacher spoke, when he satirised the 'plain pikestaff Methodists' who 'esteemed all flowers of rhetoric in their sermons no better than stinking weeds:' and it is obvious that the name 'Precisians,' so commonly used for the Puritans, was analogous to that of Methodist in its later sense. The term, however, came closest to its modern signification in the 'New Methodists,' who held 'the great point of justification' in peculiar prominence about ten years before John Wesley's birth; and in those who were so called because they 'stood up for God,' as mentioned about the same time by Calamy.

It was first appropriated to Wesley and his half-dozen friends as a piece of Oxford undergraduate banter in the year 1728; and, becoming the popular name of his followers, was fully accepted by himself and them as early as the year 1744."

However viewed, the name Methodist is suggestive. It has always been a name of good associations, even though it includes the historian of "Protestant Variations." It is too late to discuss the propriety of accepting such a name; the people who bear it must make the best of it. They must try to make it the remembrancer of all that is good in connection with its past use, forgetting the painful suggestions. They must remember the "precise and fair statements" of Christian truth; the peacemaking function of those who bore the name in France; the plain preaching of the Puritans; the "great point of justification" as the method of God's righteousness. They need never be ashamed of their name, since some cognomen seems to be necessary. Our article says that "the parent sect is now usually distinguished as that of the 'Wesleyan Methodists,' or simply as the 'Wesleyans.'" This is certainly true, so far as concerns the former designation. To the early term "Wesleyan" has been added by way of necessary distinction; but for the simple name "Wesleyan" those without the pale of the community are responsible. The names of men who have stamped their genius upon "schools of thought" or organisations have generally been afterwards linked with them inseparably. It is useless to fight against this. The orders of the Roman Church furnish several examples. Arminianism, Calvinism, Lutheranism furnish others. The Church of England is not without them. But John Wesley would not have gone to his grave so peacefully had he supposed that a Christian Church, or Christian Churches, would have been named from him. Luther and Calvin alike abhorred that thought; and their theological descendants prefer the terms "Evangelical" and "Reformed." So, whatever those without call them, and whatever name legal phraseology may stereotype, the instinct of the people clings rather to "Methodist" than "Wesleyan."

The effect of all that is written by modern Churchmen on the schismatical relation of Methodism is to show that they have no definite idea of what schism really is. The trouble which they take to show that there is nothing heretical in the community, goes far also to show that it cannot be schismatical. It was never known that a genuine schism was altogether free from doctrinal error. The controversialists on that side lay great stress on the known determination of John Wesley to live and die in the communion of the Church of England. They thereby make it most plain that the founder of the Methodist "Confraternity" did not aim at forming a schismatical body. That is a great consolation to the Methodists. They do not inherit the consequences of a

schismatical act, subsequently in some sense condoned. This being granted, the case becomes tolerably easy. It is too late to talk of schism afterwards. The separate position of Methodism was a matter which Divine Providence took 'out of the hands of the community itself: at least, that is the conviction which it seems to us the circumstances of the times, carefully considered, must force upon every thoughtful and pious mind that has in it any tincture of Christian philosophy. Let the question be transferred to the present juncture. Who will venture to affirm that this immense community could, by any method amenable to common sense, be brought into harmonious junction with the Establishment? Large secessions we can imagine; but that the Methodist community could, without disruption of its organic unity, that is, without ceasing to be all that gives it value, be reabsorbed, or rather absorbed, into the Church of England, is a thing which, Methodism being what it is, must be pronounced impracticable. There has never been from the beginning an essentially different state of things. But we must not prosecute this subject. Let us read what is said on one aspect of it.

"John Wesley died on March 2, 1791, at the great age of eighty-eight. His personal holiness had gained for him the veneration of all who knew him; his vast industry in preaching had led multitudes to a better life; his great powers of organisation had formed a society whose ramifications extended through every part of England and Wales, and across the Atlantic; his strong will had kept that society under control far beyond anything that could have been expected, when it is considered of what social elements it was composed. But when the influence of his holiness, industry, and strong will were removed, the revolution which had been impending among the Methodists for so many years immediately broke out, and exhibited at once the weak point in his organisation, that of making it dependent on a personal influence that must soon pass away, instead of resting on one corporate system of the Church, which has a continuous existence. If Wesley had possessed more faith in the Episcopate as a system, and less confidence in his own power of organisation, he might have reformed the Church of England instead of founding a sect." There is some inconsistency in our article: an inconsistency which perhaps could hardly be avoided. Sometimes Mr. Wesley is frankly absolved from the charge of establishing a sect: indeed, never was a man less guilty of that ambition. Sometimes, however, as here, he is spoken of as led into that great error by undue confidence in himself. But it is hardly fair to lay any stress on this; considering how temperately worded are the remarks on the subject. Perhaps it would be right to suggest that Wesley did reform the Church of England, and is reforming it now; more effectually than if he had used his "force of will" to coerce the

tendencies to freedom in his societies. Certainly, objection may be fairly taken to these statements as to the revolution which set in when the hand of Mr. Wesley was withdrawn from the helm. The perturbations that ensued were such as consolidated the system rather than dissolved it.

"In conclusion, it may be said that there is nothing which really differences the Methodist community from the Church of England, except the assumption of the sacerdotal office and sacerdotal functions by its ministers. This is an error of a very grave character, but it is one which has partly resulted from the incomplete manner in which the nature of the priests' office was set forth by theologians of a past day; and it is one, therefore, for which much excuse may be made. The day may come when the better instructed Methodist preachers may seek and obtain episcopal ordination, and when the less educated class may also have work assigned to them analogous to their present work, but not sacerdotal, under similar authority. A general movement of this kind would go far towards ending the sectarian position of the Methodist body, and restoring it to the position which it was intended by its founder to occupy. The two streams of practical godliness which now flow in the two separate channels of the Church of England and of the Methodist community, might then combine to form one great river, whose broad expanse would represent a unity consistent with the varieties of English character and habit, and whose almost irresistible force would mould the religion of English-speaking people throughout the world." But, if the only difference between Methodism and the Church is "the assumption of the sacerdotal office," there is really no difference. The ministers of Methodism have never assumed an office which they do not recognise as belonging to Christianity in its ministry on earth. The heretics and schismatics, if any, are those members of the Church of England who contradict the standards of that Church, and introduce a ceremonial and a priesthood which she does not tolerate in any of her formularies soundly interpreted.

It will be alleged, in opposition to this, that Mr. Wesley himself used language which by implication charged their intrusion into the priesthood upon his successors as an offence. Supposing it proved that Mr. Wesley meant by the "priesthood" what this article means—which cannot be proved, which indeed may be effectually disproved—it only shows how utterly unschismatic was the man, the work of whose hands God so abundantly prospered. It shows no more than this, at the furthest, that the Supreme Administrator was above the instrument he employed. Methodism was then, and is now, something higher than the founder of Methodism. He was not the measure of it; nor could he assign to it its limits. The system is beyond him or any man. The whole estate of Christ's Church upon

earth becomes one inexplicable chaos, if we give up the thought that the Holy Ghost, the ever present and free Ruler and Disposer, is arranging and ordering the bounds of their habitation for all the nations of Christendom which He hath made of one blood. As to the union of the two fertilising streams, we cannot but repeat what we have often found it necessary to say—that the suggestion involves a great unreality. We cannot, even in our most charitable and catholic moods, define to our thoughts any scheme for such an amalgamation, the two bodies being what they are. Those who feel most keenly the evil of division, cannot frame to their minds any scheme of union which they would dare to adopt in the present position of affairs. These remarks will apply to the last quotation we shall make. The friendly tone of some sentences is neutralised by the covert imputations of others; and, on the whole, we must shrink from the kind of advances here made.

"Apart from the usurpation of the sacerdotal office by their ministers, the Methodists have not anything in their practical system which is inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England. It met with the disapprobation of many in former days on account of its enthusiasm, but much of what is called enthusiastic in the preachers of the Methodists results from a sincere zeal in the pursuit of personal religion; and its faults are rather those of stilted language and general bad taste than those of unorthodoxy. The discipline adopted by them in their 'classes' is simply a form of pastoral superintendence; and though the 'class-meetings,' at which they 'tell their experience,' have often been made occasions for the display of spiritual vanity and pride, their real object is exactly that of confession—the unburdening of conscience. Such preachers were strange enough to the 'donnish' bishops and other prominent persons who were taken as examples of the Church of England down to quite a recent period, but the revival of personal religion and devotional earnestness, which was effected by the Evangelical and Tractarian movements, has naturalised the zeal and the confessional system of the Methodists; and has also shown that stilted language and bad taste in religion are merely class peculiarities, which must be borne with until they pass away under the influence of sound religious education."

Whoever reads, in the Companion-Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology, the articles on topics connected with confession and absolution, or the articles in this Dictionary on "High-Church" and "Ritualism," will perceive how superficial and baseless are such remarks as these on the class-meeting. There is a strange amount of ignorance yet to be corrected on such subjects as these. But here there is a dash of worse than ignorance. In one sentence we have: "The real object is exactly that of confession—the unburdening of conscience." Presently "the confessional system of the Methodists" is referred to. We know that sometimes the

doctrinal principles of those who are called Ritualists are mis-stated by their opponents. This is an evil to be regretted. But no charge ever declaimed against them equals in hollowness and recklessness that of making the class-meeting a Confessional.

The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans. A New Translation with Notes. By John H. Godwin, Hon. Prof., New College, London. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1878.

THE following is the author's statement of his position towards the Epistle which he illustrates: "The genuineness of this Epistle is so fully established that it is now universally received. We have here unquestionably the views of Christian doctrine and duty, which are of the earliest and most eminent of the preachers of the one Gospel, presented to one of the most intelligent and influential of the first Christian societies. We see the importance which he attributed to faith, not in any restricted sense, but with the wide application which belongs to trust in God, both in the Old and New Testament. The Gospel of Christ is commended as of inestimable value, because it is the Divinely appointed means for producing and perfecting this Faith. They who have faith in God, and in Christ, at once become right. They are judged to be right in character and position, being approved as upright, and declared to be in the right way for all good. As by faith they are set right really and judicially, so, being by the same faith united to Christ, they are renewed by the divine spirit, released from the dominion of sin, and raised, through the discipline of service and suffering, to the everlasting blessedness of the children of God. All the wrong and miseries of man, according to the Apostle's doctrine, result from the want of faith; and all the excellence and happiness possible for man are its fruit and reward. When so much is shaken in the convictions of many minds, and supports once trusted are found to fail, it is well to turn to the truths which cannot be shaken, and to rest on the foundation which can never be moved."

This commentary on the great exposition of the Mediatorial work, is the work of a good scholar, and abounds with proofs of a most accurate study of the original. But its tendency seems to us not to establish its readers' minds on the immoveable foundation, but to unsettle the foundation itself. It keeps always in view the "supports once trusted," and aims to make them seem still more untrustworthy. It shows an intimate acquaintance with the "convictions shaken in many minds," but does not contribute much to fortify the convictions that ought not to be shaken. There are very many expositions of particular passages that go straight to the heart and carry the soul of the true Christian with them; but that cannot be said of those which deal with the classical and fundamental theological paragraphs of this Epistle.

Negatively, Mr. Godwin does not seem to be desirous of using any of the ancient and accepted dogmatic definitions. This studious abjuration of all the old and sacred formulas is no recommendation. Doubtless, there are many dogmatic statements which may be receded from without any loss to theology or exposition; but when we find in any work a careful abandonment of every venerable and long familiar phrase we begin to be suspicious. Now we venture to say that in this volume, which seems to be composed in the interests of the veritable Gospel, there are not three statements of doctrinal truth which agree with those of the generality of Christians. For ourselves, we have long since laid down the principle that those systems of theology which are based on new and original statements of Gospel truth are to be received with much caution. We do not think that the entire system of dogmatic theology can be recast with advantage.

Nor do we much care to read expositions which entirely decline to make any distinction between the inspired and the uninspired portions of Christian literature. We do not feel much enthusiasm about the opinions of men who are judging the inspired representatives of the Great Revealer as they would writers like themselves. This may seem a bigoted statement. It may appear matter of no importance what any expositor thinks of the doctrine of inspiration, provided only he gives faithfully the meaning of the original as he finds it. But to us there is no worthy comment on a text that is not accepted as inspired. He who thinks rightly on the question of inspiration will remember that he is dealing with his author as one of a number of men raised up by the Holy Ghost to record, in the unity of one great system, his own particular contribution to the treasury of Christian doctrine. Moreover, he will, if necessary, bring under due restraint his own subjective views of what Christian truth should be. He will be exceedingly loth to speak his own words or think his own thoughts in this region. He will be disposed to distrust his own judgment altogether, especially when it is out of harmony with the sentiments of the great majority of the Christian Church, *holding in the main his own sentiments.*

So also there is a careful elimination of all the ancient formulae concerning the Trinity, Original Sin, the Atonement, Justification by Faith. Not that these doctrines severally are denied: they are simply ignored. In other sciences the representatives of modern thought and advancing opinion do all honour to the terminology that has been provided, improving on it with great caution. But there are some teachers of theological science who seem to think that they can dispense with the old terms, even though they employ none as the substitute for them. It is impossible to read this commentary without perceiving that its learned and thoughtful author holds some kind of Trinitarian doctrine: however much he may deny it, his speech everywhere betrays him. But he seems

most studious to avoid committing himself to any such doctrine : probably because he thinks his author does not. But it is impossible to comment fairly on St. Paul, without declaring definitively for or against the absolute Divinity of the Redeemer. We turn to the commentary, and find our commentator making himself, with all possible affectation of clearness, most intolerably obscure. It is hard to say what we are to understand by such sentences as these. "Jesus, the offspring of Mary, the descendant of David, is called the Son of God, ch. i. 35. He was this, not with reference to merely human attributes, nor on account of relationship to David, nor because of anything of human origin ; but with reference to the spirit He possessed and manifested, and because of the operation of the Divine Spirit, which preceded His birth, was always present in Him, and was communicated by Him." We read afterwards : "But evidently more than a holy character is here meant. The corresponding antithesis, *as to the lower nature*, shows that reference is made to the person of our Lord ; but the mention of His power, and of the rising of the dead, shows that reference is also made to the spiritual life and holiness which He imparted. . . . The spirit of holiness is, therefore, not merely the quality of a human mind, but the Divine power which was thus manifested, of perfect excellence and boundless extent. The spirit of holiness was possessed by Jesus as the Christ of God, and communicated by Him as the Saviour of men." It is utterly impossible to understand what our expositor means : whether he thinks that St. Paul thought that the higher nature, opposed to the lower, was substantially Divine or not.

There is not the same ambiguity as to the doctrine of Original Sin. Our commentator reads into the words of the Apostle a very definite negation of orthodoxy. It is true that the exposition he gives is that of the old Pelagian expositors ; there is no pretence of originality ; but, the oftener we read it, the more incomprehensible seems the view which such passages as these, taken from the Supplemental Note in Rom. v., present : "Here the nature of the connection is not declared, and only a general resemblance is asserted, without any attempt to explain the origin of sin. . . . St. Paul states that the reason for the subjection of mankind to vanity and corruption is, not in a human choice, but in the Divine purpose—the freedom of the glory of the sons of God, ch. viii. 21. It is commonly supposed that the moral nature of Adam was at first different from that of his descendants ; but this is not taught in the Bible. The statement respecting the first man—that *he was formed in the image of God*—is repeated of all men. The whole conduct of Adam and Eve is exactly like that of their children, showing no superiority of nature." These are strange declarations, coming from a commentator on the Epistle to the Romans. The phrase "showing no superiority of nature" is

very loose for one who aims, and for the most part successfully, at much precision in language. Surely the orthodox, whom this sentence is meant to condemn, never doubted that the descendants of Adam have as good a nature as that in which he was created : if, that is, the free personality of a spiritual intelligence is thereby meant. What they assert is that that noble nature, still bearing the image of God, bears marks of being universally under a corrupt bias. If the Protoplasts behaved exactly like their children, they simply yielded to a corrupt tendency, and that corrupt tendency was, according to Mr. Godwin, *formed* in them. How easy is it to say, and to make the Scripture say, that such as man is now he was created ! But how utterly contrary to the first instincts of our minds, and to the general tenor of the whole of Scripture !

"From the history of the fall in the garden of Eden we learn that wrongdoing and misery are not the results of unfavourable circumstances, but the consequences of a want of faith in God. Only by this faith can frail and dependent creatures preserve innocence, continue in what is right, and attain to moral perfection." Of course we cannot refuse to accept every word that is said in honour of faith and in condemnation of unbelief. But we do not see the propriety of this reduction of all sin in its origin to want of faith in God—that is, understanding by faith what Mr. Godwin understands by it, trust in God. There is something more in the violation of a positive precept than want of trust. Again we read : "The sin of Adam is by some supposed, without any authority from Scripture, to account for human wickedness, and to be the reason for the punishment of mankind." After reading this we turn back to the solemn text, and find it thus translated : "For even as through the disobedience of the one man, the many were set down as wicked ; so also through the obedience of the One, the many will be set down as righteous." The commentary is : "*Set down* : this is the exact translation ; and the connection shows that the term is to be taken judicially. The judgment is mentioned in the preceding verse, to which this is conformatory. For the production of character the term is unsuitable. When a few objects of a class have been examined, and sometimes one object is sufficient, we put down all the rest as being like—good or bad, as the one tried proves to be. The resemblance may be dependent, or independent, it matters not. All that is requisite for the correctness of the judgment is, that there should be a resemblance, however it may be produced." Now let this be applied to the obedience of Christ, the counterpart of Adam's disobedience. Surely the righteousness of believers in Christ, forensic or implanted, is not independent, but dependent on His. When the commentator says that "in the one there was the rejection of faith in God, and in the other the perfection of this

faith," a view is given of our Lord's atoning death that will not sustain the test of Scripture. However glorious was the faith in the Redeemer's active obedience, when that obedience is regarded as passive, we must seek for something more than faith as the secret of its atoning efficacy. To support his view the author translates Rom. iii. 25: "And God set Him forth a mercy-offering through faith with His blood." "So far as the words are concerned, this might be either the faith which produced the offering of Christ, or the faith which that offering was designed to produce. The faith of Jesus in God was *with* the shedding of His blood, and the faith of Christians is *by* this. But the description of the cause may be expected before that of the effect; a reference to the principle of our Lord's sacrifice, which made it acceptable to God, may be expected before the mention of its material manifestation; and the faith of Christ is more suitably noticed here, as the faith of His disciples is subsequently mentioned, ver. 26; so in ver. 22 the faith of Jesus Christ is first mentioned, and then that of those who are saved by Him." To say nothing of the violence done to the Greek in this translation, it entirely omits the demonstration of the Divine justice in the supreme propitiatory sacrifice offered for its satisfaction, which becomes subjectively such only *through faith*.

But we have no purpose to review the work: all we aim at is to characterise its tendency. One more reference we must make: it is to the comment on that cardinal atonement paragraph in chap. viii. 3, 4. "*Condemned sin*: condemnation is not the punishment of wrong, nor the removal of wrong; but an adverse sentence, showing the wrong which deserves punishment—the punishment being also a partial manifestation of the wrong. The *sin* which is here said to be condemned is the sin of mankind; for only in men was there sin. These sins were condemned; they were shown to be wrong by everything seen in Christ, but especially by His death. The conduct of the Queen of Sheba, and of the Ninevites, *condemned* that of the Jews; the right conduct of the former making evident the wrong of the latter. The conduct of Christ was a *sentence* against Satan, manifesting both the wickedness and the weakness of the evil dominion that was to be destroyed, John xii. 31; xvii. 11. So Noah condemned the men of his generation, Heb. xi. 7. It is not said here that Christ was condemned, in order that men might not be condemned; but that they were condemned. His righteousness manifested and condemned the wrongness of men, that they might be made righteous in character and conduct, John iii. 19." Accordingly, "impossible to the law" is made to refer to the Jewish law: "the law of sin was not feeble." But let it be remembered that there is a strict connection between "there is therefore now no *condemnation*" and "*condemned sin* in the flesh," and "that the

righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us:" in the light of this connection the entire fabric of this interpretation vanishes away. But the writer himself has forgotten part of it, at least, when he says: "The death of Christ, according to the Scriptures, was not to pay the penalty of law, but to provide and present a living power, by which what was impossible to law should be completely secured, in the possession and practice of all righteousness."

While we regard these views of sin and atonement as altogether wrong, we find very much in the ethical part of the volume that is most excellent. For instance, on chap. ix. 15, "the statement that human salvation depends on the Divine will gives no ground for the inference that this will is without a reason, or that the reason must be of one kind. Certainly no creatures can claim any good as their own right, nor can sinners claim mercy as deserved. Such reasons must be always excluded. But still the Divine will may have respect to the human will; and this is the characteristic of moral government. The Divine sovereignty, maintained by some, is the right of God to act as the governor of Nature. Doubtless He has this right, and could deal with men as with matter. But moral government is higher than natural; and moral perfections are the glory of God. The differences made in the state of men, irrespective of their choice, belong to the natural government of God; those connected with their choice to the moral." The concluding part on the morals of Christianity, or "the Fruits of Faith," is exceedingly good. But the great error that pervades the whole is a certain exaggeration of faith, mainly illustrated in the proposition of Part III.: "The being right which is from God, through the faith and redemption of Christ."

Theology in the English Poets—Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Burns. By the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen, Minister of St. James's Chapel, York-street, St. James's. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1874.

THESE lectures were delivered on Sunday afternoons in St. James's Chapel, during "the season 1872." They had been preceded by two courses, one on "The Inner Life of the Romish Church," another on "The Relation of Music to Religion," delivered by that notable 'vert who has found his way back to the Establishment, the Rev. J. M. Capes. Finding them "draw" well, Mr. Brooke followed them up by lectures on Blake, Shelley, Keats, and Byron, which he intends publishing very shortly. To lectures in places of worship, on subjects ancillary to religion, we see no *a priori* objection. In a church or chapel of the Establishment, the thing was an innovation. We remember what was lately said of Dean Stanley, when he allowed a "lecture" on

Missions to be delivered in Westminster Abbey. A good many Churchmen conscientiously object to oratorios, and such like, being performed even in cathedrals—as they have long been by the united choirs at Worcester, Hereford, &c.,—still more do they dislike the practice just commenced of trying to get them up in parish churches. Now on this point the Methodist body, and Non-conformist Churches generally, have always allowed themselves more freedom than has hitherto been considered proper by the Established clergy. Their ideas about consecration, which, with some Churchmen, rises almost to the dignity of a sacrament, have made them less constrained in the use of their chapels. The “service of sacred song,” for instance, is held as a matter of course in Wesleyan chapels, though we do object to the encomiums on the singers—amounting, practically, to a vote of thanks—with which they occasionally wind up. Missionary meetings, too, are freely held in chapels, though never, as far as we are aware, in Established churches. And this is just one instance of the “glorious inconsistency of the Church of England;” for in these churches, so carefully closed against religious meetings, archdeacons hold their “visitations,” call over the lists of their clergy, and, standing inside the “altar rails,” read out “charges,” often on such thoroughly secular matters as the Dilapidations Act, bringing in, too, all sorts of personal matters, and giving their own views on English history, supported by quotations from writers like Evelyn. Certainly nothing less formally “religious” is ever heard in any Wesleyan chapel than some archdeacons’ charges.

Archdeacons’ charges, however, are not delivered on Sundays, nor are “services of song” nor missionary meetings held on that holy day. This is Mr. Brooke’s weak point. Few of us would object to a devout consideration of poetry in its religious aspects in a place of worship; the immense majority would cry out against any attempt at such an intellectual exercise on Sundays.

Mr. Brooke takes no pains to justify himself by argument. He says:—“I had long desired to bring the pulpit on Sunday to bear on subjects other than those commonly called religious, and to rub out the sharp lines drawn by that false distinction between sacred and profane. If what I believed were true, and God in Christ had sanctified all human life, then there was no subject which did not, in the end, rise up into theology. . . . I wished, therefore, to claim as belonging to the province of the Christian ministry, political, historical, scientific and artistic work in their connection with theology. . . . And the blame of many accustomed to hear nothing but sermons from the pulpit has been wholly outweighed, in my mind, by the fact of the attendance of many who were before uninterested in religious subjects at all.”

We fear that this “fact,” viz.—that a good many fashionable people were attracted to hear a clergyman preach on the poets, is

not very sure ground for spiritual satisfaction. Goldsmith, describing the pathetic fervour of his village pastor, says—"Those who went to scoff remained to pray." Romanists, too, are convinced that the splendour of their ritual brings in a certain number of converts. One of their bishops has described their great recent increase in the United States as "the blessing of God on good music." But, in both cases, the effect is produced by *bona fide* services; by the village pastor's earnest appeals; by the regular ceremonies of Popish worship. Mr. Brooke is sanguine enough to expect a like result from lectures only indirectly connected with theology, and from the nature of the case removed out of the sphere of personal religion. But then, for some Broad Churchmen, personal religion has a very different meaning from what it had for Bishop Wilson or Fletcher of Madeley.

Mr. Brooke is a very Broad Churchman; he will not, we imagine, disclaim the title. His little book, *Freedom in the Church of England*, has been, by some, described as an attempt to make the pyramid stand on its small end. His view of the Atonement, apparently much the same as that of the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, of Brighton, is, to say the least of it, widely different from that of the majority of Christians. Some, indeed, would find a difficulty in reconciling it with the creeds and articles of the Church to which he belongs. Mr. Brooke finds no such difficulty; and the wonderful elasticity of the Establishment, which takes in York-street, as well as Lorrimore-square and St. Alban's, Holborn, sanctions, by her silence, more than one reconciliation of the seemingly incompatible.

With Mr. Brooke's views, however, we have nothing to do. We would call our readers' attention to the war still waging between Principal Tulloch, as the advocate of undogmatic Christianity, and the *Saturday Review* and *Pall Mall Gazette*, as the uncompromising supporters of dogma. Orthodoxy has, in its day, had strange allies; but it is so remarkable to find those journals asserting the need of definite creeds, that some have fancied them anxious to strain matters in order that popular Christianity might give way under the tension. Much to the same purport are the papers in the *Fortnightly* and *Contemporary*, respectively by Mr. Leslie Stephen and the Rev. Llewellyn Davies, on the late Professor Maurice. "I am half sick of shadows," many are beginning to say, to whom Christianity has been presented in a form which sometimes robs it of its chief distinctive doctrines.

But our object is neither to speculate on Mr. Brooke's beliefs, nor to discuss the propriety of Sunday lectures on the poets (Methodist chapels are not likely to be the scene of the one, nor Methodist ministers to take up with the other), but to call attention—we have not space to do more—to a book which is certainly suggestive, and, in many passages, profitable.

With Cowper began the well-marked change from the artificial poetry of the Restoration and the Augustan age. The world had got tired of sentiments tricked out in tinkling rhyme, as unreal as the pictures of Boucher and Watteau, and the shepherds and shepherdesses in the *pâte tendre* and *pâte dure* of Sévres and Dresden. A wave of free thought began to rise in Western Europe. In France it was, from the first, turbid, unclean; but still J. J. Rousseau was there the inaugurator of a real love of Nature—the father of a school which strongly affected English thought. Happily, in England, free thought was, for a long time, pure; the rising wave lifted men's minds nearer to God, and Cowper, the first poet of nature since Elizabethan times, was pre-eminently a religious poet. Mr. Brooke traces very fairly the effect on Cowper of the Wesleys. He shows, too, how impassioned devotional poetry became a necessity as soon as the preaching of the early Methodists had given an impulse to emotional religion. To the heart in its wrestling with God, in its joy unspeakable at having realised its personal relation with Christ, the quiet, didactic hymns of Watts would be hardly more satisfactory than Pope's "Universal Prayer." The want was not a poetry which should express the bending before an infinite, incomprehensible God, nor pious reflections on the beauties of Nature, but something in harmony with a heart which felt itself redeemed, or which was still in the agony of the spiritual struggle. In the hymns, therefore, of the Wesleys, and of Cowper and his master, Newton, there were (as Mr. Brooke remarks) "passion, the personal element, and expression of doctrine." "Other poets led their passion and their personal history into other realms, but Cowper kept them within the sphere of his relation to God."

Again, doctrine is to Cowper an intensely personal concern; his Calvinism is as constantly present in his verse as the idea of destiny is in a Greek tragedy; compare him in this with Dryden, or even (we may add) with Milton, in their theological passages; they treat the matter from the outside; to Cowper it is the question of his whole life: "The poetic atmosphere has changed, we are in a different world." But not only did our new school of devotional poets look to Nature—not looking from it "up to Nature's God," but rather the other way—they also looked at man in quite a new way. Pope wrote: "The proper study of mankind is man;" but Pope and his followers treated the subject intellectually. Cowper, and Crabbe, and the rest dealt with it sympathetically, and this because the founders of their school were truly devotional poets. Mr. Brooke's lecture on Cowper is full of interest, to which the painful character of the poet's views on election gives intensity.

On Coleridge he is less satisfactory; Coleridge's poetry (and our author limits himself to poetry) is so little, and of that little

the part which can be made to have a religious bearing is so very insignificant. In his poetry Coleridge seems to us very generally to slide into Pantheism. Mr. Brooke's view is that—"When we have given life to Nature from ourselves—its 'life the eddying of our living soul'—and our life is itself one that feels its source in God, and has conscious communion with Him—then there is nothing in Nature which to our thoughts is not God's life, which to our senses does not seem to speak or sing of Him. And we, finding Him everywhere, transfer our own feeling of thanksgiving and delight in His beauty and power to the world itself. . . . And so Coleridge, in his 'Hymn at Sunrise,' pictures the great mountains rising and ever rising, like a cloud of incense from the earth, and telling to all the stars, and to the rising sun, that—

" 'Earth with her thousand voices praises God.' "

It is a fine passage, and a good example of Mr. Brooke's method.

Through the nine lectures on Wordsworth we cannot pretend to go. Wordsworth's admirers claim him as the great poet of Nature, but he is also eminently a Christian poet; witness the remarkable passage in which, as he is walking home, after a party, in the early morning, amid "dews, vapours, and the melody of birds," he felt his heart full, and "bond unknown to me was given that I should be, else sinning greatly, a dedicated spirit." We are unwilling to set against this the modified Platonism of the "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality from Childhood's Recollections." We prefer thinking of Wordsworth as one who really "wished and realised the wish to present to God his life as a 'pure oblation of Divine tranquillity.' "

Burns, the poet of intense humanity, has (says Mr. Brooke) a firm religious basis. "God is for him the Father; and this sense of Fatherhood is a spirit in his work flowing through all his graver poems." Anxious, however, as he is to find a theological element in the poets whom he analyses, Mr. Brooke is obliged to confess: "I see no trace in Burns's poetry that Christ has any meaning for him. . . . It might have given Burns strength to conquer his errors if he could have felt for Christ the same kind of personal love which he felt for man and Nature." The Ayrshire ministers, we are told, were in fault, "they blotted out Christ for Burns;" surely the want makes him scarcely fit to be the subject of a Sunday discourse in a Christian temple. We cannot imagine St. Paul, on any day in the week, lecturing on Anacreon or Simonides. Burns is infinitely above them, and it is well that his gold should be displayed to those who usually seize upon his dross. At another place and time the lectures on Burns would have seemed to us the best of the series.

A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. By John A. Broadus, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S.C. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co.

"The work may be studied with advantage by all preachers. Beginners may learn much from its pages, and those who have attained excellence by long experience may here find hints, by attention to which good preaching may be made still better. Dr. Broadus teaches by example as well as by precept. His perspicuity and energy of style, and his earnest religious tone, perpetually suggest to the reader some of the highest and most necessary qualities of all good preaching." This prefatory remark of Mr. Helliier we cordially endorse. Of the many treatises on homiletics that may be put into the hands of young preachers, this volume, taken as a whole, is decidedly the best. It comes from America, but it does not import among us anything that is suggestive of what is to be condemned in the American theory and practice of preaching. The following extract will give one instance of what we mean, and at the same time illustrate the style of the book. It is on the sacred duty of preaching the meaning, and only the meaning, of the inspired text:—

"To interpret and apply his text in accordance with its real meaning, is one of the preacher's most sacred duties. He stands before the people for the very purpose of teaching and exhorting them out of the Word of God. He announces a particular passage of God's Word as his text, with the distinctly implied understanding that from this his sermon will be drawn,—if not always its various thoughts, yet certainly its general subject. If he is not willing to be bound by this understanding, he ought to reject the practice which commits him to it, and preach without any text. But using a text, and undertaking to develop and apply its teachings, we are solemnly bound to represent the text as meaning precisely what it does mean. This would seem to be a truism; but it is often and grievously violated. Not only is there much contented ignorance as to interpretation, and much careless neglect on the part of persons well able to interpret correctly, and much wild spiritualising of plain words, but, upon the wretched principle of 'accommodation,' Scripture sentences or phrases are employed as signifying what it is well-known, and perhaps even declared at the time, that the sacred writer did not mean to say, and has not said at all: 'The original meaning of these words, as used by the inspired writer, is—so and so; but I propose, on the present occasion, to employ them in the following sense.' That is to say—honoured brother, see what you are doing; you stand up to teach men from a passage of God's blessed Word, and coolly

declare that you propose to make the passage mean what it does not mean."

The author has not given the general principles of Hermeneutical Science, taking it for granted that his readers have already studied them. But he has done what is perhaps better; he has pointed out very clearly, and illustrated his principles by many pertinent examples, what are the errors the preacher should wish to avoid. There are some good remarks on the use of the originals:—

"As to the great truth of Scripture, even the slightest knowledge of the originals is of service, in helping us to enter into intellectual sympathy with the sacred writers. To read but a few pages of Hebrew, even though one should never become capable of exact exegesis, cannot fail to aid a susceptible mind in the sympathetic comprehension of Scripture ways of thinking and peculiarities of expression; and, of course, a thorough study of Hebrew and Greek will carry the benefit still further."

To this it may be added that a comparatively slight—and few men have more than that—acquaintance with the originals will make the thoughtful and well-disciplined preacher to appreciate the interpretation of those who know more than himself; will give him a key which, provided he modestly uses it, will open invaluable treasures in the exegetical treatises, which are the peculiar glory of modern theology:

Dr. Broadus dwells earnestly on the necessity of interpreting a text with careful regard to its connection. He admits, however, that the idea of strict interpretation may be carried too far. "Some principle may be presented by the text in one application, and we may, with perfect propriety, make other applications of it." He refers to an extreme case of carrying this concession too far. How different is such a course from that of a preacher who gave a missionary sermon from the words of the young ruler, "What lack I yet?"—inquiring what we lack for greater success in the missionary enterprise. But we venture to think that in all cases—certainly in the cases quoted here—texts might be found which should precisely give the very application which is indirectly given to texts not obviously bearing it. Again: "Interpret in accordance with, and not contrary to, the general teaching of Scripture. These teachings are harmonious, and can be combined into a symmetrical whole. If a passage may have two senses, owing to the ambiguity of some word or construction, to the doubt whether some expression is figurative, &c., then we must choose one which accords with what the Bible in general plainly teaches, rather than one which would make the Bible contradict itself. It is a gross abuse of this principle—though one often practised—to force upon a passage some meaning which its words and construction do not grammatically admit of, in order that it may give the sense required by one system. But between possible grammatical

meanings, we are compelled to choose upon some principle, and certainly one important principle to be considered is, that the teachings of Scripture must be consistent where the grammatical probabilities are pretty evenly balanced, a comparatively slight preference in the respect mentioned must turn the scale; and even a much less probable sense—provided it be grammatically possible, and sustained by some corresponding usage of language—may be preferred to a more probable and common sense, if the former would perfectly accord, and the latter would grossly conflict, with the acknowledged general teachings of Scripture. In order to apply this principle with propriety and safety, it is manifestly necessary that we should bring to bear no narrow and hasty views of Scripture teaching; but the results of a wide, thoughtful, and devout study of Biblical Theology." These are sound principles; but we would advise young preachers—for whom this volume is specially designed—to abstain from texts which require such careful weighing of grammatical evidence, and, with a practical application of the "analogy of faith," there are abundance of passages and paragraphs which entail no such difficulty, and involve no such responsibility. Among them the preacher may occupy himself and be safe.

Dr. Broadus nobly vindicates the "doctrinal or dogmatic sermon," properly so called. "In our restless nation and agitated times, in these days of somewhat bustling religious activity, there has come to be too little of real doctrinal teaching. The preacher who can make doctrinal truth interesting as well as intelligible to his congregation, and gradually bring them to a good acquaintance with the doctrines of the Bible, is rendering them an inestimable service." He has also a good word for the preaching of evidences, especially the internal and experimental evidences. As to apologetics proper, they should never be handled at all, unless thoroughly; for "the error may remain in the mind while the imperfect refutation is forgotten." As to polemics, here is some good advice: "It is not unfrequently the wisest policy, as it regards certain forms of error, to leave them unnoticed. In the excitement about Romanism, which its boldness and boasting has recently awakened in our country, there is reason to fear that many will fall to preaching against the Romanists where they are little known, and thus only help to bring them into notice. While well assured that these grievous errors can be refuted, we ought to remember that these errors are subtle, and, to some minds, seductive, and that here, just as in the case of infidel theories and objections, slight and hasty refutation is often worse than none. So, too, there are some minor religious denominations, whose vital breath is controversy, and who will most surely die when they are most severely let alone." The preaching of morality is also placed on its right foundation, as is also political preaching.

The most difficult topic of a volume like this is that which deals with pulpit rhetoric. It is copiously handled; but on the subject of Argument we have not the affluence of illustration which is spent on some others. On the Division of a Sermon, Dr. Broadus is very full and very practical. We must make an extract here: "Two centuries ago, when the excessive multiplication of formal divisions, and equally formal sub-divisions, was almost universal in France as well as in England, Fénelon inveighed vehemently against the whole fashion, urging a return to the methods of the ancient orators, and on this question almost all subsequent writers have taken sides. Yet a certain formality of division, and of general order, has continued to be common in France and Germany, and, for the most part, in England and America. Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, set the example, and urged it upon others, of avoiding divisions, and making the sermon a very informal address; and, since his time, many preachers in the Church of England, such as Trench and Kingaley, have followed that course. But it is worthy of special notice that the two ablest and most generally admired preachers the Church of England has recently produced, Robertson and Liddon, both regularly make divisions, and commonly indicate them in passing, while the former frequently states his divisions beforehand, and also makes numerous sub-divisions." There may be question as to the propriety of formally announcing the division, especially of announcing it in a technical style; but there surely can be no question about the necessity for analysis in the sermon itself. A miscellaneous outpouring that passes from topic to topic, without the attempt at exhibiting one subject under its various aspects of statement, argument, illustration, and application, is, generally speaking, either a mere exhortation, or worth very little. As to the application, our teacher of homiletics is particularly full, and leaves nothing to be desired.

But we need not give the contents of a volume which, we are sure, will be in the hands of most readers to whom we aim to recommend it. We are arrested, however, towards the close by a temperate statement of the question as between the three styles of delivery—reading, recitation, and extemporising. Dr. Broadus does not absolutely condemn the reading of sermons: he is too catholic-minded, and too well acquainted with the history of preaching to do that. After showing what may be the advantages of reading a sermon, he gives the disadvantages. They are very many, and very forcibly put, though some of them are not fairly urged. "If writing compels the preacher to go over the ground more completely, it is not always done more thoroughly. Being obliged to run over the surface everywhere, the preacher may go beneath it nowhere. If many sermons are spoken with very superficial preparation, so with very superficial preparation are many sermons written. There is an immense amount of strictly

extemporaneous writing. People are apt to think that what is written and read must have been carefully prepared, but they are often egregiously mistaken. A highly popular preacher once said—of course, half as a jest—that he was so frequently compelled to get up his sermons hastily, as to make it indispensable that he should write, in order to give them, at least, the appearance of careful preparation." A better argument against the habit of reading follows: "This method also deprives the preacher's thinking of the benefit of all that mental quickening which is produced by the presence of the congregation. As to thoughts which are then for the first time struck out, it is true that men of rare flexibility, tact, and grace, can often introduce them effectively in connection with their reading. But such men establish no general rule, and the great mass of those who read, have to lose such thoughts altogether, or to introduce them awkwardly, and with comparatively poor effect. And besides the distinct thoughts which occur only in the act of delivery, there is something much more important in the warmer colour which the now kindled and glowing mind would give to the whole body of thought, in those differences of hue and tone which change the mass of prepared material into living, breathing, burning speech. . . . It is true, as we are sometimes told, that by an effort of imagination when composing, one may, to some extent, bring before his mind the congregation, and feel, by anticipation, the quickening of its presence; but there are few respects in which imagination falls so far below the actual experience. In a word, reading is an essentially different thing from speaking. When well executed, reading has a power of its own; but it is unnatural to substitute it for speaking, and it can at best only approximate, never fully obtain, the same effect." Of this there can be no doubt. The perfection of a natural address must be independent of the manuscript. But there have been many practised readers who have scarcely allowed the medium to obscure in the very least the vividness of their delivery and naturalness of their speech.

Extemporaneous speaking—rightly understood—is the highest kind, in the pulpit as well as at the bar and in the senate. But it must learn some lessons from the two other methods over which it triumphs. "Let it now be carefully observed that all the disadvantages of extemporaneous speaking are such as can be completely obviated by resolute and judicious effort, while reading and recitation have many inherent disadvantages, which may, of course, be more or less diminished, but can never be removed. Let this be noticed. The born speaker will be able to overcome the difficulties of extemporaneous speaking, and will find here, and here alone, free play for his powers. We are not referring to the few great orators, but to all who have really a native talent for speaking, including some in whom this long remains undeveloped,

through lack of exercise, or wrong methods. Some men, not born speakers, but anxious to do good, and zealous pastors, may be able to write and read tolerably instructive and acceptable discourses, while they could never preach extemporaneously. But certainly what is best for them, is not thereby shown to be best in general. Methods of speaking ought to be chosen according to the wants and the powers of those who have some gifts as speakers. Very few, if any, others ought to make speaking their business.

We must not omit the admirable chapter on the Conduct of Public Worship, which should be studied by the young preacher before he reads the book, and always kept in view. The concluding words are really the conclusion of the whole matter:—"After all, our preparation, general and special, for the conduct of public worship and for preaching, our dependence for real success is on the Spirit of God; and where one preaches the Gospel in reliance on God's blessing, he never preaches in vain. The sermon meant for the unconverted may greatly benefit believers, and *vice versa*. Without the slightest manifest result at present, a sermon may be heard from long afterwards; perhaps only in eternity. And the most wretched failure, seeming utterly useless, may benefit the preacher himself, and, through him, all who afterwards hear him. Thus we partially see how it is that God's Word always does good, always prospers in the thing whereto He sent it. Nor must we ever forget the power of character and life to reinforce speech. What a preacher is, goes far to determine the effect of what he says. There is a medieval proverb, *Cujus vite fulgor, ejus verba tonitrua*. If a man's life be lightning, his words are thunder."

We recommend this book as a very useful one. It is free from many of the defects of volumes of its class; it does not lay down innumerable dry rules, illustrated by innumerable dry examples. It, by some means or other, avoids the errors that alienate in form too many of its class. It may be read with unwearyed interest from beginning to end.

The Pure Benevolence of Creation. Letters to a Friend in Perplexity. By Jasper Travers. Longmans. 1874.

THE author of this book is anxious to justify the ways of God to men. Accordingly he gives us a series of letters "addressed to a friend in perplexity," in which he labours to show that "evil is in existence in the universe because, without it, there would be no good worth mentioning. There is pain, the product or consequence of the evil, in the consciousness of living beings because, without it, there would be no such pleasure in their consciousness as to be worth living for." He starts with the premiss, that the "one possible purely benevolent purpose of the First Cause is that the living existence may be of the highest possible value as enjoyment of life to living beings."—Pp. 2 and 3. He attempts to meet the fundamental objection that the economy of nature might have been otherwise arranged, and good and pleasure attainable without evil and pain, by saying that though this is abstractly possible, involving no logical contradiction, we have no grounds for asserting its possibility, no facts of consciousness to point in such a direction; and affirms the *natural* impossibility of a life all pleasure, in other words, "an impossibility of the economy of creation being other than it is, the laws in which that economy is embodied being other than they are."—P. 81. His "first main position" is, that we have "only clearly and distinctly to imagine the life-circumstances or conditions of a life all of pleasure, and yet of some considerable value, as a whole of real living existence, . . . in order to be convinced that a life such as that could not be a life of any considerable value, to say the least." The "more thorough-going position," that such a state would be a life absolutely impossible in consciousness, though it "might be reasonably maintained," is not "an insisted-on position." The second main position is that "all consciousness, in so far as it comes under the designation of feeling, prepares the mind in which it is realised for an equivalent increase in the intensity or importance, the value or anti-value, of the opposite state."—P. 124. That thus no painful experience is wasted, because each leaves a certain preparedness for pleasure to come. After stating "the other side of the second main position," the writer devotes his seventh letter to the objection that the theory thus propounded is antagonistic to the interests of morality, and concludes by urging at some length the advantages of his doctrine in comforting and relieving the minds of those who have been perplexed by the problem of the origin of evil in any of its forms.

Two fundamental assumptions—one metaphysical, the other moral,—vitiate the above reasoning. First. The doctrine insisted on by our author is only his statement of the well-known law of relativity, that we can neither feel nor know without transition or

change of state, accompanied by an assumption of his own, that the present emotional characteristics of pleasure and pain, as we know them, are necessary concomitants in every state of being. It must be tolerably obvious, however, that the latter is an assumption, and while it is of service to point out the ends answered in our present state by pain and painful experiences, nothing more than this has been done. The fundamental objection, "If Omnipotence and pure Benevolence are the only powers at work, why pain and evil?" is still unmet; as also is another, not stated here, but sure to rise in the reader's mind, "The argument would prove that no state of consciousness, angelic or other, is possible without pain as a necessary condition of it." That there is "no waste of pain" in our present state we may well believe; that that which in itself was not necessary, though in our world so common, is wonderfully made to minister to higher ends, is a truth we may well hold: but that an existence without pain would be "nothing better at the best than a perpetual life-stream in mere waking unconsciousness, the veriest lethargy of life—an all but utter non-value in the enjoyment of life"—is as yet not proven.

Second. The author makes comparatively light of the moral side of the question. He seems to say that if comfort could be afforded to perplexed minds, we might almost disregard the effect of his teaching on morality; at all events, the effect would be only indirect, if men would avoid carrying his doctrine to its logical conclusions, and, instead of dwelling on ultimate considerations, obey the immediate dictates of reason and conscience, as though those dictates were not founded on an hypothesis at direct variance with his own, and it were possible at the same time to open the floodgates, and keep the water in! But, without joining issue at that stage, we point out another fundamental assumption, the gratuitous character of which should have been plain to the writer's mind, if no such work as Butler's *Analogy* had ever been written, or if Butler's authority as a Christian divine had with him little weight. The well-known words of the *Analogy* hardly need quoting:—"Or perhaps Divine Goodness, with which, if I mistake not, we make very free in our speculations, may not be a bare single disposition to produce happiness, but a disposition to make the good, the faithful, the honest man happy." If this be so, and at least we have abundant presumptive evidence it may be so, what becomes of our author's web of speculation?

The style in which the book is written will not be likely to seduce by its charms and graces. The sentences are involved, often to obscurity, and abound in uncouth Germanisms. "The-by-signs-observable," "life-environment, life-capacity, life-circumstances," "so all too felicitous," "pleasure passed on to and pleasure passed on from," "the all but utter non-value they

would always be and have been the conditions of to others," may serve as examples which might easily be multiplied. Style is comparatively unimportant, if matter be instructive; in this case we regret that we can commend neither.

Forget Thine Own People: an Appeal to the Home Church for Foreign Missions. Three Lectures delivered in the Temple Church, in the Season of Advent, 1878. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Master of the Temple. London: Henry S. King and Co.

WE have much pleasure in calling our readers' attention to Dr. Vaughan's plea for Foreign Missions. It is an earnest and effective attempt to show in what sense the Church of Christ is called to self-forgetfulness, and to reach forth to alien lands and strange populations as the condition of her acceptableness to her Lord. After the great selfishness of the world has been renounced, and the law of faith and sacrifice set up in its stead, there is a subtler selfishness, capable of urging many plausible arguments for itself, that may come to occupy its place. We mean that disproportionate regard for our own spiritual interests, or for interests lying very near to us, by which the vision of Christ's kingdom is narrowed, and the scale of Christian endeavour unworthily made local and limited. In this matter evil is wrought by want of knowledge. The Church at home does not know the Church abroad, hence defective sympathy and inadequate help. But this may be remedied, and a strong appeal is made to ministers, parents, and others who have opportunity of teaching, to look to it. "See that you do not leave the Church ignorant of the names and the histories of her saints, dead and living, in the mighty field of a far-off battle. Let it be more disgraceful, in your thoughts, that your children should know nothing of the planters and of the waterers of Christ's vineyard in India, in Africa, in Australasia, than that they should be ignorant of the exploits by which Switzerland became free or the battle-fields on which Germany was made one. Know, and you will feel. Know, and you will pray. You will be ashamed of the sluggishness, of the isolation, of the selfishness, which has made you think only of your own people and your father's house. The Church of Christ is the school of sympathy: of large views and self-forgetting charities. We have made it the opposite of all these. We have dwelt here in nooks and corners, till we have lost the estimate of great and little, and can neither scale the height of enterprise nor fathom the ocean of sacrifice."

There must be self-forgetfulness, also, in devoting to foreign service not what can be best spared, but what is best in itself. The notion that when the Church at home has selected for herself the choicest, then what remains is more than good enough for mis-

sionary work is false in fact, as it is unworthy in feeling. Surely it is possible to raise the general sentiment of Christians on this matter, so that no man may ever be thought too learned, or too eloquent, or too useful to be sent abroad. On the self-forgetfulness of the workman himself Dr. Vaughan speaks strongly,—words which, we fear, will be resented by some, as overlooking many considerations by which they should have been qualified. If there is unmistakeable reference to the number of Colonial bishops at present and from time to time in this country, the value of his counsel may profitably be weighed by missionaries who are not bishops and by communities that are not episcopal.

“Forget thine own people, save in thy prayers—forget thy father’s house, save in its dear memories, and its foretold, foreseen reunion above, and look not back to it while the life of this poor short being is in thee! Home-sickness is the cankerworm of missions . . . The missionary *bishop*, at all events, must forget his own people; must make his home afar; must plant there the stock of a new race, setting the example of a Christian household, of which the interests, as well as the employments, are there. At last he must lay his bones there, if it be but to solemnise the heart of his successor, and to admonish him, in his turn, that he, too, like the Church, must hear the inspired saying, ‘Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have children, whom thou mayest make princes in all lands.’ We speak of the rule, not of the exceptions. It is pleasant, it is not profitless, for the Church at home to receive back, in their age or their infirmity, men who can tell, with the living voice, how the Gospel fares in other worlds, and counsel her, out of a living experience, as to the wants and the openings, as to the encouragements and the impediments, which characterise, in this quarter and in that, the Evangelical work abroad. To his own Master each one in this matter, as in all matters, ‘standeth or falleth.’ But the principle of an absolutely life-long devotion to a mission once undertaken, is, we think, incontrovertible. And the fact, that a reproach is cast upon Episcopacy and upon missions, by perpetual withdrawal of the hand from the plough—that an actual weakness has fallen upon the Church in the Colonies and among the heathen from this visible vacillation—this, too, is indisputable. The precept, ‘Forget thine own people,’ has itself been forgotten, the ‘father’s house,’ once forsaken, has been attractive enough to beckon back from the far land—and the Nemesis has been speedy.”

That these words are superfluous or ill-timed, no one who is competent to judge will think of affirming; but we would suggest a qualifying consideration which appears to have some weight. In proportion as the real oneness of the Christian Church and of Christian work at home and abroad is realised, there will be some change in the old way of looking at missions, as though they were

additional to the ordinary theory of the Church life, and demanded something different, in the spirit and aim of the missionary, from that which is proper to the Christian minister at home. It is to be hoped it may be increasingly felt that a consecration to the work of the ministry as such covers and comprehends both the home-working and the missionary idea, and that men may pass from one department of service to the other, when expediency directs, with perfect freedom and with advantage to the work as a whole.

There are several passages in these lectures which we had marked for quotation, but find we have not room for them. One, however, must be given here. It is always a pleasure to hear words of true Catholic feeling, uttered anywhere and by anybody; but, as yet, such utterances are not so common but that, coming from an eminent and conspicuous Churchman, they deserve welcome from Nonconformists.

"Who that has lived where men worship idols can have any sight left for quarrels at home of posture and vestment—I had almost said of liturgy and Church government? 'Sirs, ye are brethren,' bursts from the astonished lips of the visitant from heathendom—ye worship one God, believe in one Saviour, invoke one Blessed and Eternal Spirit—'how can ye strive one with another?' Have ye no sense of marvellous privileges, no discrimination of things that differ, no power to distinguish between the gnat and the camel, no gratitude for a Christendom, no value for a Bible? Learn how in foreign lands sects and forms have almost merged their differences. See the Baptists of Serampore dwelling side, by side in peace and love, with Anglican bishops and High-Church professors. See Bishop Gray of Capetown, in his apostolical journeyings, the welcome honoured guest in Moravian, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, and Independent houses. See him followed to his grave by a concourse of all Christian people, sect without and party within the Episcopal Communion of South Africa disregarded and forgotten in the one higher unity of a common Christianity. See one Bishop of Calcutta travelling hundreds of miles to rejoice over the work of God in the Lutheran conversions of Nagpore, and his successor hastening thither, at the call of the foreign pastors themselves, to receive those ten thousand converts into the communion of his own Church of England. Mark how, all over India, one communion has planted and another watered, one has sown and another reaped."

Manuals of Religious Instruction for Pupil Teachers. Edited by J. P. Norris, M.A., Canon of Bristol. London: Longmans.

The Old Testament. Parts I. and II. By the Rev. E. I. Gregory, M. A.

The New Testament. Parts I. and II. By C. T. Winter.

The Catechism and Liturgy. Parts I. and II. By Canon Norris. London: Rivingtons. 1873.

THE two manuals first named are intended to furnish a kind of running commentary on the Scriptures, and afford doctrinal and religious teaching as well as mere explanation of difficulties. That teaching is distinctively Anglican, which will indicate at once its excellences and defects. There is throughout a continual endeavour to bring out the spiritual significance of the facts recorded in Scripture, and to show their relation to the kingdom of Christ. Since any adequate teaching of the Scriptures must, as it appears to us, lead to dogmatic theology, the thing to be aimed at is that the theology shall be sound and the method healthy. As an illustration of unhealthiness of method, we may refer to the second page of Canon Norris's *Manual of the Catechism and Liturgy*. "Why does the Catechism make you learn the Creed? Because you are *bound* to believe it. And why the Ten Commandments? Because you are *bound* to obey them. And why the Lord's Prayer? Because you cannot do what you are *bound* to do without God's help. When were you *bound*? At your baptism. And who *bound* you? Those who brought you to baptism. Mark this, *you*, not *they* were bound. They did not bind themselves, but *you*. . . . You must be careful to understand this aright; there is a vulgar error that the godfathers and godmothers promise that the child shall do these things. They do nothing of the kind; it is the *child's* promise from the first, put upon him by his sponsors. *He* is bound by it, not *they*." We consider that in this passage the attempt is made to raise a false issue with a child's conscience. Creed, Commandments, and Lord's Prayer ought not to be introduced with this as their chief sanction and credential, "You are *bound* to believe them because of a promise—your promise made in baptism." A child of any sensitiveness, or fine-edged moral feeling, will know that he is not dealt fairly with by a statement of this kind. He knows he has *not* made any such promise, and to persuade him that he has is neither kind nor wise. Sponsorship does not need this sort of artificial support; if it did, it would be sufficient to condemn it. There is plenty of ground on which the obligation to believe, to obey, and to pray to God, may be safely rested, but a healthy-minded child

has the feeling of being taken in by his seniors, when logic of this sort is used with him. We can easily imagine the beginnings of a deep and lasting revolt against authority arising from such an abuse of it. Let the argument of responsibility through sponsors be reserved, and held altogether subordinate to the great responsibility of the individual, which rests upon his personal relation to God and to the Lord Jesus Christ. There is no kind of composition in which a writer should be more scrupulously fair than in that which is intended for the instruction of children. Their intellectual inferiority to their teachers should put the latter on their honour. In this matter, as in some others, *maxima reverentia debetur pueris*.

In his explanation of the Lord's Prayer, Canon Norris takes the opportunity not only of vindicating forms of prayer, but of making the cautious admission that "We should go further than we are warranted if we were to say that Christ forbade unpremeditated prayer. All we can say is, that He did not recommend it when His divine counsel was asked." This is very feeble and far-fetched, and again we have to complain of a false issue being set before a child's mind. In justifying a Liturgy, it is not needful to disparage extemporary or "unpremeditated" prayer; and to insinuate that our Saviour Himself discouraged it, is one more instance of the desire to have truth on one's own side rather than to be on the side of truth. We regret such faults as these in a work that is not without merit, and which we were anxious to commend.

Sacramental Confession. By Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. W. Isbister and Co. 1874.

Dr. Howson, in a small volume which contains the substance of certain sermons recently preached in Chester Cathedral, raises his protest against Sacramental Confession; against, that is, the introduction into the Church of England of the practice of "private confession to a priest with the view of obtaining his private absolution," against the present "Romance of the Confessional," the incipient form of that which in its maturity becomes "secret, compulsory, auricular confession, a part of the sacrament of penance for sins committed after baptism." His task is an easy one when he attempts to show that sacramental confession was not instituted by Divine right; that what is observed by the Roman Catholic Church now was certainly not observed by the Catholic Church from the beginning; that a system which gives to the decision of a confessor *judicial* power in the affairs of the soul, creates the necessity for a minute casuistical training, and induces a mere quantitative morality, is radically bad; that those who undertake to overcome the "dislike of the majority of our people to sacramental confession," as the Mission Priests of St. John the

Evangelist are openly instructed in their *Mission-Mannual* to do, are sowing most baneful seeds. It does not need much argumentation to prove that when St. Paul said, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup," he did not exactly mean, "Let a man obtain private absolution from a priest before partaking of Holy Communion," or that public confession on the part of Achan before the people to God is not exactly the same thing as answering insinuating questions and obtaining remission of sins at the hands of a man in secret; but the weapons of logic and ridicule seem alike ineffectual in scotching the snake of "Counter-reformation," or cutting off its hydra-heads.

One aspect of the whole question there is to which Dean Howson hardly gives its due prominence: the markedly artificial and consequently partial and clumsy character of the so-called "Catholic" innovation. It is not a growth, but an attempt to graft; not nature, but art; not reality, but imitation. We are told in the *Life of the late Dr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark*, recently published, that a merchant of Bruges, who had been receiving orders from English Ritualists to the amount of £800 or £1,000 a-year, was counselled by Dr. Grant to discontinue his consignments, the Bishop adding: "It is sad to think that these Ritualists, having no orders and no consecration, are keeping up the material idolatry of exposing to adoration bread and wine." Monsignor Capel's utterance on the same subject will be in the memory of our readers. And what is true of the whole movement is true of the particular part of it which Dr. Howson attacks. The attempt is being made to use the magic wand of Rome, but the pseudo-magician uses the left hand instead of the right. The attempt is being made to introduce sacramental confession into a Church which permits secular education and the marriage of the clergy; nay, in which seminarist education and celibacy, practised as a priestly virtue, are at least markedly exceptional. If Rome bids her priests enforce confession, she gives them her own secluded casuistical training, and forbids them to marry. They are to be unmarried—form, as Michelet says, a third sex—before they attempt to undertake their confessedly delicate and peculiar duties. We may think the education of the seminary, the enforcement of celibacy, and the duties of a confessor, alike parts of a monstrous and degrading system, but parts of a system they are, and a system the parts of which are evidently and of necessity contrived to fit into each other. The "Counter-reformation" imitates Rome, and imitates badly; takes the edged tool without the leather sheath; and the experienced cutler, who has been handling such edged tools for years, shudders or laughs, according to temperament, as he watches the child attempting to imitate his use of them. Well may the respected Dean of Chester echo Bishop Blomfield, and justify the use of each word in the dictum

of the latter: "Auricular confession is the source of *unspeakable abominations*." And it becomes the duty of every one who has a voice to use it in joining him to raise an indignant and earnest protest against "Sacramental Confession."

Churches, the Many and the One. A New and Revised Edition of "The Constitution of a Christian Church," by W. A. Garratt, Esq. Edited, with Additional Notes, by his Son, Samuel Garratt, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ipswich. Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday. 1874.

A **TIMELY** reprint of a clear and able book. Twenty-five years ago, when *Tracts for the Times* were new, Mr. Garratt, barrister-at-law, published the text of this book under the title, *Constitution of the Christian Church*; and now, twenty-five years later, when the *Church Times* flourishes and the Public Worship Regulation Bill is not passed, the Rev. Samuel Garratt, Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ipswich, gives us his father's book, with his own editorial additions and comments. Within small compass the many vexed questions with reference to Church-constitution, Church-orders, Church-discipline, are carefully thought out and reasoned upon. Enough space is occupied for the full discussion of the various topics; none is wasted in verbiage or empty rhetoric. An appeal to Scripture forms the basis of every argument, and we cannot too highly commend the way in which Scripture is used, remembering, as we do, how such passages as "Thou art Peter" are often slighted or explained away by one party in the discussion, as they are unduly emphasized by the other.

We need not take our readers afresh over well-trodden ground. Mr. Garratt rightly says (p. viii.): "Unless both the doctrine can be proved from Scripture and the fact from history, there is no foothold for Apostolical Succession. Without the alleged fact the doctrine cannot be true, and without the asserted doctrine the alleged fact would be curious, but meaningless." And the Editor is quite justified in adding—as the readers of Chapters III. and IV. will testify: "In this volume my father deals both with the doctrine, comparing it with Scripture, and also with the fact, comparing it with history; and whereas Apostolical Succession must stand upon each of these two legs, and cannot stand without both, he shows that it has neither to rest upon; that Scripture does not teach the doctrine, and that history contradicts the fact." The references to the Fathers are as full and copious as need be, some of the passages being discussed more fully and minutely in the Appendix. Mr. Garratt's conclusions practically coincide (the variation in minor details only increasing the weight of the general agreement) with those of Dr. Lightfoot in his "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry," published in his edition of the *Epistle to the*

Philippians, and each of the essays is "a complete examination of the only documentary evidence accessible."

As to the practical importance at the present time of the publication of such a book none will hesitate, if arguments are of avail in affecting conduct. More and more clearly it is seen that the barrier between certain branches of the Church of Christ and others is the question of Orders. One Church may be "established," recognised by the State, others not; one may be endowed and wealthy, others comparatively poor, and dependent on voluntary effort; one may have social position and prestige which others lack: but none of these distinctions forms the real obstacle to union in the best sense. As an article in the *Times* for May 21st pointed out, barriers of wealth and social position are rapidly disappearing, and the gulf caused by Establishment may ere long disappear in England, as signs of the times seem to point to its disappearance from the countries where it exists on the Continent. But so long as the theory of the Church and ministry which this book seeks to destroy is maintained, so long will it be an impossibility for real unity—uniformity is not desirable—to be maintained in the visible Church of Christ. "The question is sometimes asked," says our author (p. xviii.), "whether the whole body of Wesleyans might not be re-united to the Church of England. Nothing of the kind either can be done or ought to be done, till the law has been so altered that ordained men wishing to join the Church of England, and found properly qualified in learning, conversation, and godliness, and sound in faith, shall be recognised, without any further ordination, as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." The way in which such a proposition would be received by nine-tenths of the clergy of the Church of England, including those of all schools, would sufficiently show the truth of the above remarks.

Mr. Garratt well shows another practical bearing of his father's book in this later generation. The question of the Reunion of Christendom is now assuming a new and more practical form. The history of that question is sketched by a writer in the *Contemporary Review* for the month of May, and, although it is easy to see what apparently insuperable obstacles stand in the way of such a scheme, it does not need much study to see that like tends to like, that natural affinities must ere long prevail, and that the introduction of such a powerful acid as Disestablishment, might determine and develop such affinities speedily. Whether or no there be any cataclysm threatening in the relation between Church and State, here or elsewhere, it is well to have foundations firm, based on a truth, not on either a fiction or a lie, and it is impossible for us to see how such foundation of a Church as Apostolical Succession and the Divine right of Bishops can withstand such blows as are here quietly, but steadily and effectively, given.

Protestantism: its Ultimate Principle. By R. W. Dale, M.A., Birmingham. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

MR. DALE'S lecture is worthy of the permanent form it has assumed. It is a very able exposition of Protestant claims. It asserts that the principles of Protestantism are: the right of private judgment, the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, and justification by faith. We are compelled to dissent, however, from the views advanced by Mr. Dale when illustrating his second point. After contending that no authority ought to come between the soul and God, he meets the objection that, while Protestants have got rid of an infallible Pope and an infallible Church, they submit to the authority of a book written by infallible men. Mr. Dale avers that when a Protestant reads his Bible, all thought of the writers vanishes; he is brought face to face with God. We cannot see that this reply is at all decisive as against a Romanist. When he consults his infallible man, he is brought face to face with God, so he alleges. When Mr. Dale proceeds to apply his theory to the Epistles, we think that he lays himself open to adverse criticism. He urges that when we read the descriptions that St. Paul gives us of sin and salvation, we do not accept them as true upon the authority of the writer, but on the authority of our own experience. We presume, then, that if our experience contradicts the statements of the writer, we are at liberty to reject his testimony. Mr. Dale endorses our presumption by citing, apparently with commendation, the example of Luther, who rejected the Epistle of St. James because it seemed to contain teachings that were opposed to his own experience. If experience is to be the infallible test of the truth of Bible teachings, we stand in doubt of the result. We think that the lecturer's enthusiasm for freedom of thought has carried him into error. He has yielded too much to the spirit of the age that is so impatient of authority. It has become the fashion to undervalue all attempts to demonstrate the external evidences of Christianity. The works of Paley are turned over with a supercilious smile by the young oracle whose intuitive faculty enables him to dispense with the cumbrous processes of reasoning. We cannot believe that English Protestants are prepared to occupy the position Mr. Dale has marked out for them.

The Pastoral Epistles. The Greek Text and Translation. With Introduction, Expository Notes, and Dissertations. By Patrick Fairbairn, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1874.

THIS volume on the *Pastoral Epistles* has arisen out of the author's labours as a teacher of pastoral theology: For many years he has

been in the habit of devoting a portion of the time during each session to the exposition and illustration of these Epistles, with a class of advanced students preparing for the work of the Christian ministry. The translation and comments prepared for this purpose are now offered to students of the Scriptures generally, but more particularly to those who are candidates for the ministry or without lengthened experience in its duties. It should scarcely be necessary to remind such persons of the special claim of these Epistles upon their attention. A young minister or student of theology should spare no pains to get a thorough knowledge of them. For him they stand at the head of all devotional writings, the chief and best of the innumerable works respecting the character and vocation of the Christian minister. In relation to Apostolic doctrine and ecclesiastical antiquities, they cannot be overlooked without serious loss; but for teaching the true theory of the ministry, and for directing with equal authority and tenderness a young man's growth in all the qualities which that ministry demands, they constitute a manual of incomparable value.

Dr. Fairbairn's work is mainly expository. A translation of the text is given which does not call for much remark. The exposition is throughout scholarly and careful, devout in tone, and admirable for its application of the Apostle's teaching to the conscience and understanding of Christian ministers in our own day. We give it our warmest recommendation.

Introduction to the Pauline Epistles. By Paton J. Gloag, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1874.

THE New Testament student will find this a useful and comprehensive summary of information respecting the authenticity, design, and general characteristics of St. Paul's Epistles. Separate dissertations are appended for the discussion of special difficulties and points of peculiar interest, such as "Paul's Views of the Advent," "The Man of Sin," "Paul's Theological Terms," &c. On the first-mentioned topic Dr. Gloag joins issue with those who, like Stanley, Howson, and, very strongly, Alford, held that Paul, at the time he wrote the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, believed that he himself would be alive at Christ's coming. This question may be said to be a modern one, arising out of the interest which modern theology takes in the individual qualities of thought and style pertaining to the writers of Scripture. The closer study of the question of inspiration also leads to inquiries of this nature. Dr. Gloag's discussion of the language employed by St. Paul in relation to the advent is, in our judgment, satisfactory. The inferences drawn by Olshausen, Alford, and others, from the words, "We which are alive and remain," have always seemed to us strained and one-sided. We quite agree with the following sentences of Dr. Gloag: "There is no reason, then, for the somewhat rash

assertion that Paul shared in the erroneous views of the Thessalonians concerning the immediateness of the Advent. Such an opinion he did not teach. The passage on which it is founded is clearly susceptible of another meaning, more in accordance with his declarations elsewhere expressed. On the contrary, he wrote the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians with the express purpose of refuting that opinion. His office was to proclaim the certainty of the Advent—that the Lord would surely come, and come unexpectedly; but it was no part of his mission to declare when He would come. Nay, it would appear from his predictions of the previous coming of the Man of Sin, and of the conversion of the world, that he himself did not expect the coming of Christ in his own days, and that he looked forward to death, and not to translation, as the end of his course; though at the same time there seems nothing at variance with inspiration in supposing that Paul, whilst he obtained from all definite statements, might hope that Christ would come speedily.”

The Superhuman Origin of the Bible. Inferred from Itself. The Congregational Lecture for 1873. By Henry Rogers. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

WE cordially welcome another volume from the pen of the author of *The Eclipse of Faith*, a volume which will add to the reputation already gained by its accomplished writer. Here are words of matured thought, the gatherings of many years, written in no haste; delayed, indeed, by serious accident and frequent and prolonged interruptions to health. This is, moreover, a work which has long been much needed; for though a library of apologetic writing has in our day appeared, this argument has lain awaiting expansion by competent hands. We are entirely satisfied with the treatment which the subject here receives, and we take this opportunity to urge the perusal of the book upon all who are engaged in the study of the evidences of Christianity. The work is founded on the supposition that an argument of no mean value for the superhuman origin of the Bible could be fairly founded on “the difficulty of accounting for such a phenomenon by referring it to purely human forces.” The line of argument is not an entirely new one, but it is pursued in a way both fresh and vigorous. Human nature generally, the Jewish people in particular, appears as incapable of composing such a book as it is unlikely to attempt it. This is the point of departure in a course of careful, thoughtful, and severe reasoning. Ordinary human history does not afford the materials from which such a book could be compiled; many points of it are not only not in harmony with human nature, as it has at present revealed itself, but directly contradictory to it. The Bible could not have been written by man unaided from above, if he had been disposed to attempt it; but he would not have attempted it had he been quali-

fied for it: or, as our author more tersely says, "The Bible is not such a book as man would have made, if he could, or could have made, if he would." That there are occasional apparent eccentric deviations from the ordinary current of human experience observable in other religious systems is not denied, but they are isolated instances; here the argument is founded on "the degree, the startling character, and the number of such deviations."

Amongst the characteristics of the Scriptures, which we should not expect to find in a purely human work, are the following: many of them directly opposed to general human tendencies, and singularly so to the tendency and preferences of the people amongst whom the Scriptures had their origin. Amidst an inveterate proneness to idolatry, we see an unyielding adhesion to a pure and lofty monotheism. There is a remarkable subordination of everything to the idea of God, giving to the book an unnatural sublimity, if it is to be regarded as solely the work of man. The subordination of ethics to theology is little less remarkable, while the system of morality inculcated is consistently articulated with the idea of God, and differs so widely from that of heathen nations generally. To this it must be added that the characteristic features certainly of New Testament morality are anything but what would have been expected from human nature. We feel with Mr. Rogers when he says, in an appendix to this section: "I confess I am very much perplexed to know how this more elevated morality not only *above* nature, but *against* it, should have proceeded from the heart of man; and as little can I conceive it coming from the Jews as from anybody, since it was in contradiction to a law they deemed to be Divine, and which sanctioned, as they thought, a very different practice." Of all the features, inexplicable on merely human grounds, the character of Christ presents the greatest difficulties. There are in it peculiarities which take it entirely out of the plane of human nature. What was a single paradox before is now a bundle of paradoxes. "The problem is a very complex one, moral, intellectual, and literary, all at once; and I, for one, look in vain for the properties of human nature in any class of mortals which will enable us to solve it." The difficulty of accounting for the personal character of Christ on merely human grounds is very strongly and convincingly put, often with bursts of fervid eloquence. We are led most naturally to the conclusion that, "on the whole, the ideal origination of the character of Christ, and the world's stolid reception of it, notwithstanding, as historic, would seem one continued violation of all laws of human probability,—whether we consider the antecedents, moral, intellectual, and literary, of those who produced it, or compare it with any contemporary relics of Jewish or any subsequent performances of Christian minds; or reflect that this *shadow* has clothed itself with substance, and made the world think that a painting lives!"

Other arguments follow in the train of these, each of which is briefly expanded, each presenting points of difficulty which the denial of the superhuman character of the Bible leaves unsolved; a task as yet unfulfilled by those who would account for the existence and influence of such a book on purely human ground. These are well closed by the assertion that when men have attempted to modify or corrupt Christianity, they have always assimilated it to systems obviously human, showing how entirely opposed Christianity is to the tendencies of human nature; and showing further the greater improbability that the book could have originated in so alien and unlikely a source.

To these are added arguments, confessedly ancillary to the former, but having their proportionate value, drawn from certain traits of the New Testament as contrasted with what we might have expected, judging from the antecedents of the writers; and leading fairly to the question how could the suggestions of mere human sagacity have kept ignorant men like the Apostles in the right path, when it is so difficult even for wise men to find it. Well might we ask: Whence have these men this wisdom?

Further arguments are adduced from coincidences of prediction with subsequent fact, and from the essential unity of the Bible amidst its great variety of form and contents. This is a line of defence which, even granting the opposer far more than could be reasonably demanded, would involve him in inextricable difficulties. Advantage is taken for a wide and varied reach of argument, when replying to objections founded on certain peculiarities of form and structure. Wisely Mr. Rogers has not merely sought new arguments, but used and confirmed many which, though they are familiar, are none the less valuable on that account. Rather they, having been subjected to so much pressure, have proved their stability by the firm and continued resistance which they have presented. We should like here to insert a caution, especially to junior students of these momentous subjects, against the neglect of old lines of defence, and the too eager demand for novelty. The old "evidences" are not worn out because the patience either of objectors or friends is exhausted.

Two lectures are occupied with certain peculiarities of style in the Scriptural writers. Here the work may, in the judgment of some, appear to be feeble. Much is made of characteristics of the Biblical writings which may be considered but a slight remove from (above, it may be) the best human writers. It is only fair to say that the force of the whole argument is based on the *total ensemble* of the Bible, rather than on any one or even several of its elements. In so comprehensive a treatment of a single thesis, some points will appear weak by contrast. Alone, they may have little value; but in the entire argument they have their appropriate place and worth. A proportionate prominence is given to the exceptional

position of the Bible in the world; to the singular preservation of the records of Hebrew history, "while time has consecrated those of contemporary antiquity;" to the influence which this book has exerted in stimulating the intellect, and in attracting the love and veneration, of men. It is independent of race; it has evoked a prodigious literature; it has left deep traces on the writings of succeeding ages to a degree approached by no other production; it has exerted an unequalled influence on the imagination of men, especially as seen in poetry, sculpture, painting and music. It has graced the most brilliant productions of the human mind, while it has demonstrated its superiority to all quasi-sacred books, surviving them all, notwithstanding the heated fires of severe and hostile criticism through which it has passed.

So far the argument has been against the merely human origin of the book: a complementary argument follows on the analogies between the Bible and "the constitution and course of nature." That showed the Bible to be not in accordance with what might be expected from man: this shows it to be in accordance with what might be expected from Him who built the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth. Here the argument is well sustained, though in one or two instances the analogies seem a little forced. We have written sufficient to show that this volume contains a comprehensive summary of "evidences" well and ably used. Valuable explanations and side-notes are relegated to the appendices, in which are suggestions and confirmations that serve as buttresses to the walls of this tower of strength, within which the humble believer will feel that, whatever be the independent grounds on which he first received and continues to accept the Scriptures as of God, he has here an almost impregnable defence against many assailants; and he will feel a more thankful security in the assurance that though his faith does not stand in the wisdom of man, yet the troublers of his faith are met by doughty champions, who, with equal weapons and equal skill, meet and rebut his most mighty foes. It is a good book and a useful, for which, in the name of many readers, we render thanks to its writer.

The Mysteries of Christianity. Being the Baird Lecture for 1874. By T. J. Crawford, D.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons. 1874.

THE Baird Lectureship bids fair to realise the aim of its founder, and render valuable service to theology within the Church of Scotland. Most, if not all, the great theological lectureships have, on the whole, vindicated the pious intentions of their founders; and, taking the average of fruitful and unfruitful years, it has been clearly shown that the principle of such endowments is a sound

one. The Church of Scotland is not wanting in able and learned men, so that the prospects of the Baird Lectureship may be considered hopeful.

The present lecturer's aim is "to show that the mysteriousness of certain doctrines is not, in itself, considered any sufficient reason either for excluding them from the articles of the Christian faith, or for discrediting the Christian system on account of them, as unworthy of the Divine origin and authority assumed by it."

In entering upon his subject, the writer does not stay to examine the various senses in which the word *mystery* is used in Scripture. Its fundamental meaning is undoubtedly a *secret*: but generally in the New Testament the reference is to a secret told, or capable of being told. The term is thus applied to such matters as are inaccessible to reason, and can only be known through revelation; and again, in a slightly different sense, to matters that are patent facts, or, at all events, authoritatively affirmed, but the process of which cannot be entirely taken in by the reason. It is to this latter meaning that our ordinary usage approximates, and this is the sense in which the words *mystery* and *mysterious* are used throughout the book. In short the word is employed in its ordinary acceptation, rather than in its special New Testament sense. "By a *mystery*, in our present discussion, we understand some matter pertaining to the Divine character or procedure, which, even when revealed, is not fully comprehensible by us; something which is only revealed to us in *part*, and which, so far as it is unrevealed, transcends the limits of human knowledge." Hence the writer does not apply the term *mysterious* to any truth or doctrine revealed, but rather to the unrevealed reason, grounds, and explanations of it. With regard to such a truth as the assumption of human nature by the Son of God, that which is revealed it is improper to call a *mystery*, it is a *fact* set forth as an object of our faith; the manner or explanation of the fact is the *mystery*. How Divinity and humanity were united in the Saviour's Person, is *mysterious*, and is probably a question which, in the present state of our faculties, could not have been made plain to us. Thus the word *mystery* may be considered a relative term, having reference to the capacity or means of information possessed by those to whom it is a *mystery*. Many things are *mysterious* to a child which are not so to a grown person; many things are *mysterious* to our minds at present which may not—which, indeed, we are assured will not—be *mysterious* to us hereafter. A revealed doctrine may have *mystery* connected with it in such respects as the following:—from the profound, obscure, or transcendental nature of its subject, relatively to the finite compass of the human mind; or from the limited extent of its disclosures, as embracing only the reality of the things revealed, apart from the reasons, grounds, and explanations of them. Several other particulars are instanced, and it will be seen

at once that such considerations as those just named are very powerful, and may be employed with much practical effect, both in apologetics and in ordinary Christian teaching. Dr. Crawford applies these and other considerations in a very successful manner to the leading doctrines of the Christian faith, the Trinity, the Atonement, the work of the Holy Spirit, &c. He shows with much force that there is a broad distinction between a mysterious doctrine and an unintelligible statement. The latter cannot be reasonably believed, the former may. Unintelligible doctrines, or doctrines contrary to reason, are not presented to us in the Scriptures; on the other hand, the principal doctrines of the Christian faith, relating to matters of a deep and unsearchable nature, and affording only a partial knowledge of these matters, remain mysterious, however clearly they are set forth and however profoundly apprehended. The subject, thus briefly sketched, is worked out in a thorough and masterly manner. We have little expectation that a book of this sort, or indeed of any sort, will cure thorough-going scepticism, but it appears to us admirably fitted to forewarn and forearm its readers against a class of objections to Christianity that is being freely urged.

The Divine Glory of Christ. By the Rev. Charles J. Brown, D.D. London: The Religious Tract Society.

THIS little volume deals with the indirect or incidental testimonies of Scripture to the Divinity of Christ. There is nothing new in the general idea of the argument, but the writer claims for this species of evidence a more prominent place than has generally been assigned to it. It is possible, for instance, to show that the words of the Lord which obviously reveal His *character*, have an important bearing also—and none the less important because indirect and incidental—on the glory of the Saviour's *Person*. In such passages as "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink," compassion and mercifulness are not the only things to be discerned, but the assumption of power and ability far transcending all legitimate human claims. Every examination of the Lord's own language makes it a greater marvel how those who deny His Divinity, or leave it as an undetermined question, can say a single word respecting the beauty of His human character. Can they not see that His truthfulness, reverence, and humility are all at stake so long as there is any doubt whether He be the Son of God or no? Dr. Brown's chapters on this subject may be of service to minds disturbed in their belief, while they have a devotional value to Christian readers. One peculiarity we notice that would have been better away. In a book written with a controversial aim we are surprised to find a quotation from the Song of

Solomon referred, without comment or explanation, to the Lord Himself; thus: "The Lord Jesus offers no apology—never seems levelier in the eyes of His people than when saying, 'I am the Good Shepherd,' 'I am the Rose of Sharon,' 'I am meek and lowly in heart.'" What may be appropriate enough in a devotional work is not admissible in an argument such as the writer seeks to maintain.

Annus Domini: A Prayer for each Day of the Year, founded on a Text of Holy Scripture. By Christina G. Rossetti. Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1874.

A most devout and tender little book. The prayers are collects, each founded on a Scripture text, and addressed to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is pointed out that "as all the prayers are addressed to the Second Person in the blessed Trinity, they are intended only to be used as supplementary to other devotions." The prayers are characterised by much reverence, gravity, and sweetness. They are made to rise out of passages of Scripture in a way that suggests how much more use might be made of the Scripture in public and private devotions than is customary. How often would it relieve prayer from confusion and vagueness to take the keynotes of supplication and intercession given in the Bible, and let the strain of worship really flow from them. This is not the same thing as the mere quotation of Scripture in prayer, but a much more thoughtful and thorough religious exercise. How far devotions may be systematised and advantageously made the subject of preparation and discipline, is a question to be carefully considered. Against the possible evils of formality and constraint should be set the advantages resulting from a wider range of topics for meditation and prayer, and the completer training given to the devotional life. Miss Rossetti's little volume furnishes some exquisite examples of the way in which Scripture thought and phraseology may be turned to account in prayer; e.g., Deut. x. 18, "He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger in giving him food and raiment. O Lord Jesus Christ, who lovest the stranger, defend and nourish, I entreat Thee, all sojourners in strange lands and poor helpless persons, that they may glorify Thee out of grateful hearts; and to such men as are tyrannical and oppressive give searchings of heart and amendment of ways, that Thou mayest show mercy on them also. Amen."

With the exception of the language occasionally used in relation to the sacraments, we find nothing to object to; for the rest we have but the warmest commendation.

Daily Devotion ; or Prayers based on the Successive Portions of the New Testament as appointed in the New Lectionary. By Daniel Moore, M.A. London: Kerby and Endean. 1874.

THE plan of this book of prayers is simple and good. It is intended to assist the habit of praying the Holy Scriptures, as well as reading them. Each prayer gathers up the thoughts and employs the language of a portion of the New Testament. Many will derive assistance from it in the devotional reading of the Scriptures. Having gone through three previous editions, it is now altered and rearranged to conform with the order of the New Lectionary.

The Bards of the Bible. By George Gilfillan. Sixth Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1874.

It is nearly five-and-twenty years since this work appeared. It gained considerable popularity, and, along with the author's other writings, did something towards forming the taste and style of many of its younger readers. We imagine that the changes of the last few years in literary tone and taste will be against any considerable popularity of Mr. Gilfillan's works with the same class of readers in the present day. There will always be those, however, to whom his sturdy individuality, and glowing, high-coloured eloquence will be attractive.

A Treatise on Homiletics. By Daniel P. Kidder, D.D. With a Lecture on the plan of a Sermon. By William G. T. Shedd, D.D. Third Edition. London: Dickinson and Higham. 1873.

KIDDER'S *Homiletics* is now well known to theological students, if to no other class of readers. Most men preparing for the ministry might read it with advantage, if it be borne in mind that preaching cannot be taught by books, but that hints, and the pointing out of manifest faults and follies, are nearly all that is to be hoped for from a treatise of this kind.

The Preacher's Lantern. Vol. III. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1873.

The Study. Helps for Preachers from English, American, and Continental Sources. First Series. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1873.

THESE volumes belong to a class of literature which has rapidly increased of late years. The preacher finds help of so many kinds pressed upon him, that he will do well to remember the old

adage respecting the reward of those who help themselves. A young minister could hardly receive more serious injury than so far to yield to the seductions of helps and handbooks as to cease to be a student in the proper sense of the word. For men who are hard pressed with pulpit preparation—and in the earlier years of life in the ministry that is pretty sure to be the case—there are many lawful aids for lightening labour; only let him who uses them beware: there is a *facilis descensus* into the habit of living on others, from which the return to honest independence is very difficult. Neither of the works before us, however, need do its readers that ill service, and from either of them a student of theology, or minister, may derive pleasure and profit.

The Preacher's Lantern has completed its third annual volume—an indication of vitality—and fairly sustains its character. The principal contributors for the last year are Professor Van Oosterzee, translated by Mr. Maurice Evans, Mr. Jacox, the Rev. Paxton Hood, and the late Rev. Caleb Morris. There are some good papers on pastoral life and duty.

The Study draws largely from American sources. The names of Mr. Ward Beecher, Dr. Cheever, Professor Day, and Dr. Shedd will be familiar enough to most readers, and their contributions to this volume are characteristic of the writers. It includes papers on Christian evidences, on mental and moral philosophy, on exegesis, Scripture illustration, Christian literature, and practical Church work. It appears to us to deserve the attention of the class of readers it seeks, and to be likely to be of use to many.

The Philosophy of the Cross. By the Rev. Robert McCheyne Edgar, M.A., Dublin. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

WE cordially commend the plan of preaching "courses" of sermons. By such means only can the fulness of a subject be exhibited and the evils of unconnected and fragmentary preaching avoided; while to the aim of the individual discourse is added the definite and useful aim of leading a congregation to the steady and more prolonged contemplation of an entire subject of inquiry. These advantages are fairly illustrated in the volume before us. It is composed of a series of spiritual contemplations of the crucified Christ; the philosophical character of which is defined to be a showing "how the great fact has its outcome in human experience." The Cross is viewed as the centre of a circle whose circumference is described by the various conditions of human experience. Originating in controversy, and having an especial reference to sacramentarian error, which it judges to be based upon "misapprehensions about the object of faith," it nevertheless extends far beyond the bounds of a mere refutation of false opinions; the

author having seized the just view that the only effectual method of eradicating error is by implanting truth.

The reasoning of the whole is fair; the tone is reverent and spiritual; the style concise and easy, with an occasional depth of penetration and careful exposition. On the other hand, there is a want of thoroughness in dealing with some important topics, and a little straining after unity which betrays the author into feebleness; while the freedom of pulpit address endangers the closeness of the reasoning, and the condensation and compactness which belong to philosophical writing. Yet, as a practical exposition of the relation of the Cross of Christ to the various phases of the moral life of men, it is a worthy contribution to the religious literature of the day.

Les Albigeois et l'Inquisition. Par Napoléon Peyrat. Paris. 1872.

Origines, Développement et Disposition du Catharisme, après de nouvelles Recherches. Par Albert Réville. Paris. 1874.

THE destruction of the Albigenses is a standing reproach against Popery. Like the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, it is one of those terrible facts which no Jesuitry can explain away. But about the sect itself and its tenets few of us have any distinct idea; we class them with the Vandois, the followers of Peter Waldo—*pauvres de Lyon*, as they were also called, from the city where they were most numerous. This is a mistake. The Vandois were Protestants in the true sense of the word, combating Romish error and corruption, and asserting the superiority of charity and inward piety over the refinements of scholastic dogma. The Cathari (afterwards called Albigenses), though mainly called into being by the unbearable corruption of the Romish clergy, undoubtedly held metaphysical notions about God derived from the old Manichees. No doubt their "heresy" has been vastly exaggerated by Romanist writers, who have also accused them of gross profligacy, hoping thereby to palliate the horrors of their extirpation; and some of the more superficial English writers have, like Sir James Stephen (*Lectures on French History*), spoken of Languedoc as a second Canaan, courting destruction by its sins. But, all allowance made, it is clear that the Albigenses were technically "heretics." Professor Schmidt of Strasburg (*Histoire et Doctrine de la Secte des Catharis*) shows that their creed was a form of dualism. Some of them held that the principle of evil existed from all eternity; that it created the world, and indeed all matter; and that mortal souls are portions of the "heavenly light" seduced by the Evil One to come down upon earth. These souls God suffers to remain in our bodies

in order to punish them for straying from heaven. Thus the earth is a place of penance; and the work of Christ and of the Spirit is to recover these portions and reunite them to the Divine. From their nature the souls must ultimately return whence they came; to shorten the term of their banishment by bringing them back to Godliness God sent forth Christ, neither His body nor His sufferings being other than apparent. Their favourite book was St. John's Gospel; the Old Testament they held to be the work of Jehovah, a form of Satan. Another party looked on Satanael as a son of God, who, being turned out of heaven for rebellion, created man and woman, and by the latter became the father of Cain. God in pity gave men souls, and then sent His other Son Jesus into the world that men might sooner escape from Satanael's power. They will do so at last; and at the great end of all the wicked son of God will himself be restored to the bosom of the Father. Such seems to have been the doctrine of the Cathari. In practice they were divided into two classes—the *perfect* (or good men) and the mere *believers*.

The former might not fight, nor kill any creatures but reptiles; meat and milk were forbidden them; fish they might eat. Marriage was an unholy thing; it was of the flesh, and moreover it swelled the number of Satan's slaves. The latter lived much as other people, save that every now and then, and specially in their last illness, they received at the hands of one of the "perfect" the *consolamentum*, whereby "the Spirit" was imparted. This was a washing with water, accompanied by the prayer: "*Aies merce de l'esperit posat (positi) in carcer*" (Have pity on this spirit in prison). The rite was generally administered by a bishop, a very simple kind of personage, who, with his two deacons ("sons"), was always journeying from place to place. Like the Gnostics in earlier times, these Cathari were great adepts at concealing their opinions; they were allowed to do so in case of danger; and so they passed from castle to castle, strengthening the hearts of the people and making fresh converts, till their sect formed the majority in Southern France. We say "from castle to castle," because (as M. Peyrat well remarks) the strength of Catharism was among the Southern nobles; its whole system was aristocratic. This, with the sole exception of the Vandois, has always been the case with religious reforms in France; the smaller nobility were Huguenots; Port Royal had a special flavour of nobility. It was this beginning at the top and not from below which has been the weakness of French Protestantism.

Why did Dissent in Southern France take that particular form? There was the difference of race, of which M. Peyrat, who claims to be a descendant of the persecuted Cathari, perhaps makes too much. This was combined with hatred of the house of Capet, the steady foe to those communal liberties

of which the South was so justly proud. Arianism, too, the creed of the great Burgundian Kingdom, of the Lombards, and also of the Visigoths, had doubtless left in Languedoc a predisposition to Dissent. Above all, the quick-witted Provençals, less saturated than the people of the rest of France with German barbarism, and kept on the alert by the satires of the troubadours, were more scandalised than were others at the profligacy of the clergy. This accounts for the rapid growth of the "heresy;" Provence was ripe for new opinions; and Manicheism had been planted in Bulgaria by the Emperor Basil, who transported thither the Paulicians of Armenia. Thence, along the shores of the Adriatic, and by way of the trading cities of Italy, the new ideas made their way westward. As early as 1085 *Cathari* were found in Turin; and one of their names, *Paterini* (under which Walter Mapes describes the cruel treatment they underwent in England), is from *Pataria*, the rag-pickers' suburb in Milan. *Cathari*, by the way, is in Milanese *Gazari*, which the Germans corrupted into *ketzer*, their ordinary word for heretic. M. Réville thinks it hopeless to inquire by what channels *Catharism* made its way into France; we can, however, be certain that it came from the East, and that it found a soil prepared for it; the growing importance, too, of Satan in Mediæval theology was of itself something Manichean.

Catharism was at its height about 1167; then was held the Council of St. Felix de Aranan, at which appeared an heretical bishop, Nicetas, from Constantinople, who appears in the popular as "Pope Niquinta, who was coming to restore all things." Before Innocent III. preached his crusade, a swarm of Norman and Flemish nobles settled in the land. Raymond of Toulouse ("the Provençal Hamlet," M. Peyrat calls him, so constantly did he "let I dare not wait upon I would") was amused with the offer of terms, while Simon de Montfort and Arnaud the Legate pressed the siege of Béziers. Everyone knows the fearful story of its capture; the Legate's "*occidite omnes; Deus novit suos*," and the exulting words of Cæsar de Heigterbach in a letter to Innocent: "*Ultima Divina mirabiliter scievinte 20,000 hominum internecimus*." Carcassonne surrendered, and only 450 of its people were burnt alive. Peter of Arragon comes to the rescue, but De Montfort defeats and kills him at Muret. Toulouse opens its gates, and is partly burnt down; young Louis, son of Philip Augustus, who was at De Montfort's side, regretting that it was not wholly destroyed. Twice Toulouse rises, and the last time, after besieging it for nine months, De Montfort is killed by a stone thrown at him by a woman, in 1217, just thirty years before his son perishes at Evesham. He had, however, lived long enough to thoroughly ravage the South of France. That *côte rotie*, where the ravines, and dry watercourses, and towns and castles perched nest-like on

the tops of steep rocks, are so unlike anything else in France, has, in parts, not yet recovered the desolation then brought on it. Well might the troubadour sing :—

" Aï Tolosa e Provença, e la terra d'Agença,
Bezors e Carcassey, Quo vos vi! quo vos vey!"
(What I saw you; what I see you).

But the *Cathari* were not yet crushed. The Inquisition was set to work to unveil the subtlety with which they began to hide their opinions. Paid informers, keener of scent than the bloodhounds who were often employed to hunt the heretics, were encouraged; torture was freely used; every now and then batches were brought in from the villages and flung into the living grave of the *in pace*. Sometimes the intolerable cruelties were cruelly revenged; after a great burning at Lavaur, thirteen inquisitors, with their servants, were surprised and slain. At one time things looked brighter: Aragon and Castile were going to help, and the English were at Bordeaux. Louis IX. defeated the English at Tailleburg and Saintes, and the *Cathari* became a set of proscribed outlaws (*faidits*). Their last stand is at Montsegure on the Puy (truncated hill) of the same name near Carcassonne. No one should go to Pau without seeing this most remarkable hill. It was the fastness of the old family of Belissen. Mirepoix (kinsmen of the Celtic goddess Belisau or Melisendra), warriors, troubadours, chiefs of the *Cathari*, had all sprung from this stock. It has produced, too, many remarkable women: Viscountess Esclarmonda, for instance, was a very saint in piety and charity, and as wise as she was saintly. The hill was like a rabbit-warren, full of subterranean ways, by which, during the siege, news came in from the outside; news, but not help. The Count of Toulouse was away in Calabria, hunting with that much over-rated prince the Emperor Frederic II. The besiegers built a vast "cat" (as those moveable towers were called), pushed it slowly forward, and at last, from its summit, poured over the wall. All the clergy of the *Cathari*, over 200 in number, were burned in a vast pile outside the place, the spectators singing *Veni Creator Spiritus*! The laymen were walled up in prison at Carcassonne. The last act of all is the search in the cavern of Ornolac (now Lombrives) near Tarascon. Here the miserable remnants of the *Cathari* had taken refuge. They were tracked out, and the mouth of the cave was built up and watched till all inside was quiet. Heaps of bones (covered with stalagmite, "as if," says M. Réville, "the mountain had, with its stony tears, woven a winding-sheet for its dead") are found inside. Some have mistaken them for prehistoric remains; indeed, M. Réville thinks many of the "prehistoric caves" of Southern France were only places where the *Cathari* took refuge. After this the Inquisition worked unaided: *Catharism* died out, being merged in the

Vaudois and other growing faiths, or in that sorcery which was so rife in Mediæval France, and which must have appeared a "reasonable faith" to those whom "holy Church" treated in such a fiendly way. *Catharism* was ruined; but the Papacy never recovered the shock which its cruelty had given to men's consciences.

A faith based on dualism cannot stand; it must become ascetic, must discredit marriage, &c., and therefore it must have two sets of rules: one for the many, whom it is content to leave "in corruption;" another for the perfect few. Christianity has but one morality for all. Further, *Catharism* was, in its way, just as sacerdotal as Catholicism; the constant intervention of the priest was necessary, though the value of his ministrations was made to depend, not on "his indelible orders," but on his personal piety. But, in spite of these weaknesses, *Catharism*, the faith of these unhappy Albigenses, deserves our sympathy. It clung to the idea of sonship with God; it brought out fully the grand truth (so lost sight of amid Mediæval intercessionism) of the working of the Holy Spirit. No doubt it modified, if it did not originally call forth, the Franciscans, those noble opponents of the cruel Dominicans, whom some one calls "the Methodists of the thirteenth century." One of the most celebrated of them, Delicieux, was a *Catharus* in all but name. Politically speaking, the existence of *Catharism* was an evil; Southern France had to be welded to the rest of the nation, and the welding was cruelly done because of this pretext of "heresy;" but, from a religious point of view, we must always be thankful that God left Himself not without witness even in the darkest of Papal times. It is well now and then to be reminded how dark they were, and how fearful the cruelties which went on amid the darkness.

II. GENERAL LITERATURE.

A History of Greece. By the Rev. G. W. Cox, M.A. Vols. I. and II. from the Earliest Period to the End of the Peloponnesian War. London: Longmans. 1874.

It might have appeared, at the first sight, doubtful whether a place could be justly found for a new history of Greece. The work of the venerable Bishop of St. David's will never be antiquated so long as the judicial sobriety of a statesman, and the accurate knowledge of a most accomplished scholar find their fitting honour. Mr. Grote's extensive learning, political experience, and enthusiastic sympathy with the free life of a democracy will long give his history the character of a fully adequate exposition of at least one side of the life of Hellas. And if any deficiencies are left to be supplied—partly from Grote's more imperfect familiarity with the artistic side of Hellenic genius—partly from the light which later researches, especially in Germany, have cast upon some of the more obscure periods of the history—these are well filled up by the work which gives incontestably the most complete picture of ancient Greece in all its aspects now accessible to the student, the masterly volumes of Ernest Curtius. But Mr. Cox has taken up a line which assures to his book a place of its own in the library of the scholar, by the side of its greater rivals. Of the scholar, we say intentionally;—for so far as the general reader is concerned, we should regard it as a matter to be greatly regretted, if it were to be considered as in any way replacing Thirlwall, Grote, or Curtius. Its merits and its defects appear to us to have almost an equal share in rendering it unfit to be *the* English history of Greece.

The distinctive characteristics of Mr. Cox's work are two in number; first, the application of what he considers to be the ascertained results of comparative mythology to the disproof of all attempts at extracting history from early traditions, however plausible and wide-spread; and second, the study of the chief historical authorities for the period, with which he deals in a spirit of acute and unsparing scepticism. The thorough-going manner in which Mr. Cox has carried out his principles gives considerable interest to these two volumes in the eyes of scholars; the exaggeration which, to the best of our judgment, marks his conclusions, makes them very untrustworthy guides to learners. In the first place the "solar myth" hypothesis is pushed to an extent, which will certainly go very far to blind sober students to the

truths which may really be discovered by the more moderate application of it. What can be the meaning of a passage like the following?—"The Argive, again, is but a sojourner in the realm of Aphrodite Argynnis or Argennoe the favourite of Agamemnon, or of Arjuna the brilliant, the comrade of Krishna in whom we have seen the counterpart of the Hellenic Kephalos; and his name is but another form of that of the Arkadians, which reappears not only in the name of the wonderful ship Argo, but in the Greek Arktouros, the Latin Ursa and Ursula, the queen of the eleven thousand virgins, the goddess of the Hieselberg."

Does Mr. Cox mean to say that because Argos and Arkas may possibly both contain the root *arg*, "bright," therefore all traditional accounts of Argos and Arcadia are to be referred to the shadowy region tenanted by the children of the light? Or is it rather that the traditions of the history of the town of Argos have become so inextricably interpenetrated with myths whose only basis is a popular interpretation of the name,* that historical science now is utterly unable to distinguish them? But in order to lend the slightest probability to such a theory, it is needful that we should find some indications of a tendency to connect the etymology of the tribal names which Mr. Cox presses so readily into his service with that of the various roots which signify light. Popular etymologising has wrought some strange freaks are now with names of persons and places; but it is rash work assuming that in almost every case this tendency has been at work. Again and again in reading Mr. Cox's earlier chapters, as in the study of the "Mythology of the Aryan Nations," on which they are founded, we have been reminded of Hesiod's line—

οὐρανὸς οὐκ ἴσασιν θεῶν πλεόν ἤμους πάντας.

For instance, the origin of the connection of Phoibos with Lykia is irresistibly self-evident, so soon as we think of his epithet "Lykegenes," child of the light; we see why a country, which, whatever the real origin of its name, could so easily be regarded as "the country of light," should be held to be closely connected with the true God. But surely the force of the argument is indefinitely weakened rather than strengthened, when we are told to find in Athenians worshippers of the dawn, and in Ionians men who had come from the violet land of the morning (the metathesized digamma in *ἄφωρος* does not trouble Mr. Cox†), where also the Phœnicians had their dwellings in the purple regions of the East.

* Mr. Cox's Index refers to this passage under the heading "Argives, the meaning of:" but we cannot suppose that he means hereby that the name had originally anything to do with "light:" this would indeed be a daring defiance of all sound philology and common sense alike.

† Philology is not Mr. Cox's strong point. His assertion that in Phœnix we have the root "freeze" (Grimm and all his laws notwithstanding!) is quite an

But even if we were to allow to the extreme advocates of the "solar myth" hypothesis all that they would claim—even if we were to grant that the name Argos, for instance, which properly denotes "a plain," was so confused in the minds of the Greeks with a similar root denoting brightness, that numberless legends arising in the stories of the struggles between light and darkness were unsuspectingly transferred to the Argives and incorporated in their traditional history,—still this concession would be very far from justifying Mr. Cox's procedure. Allowing the widest range to the etymologising of this school, still there are many traditions belonging to nations whose names cannot be in any way linked with light or darkness, with the "rosy blush of the dawn," or "the purple light of the gloaming." How are we to deal with these? Comparative mythologists are apt to treat them in a manner which looks to us much like a *hysteron proteron*. We are told, for instance, that the dawn is figured as a beautiful maiden carried off by the demons of darkness appearing as storm-clouds, and delivered at the close of the day when the shafts of the sun-god have slain her foes. And then we are bidden to see in every legend of a captive and rescued princess a distortion of a "solar myth." But we may ask, with all due deference, whence was it that the early "Aryans" (to use a word whose right of existence is at best but problematical) got this notion of representing the dawn's disappearance and reappearance under the figure of a captive maiden? Surely from their knowledge of the occurrence of such rapes and rescues within their own experience. Why then are we to assume it to be necessary in all cases that the legend should traverse the heavenly cycle before it could be applied to things of earth? Whatever may be the ultimate verdict of historical science on the residuum of truth to be discovered from the analysis of early Hellenic legends, we are persuaded of two things, first, that the "solar myth" hypothesis is very perverse, being the magic key to open every lock, and secondly, that a careful study of customs, institutions, proper names, and national characteristics, as they are found to exist at the dawn of contemporary historical evidence, will show us many firm stand-points and finger-posts in what some historians would have us believe to be an ever-shifting and trackless desert.

We have dwelt at such length on what is perhaps the most

a par with the statement, "The philological identity of the names Hellen, Hellas, &c., and of all these with Helios, Elios, and the Latin Sol is not disputed." Professor George Curtius is not an authority whom most would be willing to ignore. Mr. Cox wisely leaves M. de Coulanges responsible for the derivation of the Roman Curia from *curiæ*, a band of (*κοῦρες*) sons. But he is himself not less pre-scientific in his note on *Pompeiius* and *Pontifex* in Vol. I. p. 74.

novel point in Mr. Cox's volumes, that we have but little space to touch upon their second principal characteristic. But to this we are disposed to ascribe much more value. It is certainly a service done to scholarship to examine with the utmost severity the narratives of Herodotus and Thucydides; and this work Mr. Cox has done very thoroughly. Wherever there are inherent improbabilities in the story as our authority tells it us, wherever his means of ascertaining the truth were likely to have been inadequate, or his motives for distorting or concealing it powerful, then Mr. Cox's acuteness at once detects the flaw. That his suspiciousness often should exceed his sobriety of judgment is to be expected from the nature of the case; the *advocatus diaboli* is not the one to whom we should look for an impartial summing-up. No student of the Persian or the Peloponnesian war will be able henceforward to feel that he is master of all that is to be said on the question until he has read and weighed what Mr. Cox has written upon it. But we shall be much surprised if the general verdict of scholars accepts the results of his destructive criticism. To take but one instance, we cannot believe it possible that historical science will rest, as Mr. Cox does, content with pointing out the dramatic and legendary element in the account which Herodotus gives us of Kroisos, and will make no satisfactory endeavour to discriminate the purely romantic portion from the kernel of truth around which, according to all analogy, it has grown up. Still less can we believe that it will see in the traditional wish of Kyros to sacrifice the defeated monarch by fire, simply a distorted solar myth.

If we have felt ourselves obliged to express an adverse judgment on the distinctive characteristics of Mr. Cox's book, this certainly cannot be modified by a consideration of its general features. We are bound to say that so far from embodying in a moderate compass the results of modern research, nothing is more conspicuous than the narrow range within which Mr. Cox's studies seem to have been confined. In a manner which is neither generous nor candid he speaks of his own plan of furnishing references for verifying or refuting his conclusion, as essentially different from that of Dr. Curtius. We venture to say that a student desirous of working out any question for himself will find vastly more valuable help supplied him in the references with which, in the later volumes especially, Dr. Curtius's history abounds, than in the singularly meagre assistance which Mr. Cox's margin offers. Quotations from "The Mythology of the Aryan nations" are numerous; and occasional references are given to Sir G. C. Lewis's writings; but with these exceptions the authorities quoted in the notes appear to be almost wholly limited to Grote's History and the passages from the most familiar classical writers which have long become the common property of all historians. On

topography, chronology, numismatics, inscriptions, and the countless questions of detail that are constantly presenting themselves, the most recent discussions, English and foreign alike, are simply ignored. Mr. Cox has apparently made the mistake of supposing that the amount of knowledge which would enable a writer to produce one or two suggestive articles on certain aspects of the history of a nation entitles him to attempt the very different task of depicting the entire national life. If, instead of ignoring throughout the splendid work of Professor Curtius, Mr. Cox had caught something of the spirit of his method, we might have had to wait much longer for his *History of Greece*, but it would have been a very different, and, we may venture to add, a much more durable production.

The Poems and Fragments of Catullus. Translated in the Metres of the Original, by Robinson Ellis, Professor of Latin in University College, London. London: Murray. 1871.

PROFESSOR ROBINSON ELLIS, in his version of the poems of Catullus, has ventured on an experiment of very great interest. Many attempts have been made to naturalise the classical metres, especially the hexameter, "the strong-winged music of Homer," but hitherto with extremely doubtful success. For the most part writers contented themselves with simply applying the laws which guided the quantitative verse of the ancients to our own purely accentual verse: all accented syllables were reckoned as long, all unaccented syllables short; and, in consequence, we were asked in a line such as Longfellow's—

"This is the forest primæval: the murmuring pines and the hemlocks,"

to recognise a vowel as short, even though four consonants came between it and the next ensuing. Or we get such spondees as those which even Mr. Matthew Arnold gives us in the line beginning—

"To the camp of the Greeks."

Verse written in such a fashion as this could only be forced into even the semblance of Homeric hexameters by an artificial and laboured pronunciation, which deprived it of all natural charm; and even then it sounded more like a barbarous parody than a tuneful echo of that which it was intended to reproduce. Or if, as in some of the attempts of the Elizabethan poets—notably of Sir Philip Sidney—the strictest rules of classical quantity were observed, no attempt was made to reconcile them with the laws of English accent. There is little or no fault to be found from the point of view of quantity in lines such as—

Nurse inward maladies, which have not scope to be breath'd out,

but the misplaced accent of the second and third words is quite enough to make them grate terribly on English ears. Mr. Ellis for almost the first time in English verse—although we are surprised that he ignores Mr. Cayley's very noteworthy hexameters in quantity—has endeavoured to meet at the same time the requirements of classical and of English metre. Every word is allowed to have its natural English accent; and yet (with few and pardonable exceptions) no unaccented syllable is allowed to stand as short, unless it is really so, when judged by the standard of quantity. The task which the translator has thus set himself must have been one of immense difficulty; but it has been discharged with at least a very fair measure of success.

More than this cannot be said. All that a consummate knowledge of the author, and a ready command of a singularly extensive vocabulary could do to reproduce Catullus for us, has been done by Mr. Ellis. Occasionally we find little pieces rendered as perfectly as we can ever hope or even wish. But more frequently the fetters in which the translator has been working have left too evident traces of this cramping effect on his work. The one quality which of all others we can least dispense with in a version of Catullus is simple and graceful directness; and Mr. Ellis's version is far too often plainly artificial, laboured, and involved. We have too often in the place of the frank outburst of passion or the lightsome play of wit, which unite to make Catullus the Burns of Rome, a marvellous *tour de force*, which leaves no other impression so strong as that of wonder at its ingenuity. This is perhaps especially conspicuous in the *Atys*. It must have required incalculable skill and patience to elaborate so faithful a reproduction of the original; and yet we seriously doubt whether the English reader would gather from it so true an idea of the spirit of that unique poem as from Mr. Theodore Martin's far less literal version. We may notice in passing an instance in the fifth line in which, led apparently by the necessities of metre, Mr. Ellis has used language that singularly fails to convey the meaning of the original, or, indeed, any meaning whatever.

It is much to be regretted that Mr. Ellis's enthusiasm for his author has led him to translate the whole of the poems. No small number of the smaller pieces are of a revolting coarseness, which is a little disguised, but by no means removed, in translation. The present dainty little volume would have been much more welcome if it had contained a version of only those poems included in the charming selection of the Clarendon Press series, so fitly introduced by the words "*aliud est odorem noscere præsepis, aliud in sterquilinio volutari.*"

***The French Revolution and First Empire.* An Historical Sketch. By William O'Connor Morris. London: Longmans. 1874.**

MR. MORRIS informs us that his volume was prepared with a view to publication in the series projected by Messrs. Longmans under the title "Epochs of History." Not exactly falling in, however, with the design of the general editor, it has been issued separately. Traces of this origin are evident throughout the volume, which has too largely the character of an "abridgment for the use of schools." Bare enumeration of facts, too dry and colourless to impress the reader, occupies space which had better have been given to a fuller exposition and more vivid illustration of the great principles at work in the Revolution. Mr. Morris shows that he is quite able to see and exhibit the broader aspects and deeper sources of events, and he has done this with more success than any work of moderate length with which we are acquainted that deals with the same epoch. His sketch, though briefer, is, in valuable information, really fuller than the dull Abridgment of Alison, while the party-leanings of the writer are far less prominent. The period of the French Revolution, so crowded with striking events and dramatic situations, so varied, terrible, and brilliant, is one peculiarly difficult to exhibit as a duly proportioned and accurately connected whole. Mr. Morris would have made a nearer approach to executing the task if he had worked from the first with more regard to the needs of the general public and less to those of young students; but as it is, he has produced a very useful outline of a history that must always attract many readers, and a valuable introduction to the study of the larger and more minute works on the last great age of destruction and origination in European society. Considering the speed at which the writer is compelled to pass over his immense field, the impression produced is strong and clear, while the style, though at times somewhat inaccurate, is fluent and pleasing. Two historical maps and several lists of authorities, critics, &c., add considerably to the value of the book.

***Bothwell.* A Tragedy. By Charles Algernon Swinburne. Chatto and Windus. 1874.**

HITHERTO Mr. Swinburne has written little that could be reviewed in our pages. His *Poems and Ballads* were best left unnoticed; to criticise poetry of that kind is to call attention to what all sane men would wish to keep for ever out of mind as well as out of sight. The *Songs before Sunrise*, in which he hailed the dawn of

intellectual and political freedom in Italy, contained some glorious passages, notably that ending with

"And the dove of his worship a raven,
And a leopard his life-giving lamb,"

wherein he characterised the Papacy, its utter hollowness, its delusive pretensions; but they were not enough to atone for the gross pruriency of his former work. *Chastelard*, too, the prelude to *Bothwell* (for the present huge volume of 582 pages is but the central piece of a trilogy) bore traces of the same lubricity which ran riot in the *Poems and Ballads*. But *Bothwell* is at least pure; and, being so, we hail it as an omen that the poet has awakened to better things. Of the rank which it will take in our literature we will make no prophecy; indeed, to thoroughly appreciate such a poem, with its portentous acts of twenty and more scenes, its scenes of forty pages, its enormous monologues—that of Knox longer than most sermons—and its two columns of characters, would need far more careful reading than we have as yet had time to bestow. It is not a play; it is what the poet calls it, in the introductory verses (in French) appropriately addressed to Victor Hugo, author of *Hernani* and *Les Burgraves*, an epic drama; and it well deserves to be described in his own words as—

"Plein de tumulte et de flamme,
Oh vibre un siècle éteint, oh flotte un jour qui fuit."

Mary herself and Herries are the representatives of Popery, the former in its bad corrupting tendencies, the latter in its noblest aspects. Darnley's loathsome unmanliness and wretched vacillation are set off by Morton's cruel Iago-like stanchness and Bothwell's coarse selfish ambition. Everybody whom the history of the two fatal years speaks of is introduced, down even to Fauldenside, who held the pistol to Mary's breast while Rizzio was being killed, and Hay of Talla, who, while helping to prepare the catastrophe at the Kirk o' Field, talks of her heart as being stouter than his own, in that "she can sleep with next night's dead man overhead." Indeed, the play is a complete history, and may be read as such, rather than an historical drama; it gives us not (as other historical plays) a few trees here and there, but the whole tangled wood. Yet, amid the tangle, individual character is wonderfully preserved and forcibly delineated.

Mary, in all her varying moods, is, of course, the central figure. She is exactly Mr. Froude's "beautiful panther" (stolen from Shelley's "a pard-like spirit, beautiful and swift"), herself incapable of real lasting love. Though ready for a passing whim to sacrifice name and fame, she is yet able to inspire the wildest passion in anyone on whom she lavishes her temporary affection.

Scotland and its people she hates ; here is one out of the many signs of her feeling in that respect :—

“How bitter black the day grows ! one would swear
The weather and earth were of this people’s faith,
And their heaven obscure as their thoughts of heaven,
Their light made of their love.”

Sometimes she sees for a brief moment the joy of calm and the blessedness of humble innocence ; to Rizzio, with whom, if with anyone, she would speak truth, she says :—

“I could be glad and good
Living so low, with little labours set
And little sleeps and watches ; night and day
Falling and flowing as small waves in low sea
From shine to shadow and back, and out and in
Among the friths and reaches of low life ;
I would I were away and well. No more,—
For dear love, talk no more of policy.
Let France, and faith, and envy, and England be,
And kingdom go, and people ; I had rather rest
Quiet for all my simple space of life,
With few friends’ loves closing my life-days in,
And few things known, and grace of humble ways,
A loving little life of sweet small works.
Good faith, I was not made for other life.”

Mary idly wished for lowly comfort, as Balaam idly wished to die the death of the righteous. But her active principle throughout is revenge. On this tune she is never tired of peeling out variations. What she will do when she gets her foes into her power is the burden of every long speech ; no wonder she made those foes at last implacable. Just as in her grandson’s case, Cromwell and the rest felt he or they must perish, so anyone who had offended her became perforce her deadly enemy.

Standing by the boat that is to take her to England, she says :—

“If I live,—
If God pluck not all life out of my hand—
If aught of all mine prosper, I that go
Shall come back to men’s ruin as a flame
The wind bears down, that grows against the wind,
And grasps it with great hands, and wins its way,
And wins its will, and triumphs ; so shall I
Let loose the fire of all my heart to feed
On those that would have quenched it.

“I will leave
No living soul of their blaspheming faith
Who war with monarchs ; God shall see me reign,
And He shall reign beside me. . . . I will set
Those old things of His holiness on high
That are brought low, and break beneath my feet
Those new things of men’s fashion. I will sit
And see tears flow from eyes that saw me weep.”

Revenge and a furious love of Popery are the feelings which inspire her. Besides these, there is her boundless treachery. When she leaves Darnley to his death in the Kirk o' Field, she says :—

“ I charge you on my love,
Sleep sound for my sake.”

When those who are laying the train stumble and make a noise she feels just one pang, like Medea just before she slays her sons :—

“ Ah ! my heart —
It wrings me here in passing ; pardon me.”

But she soon recovers, and says to her wretched husband—

“ We must part ;
Keep with this kiss this ring again for me
Till I shall ask it of you ; and good night.”

There is nothing in *Æschylus* more terrible than the whole scene ; it forcibly recalls Clytemnestra's welcome to Agamemnon.

The closing lines of the scene (act ii. sc. 21), in which Darnley foresees his doom—

“ Would'st thou think
She set this ring at parting on my hand,
And to my lips her lips ? and then she spake
Words of that last year's slaughter. O ! God, God,
I know not if it be not of Thy will,
My heart begins to pass into her heart,
Mine eye to read within her eye, and find
Therein a deadlier scripture——”

is exceedingly powerful.

Very powerful, too, is the contrast between Herries, the stout Romanist but still stouter Royalist, and Knox.

Herries well characterises the levelling spirit which was loosed at the Reformation :—

“ . . . As a wolf, an hungred and awaked,
That long hath slept and starved with foodless dreams,
Assuaging its fangs through bloodless hours,—
The common people that in damp den rest
With heartless hopes assuaging its blind heart,
Hath fed for ages on itself asleep,—
Shows now the keen teeth and the kindled eyes
Of ravening heads innumerable, that gape
And glare about the wide ways of the world,
Seeking their meat of God ; and if He fail,
Then of the devil that burns in minds of men
Rebellious. . . . Hath not Knox
Struck with his fangs of speech monarchy,
No less than the Church that first was stung,
Preaching for all men knowledge equally,

And prostitute and perilous freedom shared
 With all blear-eyes, brute mouths, and unwashed hands
 That lust for change, and take all fires for light
 Except the sun's, wherein their fathers walked?"

If Mary is taken away, the sea-wall will be breached which keeps out all this flood of wild democracy.

Knox, in a very long speech to the Edinburgh people (act iv. sc. 7), is, of course, bitter on the other side. Mary's conduct is the condemnation of the creed which she professes; by its fruits it is known:—

"If the Mass
 Hath brought forth innocent fruit, and in this land
 Wherein she came to 'stablish it again
 With 'stablished peace, with honour—If in her
 It hath been found no seed of shame, and she
 That loved and served it seems now in men's sight
 No hateful thing and fearful . . .
 Then have I sinned."

His whole speech is grand, and much more natural, though of course far less dramatic, than had it been tersely given. He speaks as John Knox spoke—so do the others; and thus we get long monologues reminding us of the speeches in the *Iliad*. In some respects the book may be compared with *Paradise Lost*. For those who will read with eyes open there are treasures ever new. But Mr. Swinburne must be content with that "fit audience though few" which Milton foresaw. Not even the excitement of passages like Darnley's horrible dream (told to his man Nelson in the Kirk o' Field) will carry ordinary readers through these 500 pages, though that one passage of itself is enough to make the reputation of an ordinary poet. The songs, French and English, are of course musically perfect. Here is an exquisite imitation of old Ronsard:—

"Qui se fie
 A la vie
 A vau-l'eau va vers la mort;
 Et que l'onde
 Rie ou gronde,
 Elle entraîne loin du port."

But we must conclude. Our main object in noticing *Bothwell* has been to note the happy change in Mr. Swinburne's style. His aim is to show that "sorrow tracketh wrong, as echo follows song," and he keeps this aim steadily before him. Nemesis, swift and pitiless, is working through every scene from beginning to end. "There is no peace to the wicked" was never more terribly illustrated than in these scenes, so full of wild action, so lurid with the light of coming vengeance. Mr. Swinburne's hardest task is before him. At the close of this book Mary crosses the

Solway with Mary Banton, "whose whole life's love went down" into Chastelard's grave, and who lives that by-and-by she may sate her hatred by gloating over her mistress's death. In *Mary in Prison* the poet will have little temptation to his old sin. We do trust that henceforth he will always be kept from it.

Mary and Charles Lamb. Poems, Letters, and Remains, now first collected, with Reminiscences and Notes by W. Carew Hazlitt. With Portrait, and Numerous Facsimiles and Illustrations of their Favourite Haunts in London and the Suburbs. London: Chatto and Windus. 1874.

THERE are two or three of the painters of to-day who are fond of taking, as subjects for their pictures, some incident in the lives of the great painters of old. It is a dangerous practice. The suggested comparison is generally too damaging. And similarly there is, or so it seems to us, a kind of temerity in any writer of average literary gifts writing a book on Charles Lamb, and thus bringing his own work—for extracts are, of course, inevitable—into juxtaposition with that of the master. It were no easy task, indeed, to furnish an adequate setting for those gems of genial humour, quaint fancy, and delicate pathos. We have no wish to be hard upon Mr. Hazlitt. Amid much in his book that is nearly worthless, and partakes somewhat of the nature of antiquarian lumber, he has rescued from oblivion a series of Mary Lamb's letters, which are of great value, both intrinsically and from the light they throw upon her own and her brother's mode of life. But we confess to a sense of incongruity, a feeling that there has been some mistake of vocation, when we meet with such passages as the following, coming from the pen of a commentator on the works of the kindly playful humourist, whom Coleridge called his "gentle Charles:" "The mischief was done from a desire to present Lamb before a generation which had not known him as they knew him, in a light which was not a true one; and for this purpose they"—Mr. Hazlitt is speaking of Lamb's previous biographers—"did not scruple to tamper with the man's correspondence, and to put a figure of wax of their own fashioning in the place of the real flesh and blood. Lamb was deranged once or twice in the course of his life; but this was to be glozed over at any cost. Lamb partook freely of beer and spirits; but this was to be flatly contradicted. Lamb used strong expletives; but this was not to be allowed to appear anywhere. What was the object? it may be inquired. Perhaps, reverence for the memory of Lamb. Was it not, rather, half-heartedness, egotism, effeminate prudery? Was it not a solicitude to exhibit the man in as elegant an aspect as might be, for fear the world should be scandalised at the notion

of gentlemen of position associating on intimate terms with a person who quaffed porter out of a pewter pot and interlarded his discourse with profane expressions?" These be the amenities of literature! And we own it does seem a little hard to be thus pilloried, for accusing one's friend of the terrible offences of being sane and temperate—especially as neither Talfourd nor Barry Cornwall had laid any stress whatever on Lamb's sobriety, and the former had distinctly asserted that he was at one time under restraint.*

But to turn to the contents of the book before us. They consist of some seventy pages of letters, written by Mary Lamb to Mr. Hazlitt's grandmother, for the most part; of some of her poetry for children; of a graceful paper of "Recollections of Mr. Lamb" by Mrs. Cowden Clarke, reprinted from the *National Magazine*; of some one hundred pages of "New Illustrations" of the life and character of Charles Lamb, of some sixty pages of "Inedited Remains;" of an appendix, containing a catalogue of books which had belonged to Charles Lamb, and were advertised as for sale by a bookseller in New York; and, finally, of a paper by Mr. Curtis, reprinted from the *New York Magazine*, and containing a series of unimportant notes from Lamb to a Mr. Thomas Allsop.

Of these, the only portion that need detain us is Mary Lamb's correspondence; for the "Inedited Remains" were, for the most part, hardly worth editing. It is doing Lamb and his memory no honour to reprint everything that fell from his pen; and Mr. Hazlitt will, we hope, forgive us for so far differing from him as to say that the humourist's life and character have been—well, better illustrated before.

But the letters of Mary Lamb—the "fine brain," as Leigh Hunt called her—these were worth rescuing from the pages of *Macmillan's Magazine*, in which they had before been ephemerally published. "She had a mind at once nobly toned and practical," is the felicitous saying of Mrs. Cowden Clarke, and the letters bear this out to the full. They are simple, easy, full of a genial social tolerance, and of shrewd observation, as when she says, "My brother, who never makes up his mind whether he will be a miser or a spendthrift, is at all times a strange mixture of both." They give us glimpses, more vivid than anything hitherto published, into the daily life of that gifted couple, so pathetically, tenderly united in a common love and sorrow, and over whom the "madness cloud" rested so perpetually. "Do not say anything, when you write, of our low spirits," she says; "it will vex Charles. You would laugh, or you would cry, perhaps both, to see us sit

* These are the words in which the fact is "glozed over": "There was a tendency to insanity in his family, which had been more than once developed in his sister; and it was no matter of surprise that in the dreariness of his solitude it fell upon him, and that, at the close of the year, he was subjected for a few weeks to the 'restraint of the insane,'" &c.

together, looking at each other with long and rueful faces, and saying, 'How do you do?' and 'how do you do?' and then we fall a crying, and say we will be better on the morrow. He says we are like toothache, and his friend gumboil—whieh, though a kind of ease, is but an uneasy kind of ease, a comfort of rather an uncomfortable sort."

Again she shows us her brother Charles in the act of composition, as it were,—and the night may well cheer such of his humbler brethren of the pen as may suffer from occasional fits of nervous inability to express their thoughts. Now he is hiring a separate lodging at 8s. a week, because he cannot write at home. Now he is ensconced in a commodious garret, so that he may be free from interruption, and at first is "quite delighted with his new acquisition; but, in a few hours, comes down again with a sadly dismal face. He could do nothing, he said, with those bare white-washed walls before his eyes. He could not write in that dull, unfurnished prison." And now, again, we watch the pair composing the *Tales from Shakespeare*. "You would like to see us, as we often sit writing on one table (but not on one cushion sitting), like Hermia and Helena in the 'Midsummer Night's Dream;' or, rather, like an old literary Darby and Joan: I taking snuff, and he groaning all the while, and saying he can make nothing of it, which he always says till he has finished, and then he finds out that he *has* made something of it."

Like to see them! Do we *not* see them, and is not the pleasant picture sketched with a graceful and tender hand? These letters are a treasure-trove indeed. As we read them, we almost retract what we have said of the other portions of Mr. Hazlitt's volume.

The Prose Works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. "Outre-Mer," "Hyperion," "Kavanagh," "The Poets and Poetry of Europe," "Essays," etc. Edited, with an Introduction, by the Author of "Tennysonianism." Illustrated by Valentine W. Bromley. London: Chatto and Windus (Successors to John Camden Hotten).

ALTHOUGH the prose works of Longfellow can scarcely be said to stand on the very high level of popularity whereon his poetry stands, his two contributions to prose fiction are certainly very popular, and also highly worthy of popularity. Both *Hyperion* and *Kavanagh* may be said to confer as much distinction on their author among the fictionists of America as his many volumes of verse confer upon him among the poets; and if the *quasi-fiction* *Outre-Mer* is less interesting than these to story-readers, it is more interesting to those who esteem the author as an admirable critic. In truth, the narrative element in *Outre-Mer* is but meagre; and the work is really complementary to the more important *Poets and Poetry of Europe*, stated by the editor of the present volume to be now pub-

lished in England for the first time. We presume our old familiarity with the work was acquired from some American copy; but whether this is its first appearance here or not, the numberless admirers of Longfellow—and, indeed, the reading world at large, owe the publishers their thanks for a collection, as full as the present, of that author's works in prose. We are very glad to see the small collection of essays entitled *Driftwood* added to the series; and still more so to meet with the two chapters of *Outre-Mer* which have been omitted from every edition since the first. These are the chapters on "Old English Prose Romances" and that entitled "The Defence of Poetry," which both appeared in the two volumes published by Bentley in 1835, without any author's name—simply as *Outre-Mer; or, a Pilgrimage to the Old World. By an American*. They are important chapters as a part of Longfellow's agreeable and instructive critical repertory; and we hope that, now Messrs. Chatto and Windus have done the good service of restoring them to their proper place, they will meet with a fair share of attention from our hurrying reading world, which can scarcely find time to read sterling books, so taken up is it with what we may call the humbler literature of the next generation. Whatever we find in Longfellow is wholesome and manly. He is not one of the strongest writers of America; but he has certainly been, and still is, one of the best influences in modern literature. Rising occasionally to great height in poetry, he has still not, as a rule, conformed to the highest standard; but, in the quiet level along which he has worked, he has been always pure and sweet, and has taught to thousands what it is to admire poetry when the same thousands might never have learnt this had the guild of poets been made up wholly of Miltons and Shelleys and Tennysons.

A History of Booksellers, the Old and the New. By Henry Curwen. With Portraits and Illustrations: London: Chatto and Windus, Publishers (Successors to John Camden Hotten).

"In these days," says Mr. Thomas Carlyle, "ten ordinary histories of kings and courtiers were well exchanged for one good history of booksellers." Mr. Curwen has set this saying as a motto in the fore-front of his book, presumably to disarm at once any criticism adverse to the existence of such a book. But in the first place, for the motto to be appropriate, it must be assumed that the book is a good one; and in the second place, the words of the Chelsea *literatus* may be so read as not to set any very great store by even a good history of booksellers; for, of a truth, "ten ordinary histories of kings and courtiers," such as one meets with now-a-days, "were well exchanged" for one *bad* history of booksellers, if only for the sake of lessening the number of bad

books with which we are overwhelmed. However, we do not wish for a moment to imply that Mr. Curwen's is a bad book, though we may not agree with him on every subject embraced in his history. On the contrary, we are of opinion that he has deserved well of the public, if only on account of the primogeniture of his volume, there being at present no other work on this subject of much and varied interest. Mr. Curwen tells us that, in the planning of the volume, it was resolved "to primarily trace the origin and growth of the bookselling and publishing trades up to a comparatively modern period; and then to select, for fuller treatment, the most typical English representatives of each one of the various branches into which a natural division of labour had subdivided the whole." Now, without stopping to discuss the grammatical question whether a division can be said to sub-divide anything (we lean to the opinion that *the person who makes* the division sub-divides), we proceed to note that although the foregoing passage might be thought to indicate a pretty full account of early booksellers, we find them all dismissed in a matter of seventy pages. "The booksellers of olden times," treated of in these seventy pages, range from William Caxton (15th century) down to the early part of the present century; and the rest of the book, over 400 pages, is devoted to modern publishers and booksellers. It is, however, an interesting work; and we trust we shall not be thought to detract from its merits in expressing the hope that a second edition may be called for, and that if this be the case, the history of early booksellers may be extended into a separate volume, equal in bulk to the portion of the work devoted to modern booksellers. There is certainly room for such an extended work; and Mr. Curwen's book would thus be more symmetrical than at present, and would appeal to a large class of readers; for there are numbers of readers who care but little about contemporary booksellers, their history, and business, who still take a great interest in the lives and doings of the early pioneers.

Traditional Tales of the English and Scottish Peasantry. By Allan Cunningham. A New Edition. London: F. and W. Kerslake, 13, Booksellers'-row. 1874.]

THERE is so much talent, vigour, and vivacity in Allan Cunningham's creations, whether in prose or in verse, that we cannot but be glad to see a reprint of a work of his, now somewhat scarce, claiming attention amid the press of mediocre and bad books weekly put forth. These *Traditional Tales*, which, by-the-bye, have a good deal more Cunningham than tradition in them, do not need the recommendation of Sir Walter Scott; and yet it is interesting to recall that the great fictionist was a warm admirer of the ener-

getic stone-cutter, whose brain was so fertile and whose taste was so good, whether in the invention or in the selection of traditions of the peasantry. Some of the poems with which Cunningham's prose is interspersed are quite on a level with the best things of the Ettrick Shepherd; and this is notably the case with several of the pieces of verse to be found in the present volume. Like Hogg generally, and even Burns sometimes, Cunningham erred on the side of too much finish; but his style has so much native force that one readily pardons in it the tendency to be too ornate.

Higher Schools and Universities in Germany. By Matthew Arnold, D.C.L., formerly Foreign Assistant Commissioner to the Schools Enquiry Commission. London: Macmillan and Co. 1874.

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD has chosen an opportune moment for re-publishing an important part of the work which he issued in 1868, on the *Schools and Universities of the Continent*,—a work which all profound students of the Education Question are bound to have read, and which has long been out of print. He has now omitted what relates to the development of the French school system, because no practical lesson for the English is, in his opinion, to be derived from that quarter; and precisely because the reverse is true of the German school and university system, he has chosen to print the present volume. Mr. Arnold takes the opportunity, in a preface of seventy pages "to the second edition," of adding one more to the interesting series of essays to which he so often adds under the plea of a preface; and this present preface is all that claims the attention of a reviewer of current literature. The subject chosen by the essayist is the question of giving a Catholic University to Ireland. This he is strongly in favour of, and he congratulates himself on having proved the propriety and advisableness of the step beyond a question. And so he has proved this, if one grants the premisses on which he founds a clever and entertaining argument, fraught with much instruction, and disfigured, naturally enough, by some misprision of Nonconformity. The whole argument is based on the fact that Catholicism is the religion of the great majority in Ireland; but, to found on that fact the argument of Mr. Arnold, it is necessary to assume that Ireland is a separate country from England. It is, in fact, no more separate than Wales: it is just so much of the United Kingdom; and of the United Kingdom the vast majority of citizens are Protestants. With this side of the question Mr. Arnold fails to deal, and his argument is therefore void, for want of truth in the starting point. The reprinted part of the book is, however, full of interest, and of "light,"—more so than of "sweetness."

The Slang Dictionary, Etymological, Historical, and Anecdotal. A New Edition, Revised and Corrected, with many Additions. London: Chatto and Windus, Publishers (Successors to the late John Camden Hotten). 1874.

It is now more than fifteen years since the original edition of this book made its appearance; and it was full time for a new and improved issue of what, though not of universal interest, is an extremely useful and instructive work. Even as regards interest, the volume appeals to a wider circle than one would, at first sight of the title, be disposed to think; for, however contemptible may be the use of the great majority of the slang expressions current among the youth of our educated classes, it is yet a fact that numberless slang words have so fastened themselves on the English tongue, as spoken in the nineteenth century, that neither the press, the bar, nor the Houses of Parliament, can get on without more or less of this element of speech. It is also a fact, that such a work as a slang dictionary has a special use for a nation whose most popular books (the works of Charles Dickens) are full of all sorts of slang. Besides a vocabulary very much extended as compared with that of the original edition, we have here a history of cant, or the secret language of vagabonds; an account of their hieroglyphics, of the vulgar slang of fast life, of the "back-slang" used by the London costermongers, of the "rhyming slang" spoken among the ballad and "last dying speech" men, and of the "centre slang" of the dangerous classes. There is also a good catalogue of works bearing on the subject. To those who are curious as to the means by which the English tongue has been and is being perverted and corrupted, the whole of these historical or descriptive portions are well worth reading; while, as a work of reference, the book deserves to be highly successful.

An Outline Study of Man; or, the Body and Mind in One System. By Mark Hopkins, D.D., LL.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1873.

THE writer of the above volume has three objects in view. One is to "present man in his unity"—i.e., to blend together, and exhibit in one view, results of physiology, psychology, logic, and ethics. The second is to "popularise metaphysical subjects by means of the black-board"—i.e., to explain faculties by means of lines, and their relation in thought by their representation in space. The third is to "present some views of my own, perhaps worthy of attention."

Whatever success has been attained will not be due to the style and composition of these lectures as printed. The construction of

sentences is sometimes not even grammatical—(e.g., sentences on pp. 87 and 47)—and the composition throughout is loose and slovenly. We have, for example, “the appearance of something that approximates it but is not it;” “intellect placed lowest, it belongs there;” Berkeley’s “denial of matter;” the “field of the ludicrous;” “running out into many forms of humour,” &c.; “the distinction indicated by the Apostle is as well as we can do.” If we must have the American phrase “back of” continually, we surely may protest against “skepticism,” “defense,” “marvellous,” to say nothing of “practiced” and “skillful.”

The third object aimed at by the author has interfered with his success in endeavouring to secure the first. It might have been possible, though it would have been difficult, to give in the space allotted a clear and succinct account of the results generally accepted in physiological and psychological science, together with such a statement of the vexed questions yet undetermined as that reader or hearer might understand the problem he was incompetent to solve. But no such succinct account is obtainable from Dr. Hopkins’ book. The confused, and often one-sided, representation of the state of the question is so intermingled with the not very clear statements of the writer’s own views, that no one could by any possibility obtain the clear outline of the subject, which is the least such a book as this ought to give. As examples, we may adduce the method of dealing with the subject of “Consciousness,” pp. 102 ff, and the representation of the doctrine of Berkeley, and the paragraphs relating to the external world on p. 118.

The success of the black-board system of teaching metaphysics cannot be judged of by a reader; we are glad to learn from the preface that success has been achieved. We certainly fail to see how the diagram on p. 195, representing “the products of the intellect brought forward,” could help any hearer’s apprehension; and in choosing between involved and crude classification with black-board, and clearness and simplicity without, anyone may be pardoned for preferring the latter.

As to the author’s own views, we need only say there is nothing remarkably original in this volume. The author is, on one of the most vexed questions, a Natural Realist with Hamilton, and there are few traces of the study of Mill. We read, “On this subject there is a remarkable form of belief in our day—that of Mill and his followers,” and “Mill is a Sensationalist!” On another difficult question, that of the Will, Dr. Hopkins is strongly anti-Determinist, but nowhere fairly and fully states the question at issue.

A religious spirit pervades the book, and the bearing of Scriptural teaching on metaphysics and moral science is indicated in the latter part of it, though many religious men would by no means assent to some of the conclusions arrived at.

History of French Literature. Adapted from the French of M. Demogeot. By Christiana Bridge. Rivingtons. 1874.

THIS is a clever adaptation, for the benefit of English students, of M. Demogeot's well-known Handbook of French Literature. Miss Bridge's labours have not taken the form of a mere translation. She has had recourse to English writers, as Hallam for instance, in order to illustrate the various portions of her subject; and has worked these extraneous materials, and the original French history, into a homogeneous whole with some skill. If we have a fault to find, it is that the translated portions are too literal, and in consequence scarcely sufficiently clear for the class of school readers who are to benefit by the book.

The Great Ice Age and its Relation to the Antiquity of Man. By James Geikie, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. of H.M. Geological Survey of Scotland. W. Isbister and Co. 1874.

No portion of the earth's past history is more full of dramatic interest than that which forms the subject of the above work, but the entire length and breadth of that interest is only beginning to dawn upon our minds. After vast cycles of physical and organic changes had again and again revolutionised the surface of the globe, the Tertiary age witnessed new revolutions of that surface, and heralded yet vaster changes. Those remarkable Eocene beds represented by the clays and sands upon which London and Paris are built, accumulated in the neighbourhood of a land upon which palms grew, whilst thick-skinned animals of hitherto unknown forms roamed under their forest shades. In the seas and rivers, crocodiles and turtles disported themselves, as they do now, under tropical suns. When this age passed away, to be replaced by the Miocene period, the modern forms of animal life floated into existence in a marvellous manner. The types of the huge quadrupeds which now roam in the forests of Africa and of India made their appearance. Elephants and mammoths, rhinoceri and hippopotami, with hosts of other associated creatures, became conspicuous features of the landscape, both from their numbers and from their bulk, and many of them have continued to be represented in creation up to the present time. The Miocene age was succeeded in its turn by the Pliocene period, during which similar creatures existed on the land, whilst whales and sharks of giant dimensions abounded in the seas. The general history of the earth up to this point has long been known with considerable approach to accuracy; but here exact knowledge and exact classification of deposits equally ended. Men were aware that vast accumulations of clays, sands, and gravels of yet more recent

date were strewed over the Tertiary strata, and it was also known that many of these superficial deposits contained the remains of extinct animals, similar to those of the true Tertiary epoch; but the history of this portion of the earth's crust was wholly unknown. The late Professor Buckland led the way to the study of cavern deposits containing the bones of hyenas and bears, of the cave lion, and a host of other semi-tropical creatures; but no clue was obtained to the history of their lives. As knowledge increased it became evident that arctic and semi-arctic forms were mysteriously intermingled with tropical and semi-tropical ones; but beyond this all was dark and unintelligible.

At this time, Charpentier and other observers followed in the steps of De Saussure, and began to study the origin and effect of Alpine glaciers; they were followed by Agassiz and Forbes, each of whom threw fresh light upon the history of these ice seas, and applied their knowledge of that history to the elucidation of some obscure geological phenomena. The discovery by Buckland that, at a comparatively recent period, many of the valleys of North Wales and of Scotland had been occupied by vast glaciers, resembling those of the Alps, opened the way to a series of important inquiries respecting the physical history of the British Isles. Evidences of the existence of similar glaciers were soon discovered in other parts of the country; and not only was this the case, but many of the superficial beds, to which we have referred as being strewed broadcast over the land, were found to contain grooved pebbles and other indications of ice-action, leaving no room for doubting that ice had, in some way or other, been concerned in the distribution of these widely-diffused accumulations. It gradually became clear that not only over the British Islands, but over all Northern Europe and North America, the semi-tropical Tertiary age had been succeeded by an arctic one. That during part of that period our islands were connected with each other and with the Continent of Europe, which then stretched for some distance into the Atlantic beyond its present boundaries, whilst other parts of our country were submerged, along with much of the Northern Hemisphere, 2,000 feet beneath the sea—leaving only a few of our highest mountain peaks standing out as islands surrounded by an icy sea.

At a still later age, the land again rose, and our country once more became part of the European Continent. This condition, however, was succeeded by another partial depression, allowing the sea to flow in upon the low valley now occupied by the English Channel, the Straits of Dover, and the southern portion of the German Ocean; producing that final severance of Great Britain from the Continent which has proved of such infinite social and political value to us as a nation.

Although we have many memoirs on various portions of this great

subject scattered through the different scientific journals, and though all the geological manuals and text-books published within the last few years contain sketches of the same period, it has not hitherto been made the subject of a volume like that of Mr. Geikie. The theme abounds in inherent difficulties arising out of the local variations in the aspect and arrangement of these deposits. Many of the details of these arrangements are so obscure and confused that their reduction to a systematic classification is as yet almost an impossibility. Nevertheless Mr. Geikie has made a bold and manly attempt in the right direction. Whilst we recognise the accuracy of the broad outlines of the interesting volume which he has produced, exception will be taken to many of its detailed observations and interpretations, by some of those who have been labouring in the same field. The distinction which Mr. Geikie draws between the "Full" of Scotland and that of the Midland and Eastern parts of England will certainly be rejected by many. The author considers that the former has been produced under a vast sheet of land ice, like that which is constantly moving seaward from the higher plateaus of Greenland, whilst the latter, comprehending those of Lancashire and the Yorkshire coast, he believes to have been accumulated under the same ice-sheet, but where it had left the land and was ploughing its way through the sea, grinding up the sea-bed as it did so. In like manner his detailed views respecting the alternations of glacial and more temperate periods are open to great doubt. These are not points, however, which in any way affect the broad outlines of the history which his book records. The former existence of a series of glacial conditions affecting Midland Europe is now a great and universally recognised fact, but we doubt if we can with any propriety speak of THE Great Ice age. There have obviously been, as Mr. Geikie himself shows, vast alternating periods of heat and cold in the time intervening between the close of the Tertiary epoch and the beginning of the Historic period. Hence we have, in all probability, had several Ice ages. Mr. Geikie discusses the various animals which made their appearance on the land during the vast interval of time to which his book refers; but here, being more of a field-geologist than a palæontologist, he has had to rely upon the observations of others rather than upon his own. The all-important question of the relative period of man's entry upon the scene is also considered. On this point our author thoroughly recognises man's high antiquity, regarding it as indisputable that he was coeval with the arctic mammalia, such as the reindeer, the mammoth, and the woolly rhinoceros; that he witnessed the return of warmer conditions, when these animals were displaced by the lion, the tiger, and other animals of southern origin; that he lived through the vast age when much of Europe disappeared under the ocean; and that he again witnessed its emergence when

he travelled, as so many would be glad to do now, without having to encounter the voyage, across the Straits of Dover. Of course much of this will be disputed by those who differ from Mr. Geikie as to the value of the evidence upon which these important generalisations are founded. But we have no hesitation in recommending his book as a valuable and readable contribution to the literature of this increasingly important subject.

Glances at Inner England. A Lecture Delivered in the United States and Canada. By Edward Jenkins, M.P. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1874.

MR. JENKINS appears from his preface to anticipate unfavourable criticism from his countrymen, for having so frankly reviewed among foreigners the less favourable conditions of English Society. We do not feel inclined to make objection on this ground. Those who write or speak on politics have something better to do, let us hope, than congratulate themselves and other people upon the admirable state of things existing all round. The dullest of us are almost tired by this time of hearing eulogies on modern progress, involving comparisons between ourselves and the people of the antesteam-and-telegraph period, very much to the disadvantage of the last-named. Any kind of talk on social and political matters is preferable to this. We would rather have Mr. Jenkins bristling with indignation over innumerable grievances and championing all sorts of oppressed interests, than the fluent eulogist of modern civilisation, who measures the progress of humanity by the number of miles of railroad that are opened each year. The generous sympathies shown by Mr. Jenkins for the unfortunate and oppressed are not so common as might be amongst politicians just now, and we wish him all possible success in the line he has marked out for himself. But the mission of a reformer of things in general has its perils, which it is not unkind to illustrate from the book before us. We do not say that the judicial intellect is, in itself, absolutely the most desirable, or that it is best adapted to the work of the reformer and philanthropist, but some measure of it will be of service even to the most ardent of advocates. To say that in pleading a good cause nothing is gained by exaggeration, is not enough; actual loss is incurred. The best cause in the world is prejudiced by being overstated, for the reaction almost invariably produced is not likely to be confined within the limits of strict justice. If, for instance, a class of persons, not without real grievances, but on the whole possessed of the most substantial rights and privileges of human beings, are described in terms appropriate only to slaves, those who feel the exaggeration of the language used are ready to go to the other extreme, and deny the existence of any grievance at all. Thus the breach is widened, and difficulties in the way of adjustment are multiplied. Now Mr. Jenkins has con-

siderable tendency in this direction, partly we believe arising from the well-known fact that few men have the power of stating an opponent's case with perfect fairness, and partly due to the literary habits of a satirical writer. There are strong temptations in respect of tone and style for a writer like Mr. Jenkins, whose greatest literary success has been achieved in humorous satire. It is doubtless somewhat difficult to change the key from that of *Gins's Baby* to one less pungent and epigrammatic, but the effort is worth making, since political reasoning can hardly be carried on to much purpose in the former.

It was the more necessary to be accurate in statement and reasoning, because Mr. Jenkins's audiences were not likely to possess much previous acquaintance with his subject; and as "a doctrine is not judged at all till it is judged in its best form" (to quote a wise saying of Mr. Mill's), the faults and shortcomings of English Institutions should have been discussed with a fuller acknowledgment of the difficulties involved and of the different conclusions arrived at, even amongst competent and well-disposed persons. No one can examine social and political questions with much attention, without seeing that the cases in which the wholly right stands in immediate contrast with the wholly wrong are not very numerous. Of course, the business of making up one's mind and choosing sides on a question would be very much easier if it were so. If one had to choose, for instance, between the oppressor and the oppressed, between the guilty and the innocent, who could hesitate for a moment? If the unfailing remedy were always ready to hand, who would not be for applying it at once to its particular evil? But it is just here that the difficulties of the case begin, and a man must not be accused either of cowardice or of cruelty because he has doubts respecting the mode of cure proposed. The fine human feeling expressed with such literary skill by the author of *Gins's Baby*, fails to assure us that he is much nearer the solution of intricate social problems than are some others, who also have looked at them and do not profess to see their way quite so clearly.

Such a passage as the following appears to us to be a very good specimen of the kind of fault-finding which cannot be of the slightest practical value. To be of any service it would require definitions, and limitations, and precise statement of particulars, which would result in its disappearance as a whole. By the time it had been qualified into meaning anything it would have become a different thing. "A prominent thing which stands out in the *England of to-day* is the number and power of *vested interests*. The Crown has vested interests—the aristocracy have vested interests—the Church has vested interests—the clergy, the liquor-sellers, the army and navy, the bench and the bar, officials of the courts of law, every endowed charity, the schools and many schoolmasters,

railways, turnpikes, municipal corporations, lords of manors, dukes and chancellors of duchies, markets, fairs, constitute a vast and mighty array of vested interests. You can scarcely drive the chariot of legislation in any direction without jarring against one of these obstructive interests." Well, why not? What is there so much amiss in vested interests that the writer should run a tilt against them in this manner? On his own showing, nearly every class of persons possesses vested interests; and if he has not included authors and publishers in the list, it was simply because enumeration was becoming tedious, for we observe a notice on the title-page of his book to the effect that *all rights are reserved*,—a pretty clear intimation that in this particular instance it is intended that vested interests shall be respected. But indeed society is only possible through the recognition of such interests. Civilisation might almost be defined as the state in which vested interests are acknowledged, defined, and protected. In a very early stage of civilisation there is some little difficulty in securing recognition for a man's vested interest in his own person and property; and those useful pronouns *meum* and *tuum* come into existence as part of the vocabulary of vested interests. As society becomes more complex, vested interests become more numerous, and their harmonious adjustment and reconciliation is the principal task of those who make and administer laws. But surely it is no great matter of complaint that in a state of society like ours vested interests are many; and as for "the chariot of legislation," and the difficulty there is in driving it by reason of these obstructive interests, let us hope things are not so bad as Mr. Jenkins would have us believe. Considering the various mishaps to which that kind of chariot-driving has in all ages been exposed, it may be as well that the crowded state of our thoroughfares compels careful driving.

Mr. Jenkins appears to hesitate between the ordinary speech used in daily life, and the literary style proper to the satirical humourist. Sometimes one is employed and sometimes the other, with results that, from a literary point of view, are not happy, and, with regard to the object sought, peculiarly unfortunate. "So the beadle worshippeth office, wrappeth himself round with office and its badges—accounteth that his office was made for him and he for his office. To him his parish is the world. The beadle loveth to show his power; before him little boys tremble and old women bow down themselves. The weak look in vain to him for help or mercy; to the strong he showeth respect. He fawneth upon the great, and by humility he winneth many favours—and many kicks. He is willing to sacrifice anything for his office and himself; even his wife, his family, his wife's relations, his honour, his honesty—all these things are as nought weighed in the balances against the ennobling garb of office. Office makes him. Without office he is John Smith or Ezekiel Jones, of any-

where—in office he is the beadle of Bellyfillin. He will take any oath of allegiance you please, an' it will procure him an office; he will break any oath you like if it will preserve him the dignity and the emoluments. Moreover, he confineth himself not to one place. He goeth about, seeking where and what he may devour." At the beginning of his lecture, Mr. Jenkins says, "I have not come here simply to amuse you. I could not have come to you without a certain mission. Let these things be honestly and profoundly elicited. For such matters your brilliant criticsasters are but the 'creakling of thorns under a pot.'" If the latter paragraph had been written by a reviewer instead of the lecturer, it would have sounded rather hard upon Mr. Jenkins.

A Memorial of the late Rev. Thomas Binney, LL.D.
 Edited by the Rev. John Stoughton, D.D. London:
 Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

It is from no fault of the compiler of this volume that it will prove unsatisfactory to many readers. Mr. Binney was so truly a great and a worthy man, that an ample memoir may, with propriety, be desired by all who had even a slight knowledge of him. Upon this Mr. Binney laid his own interdiction, strictly prohibiting the publication of any memoirs under the sanction of his family or executors. However we may regret this command, we cannot but respect it. We have, therefore, but a brief biographical sketch which has already appeared in another publication. To this are added sundry papers which represent the man as well as the opinion and judgment of thoughtful and competent friends could do in the absence of facts and incidents. The addresses by Dr. Allon are very tender and faithful; and the discriminations of the funeral sermon by Dr. Stoughton are alike worthy of their author and their subject. The other pieces are loving testimonies to a departed friend, which make this little volume as complete as, under the circumstances, it can be. All who did not know Mr. Binney personally, or had not the privilege of hearing him preach, may gather from this little volume how worthy was the man; but from the Weigh House Sermons and the other too few publications of Mr. Binney, they must learn the character of the teaching with which he blessed his generation.

The Life of the Rev. Alfred Cookman, with a Brief Account of his Father, the Rev. George Grimston Cookman. By Henry B. Ridgaway, D.D., with a Preface by the Rev. W. Morley Punshon, LL.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

THE life of a very earnest and successful minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. By this book Dr. Ridgaway

has introduced to us a man of more than ordinary excellence. The sketch is composed out of somewhat scanty materials, but is well managed. The interest of the volume mainly centres in the recital of Mr. Cookman's ministerial experiences. The account of his youth does not satisfy our English prejudices. The "Young America" element is rather too obtrusive. Mr. Cookman's ministry was very effective in producing immediate results. His sermons, judging from the specimens given, dealt with the conscience and the passions. He was not an "intellectual preacher." He roused sinners, and led them to the Saviour—that was his work, and admirably he did it. He abhorred "the critical, metaphysical, Germanised student of divinity." His ideal of the preacher was "one whose soul is one blaze of holy zeal, . . . who goes through the world like fire through the prairie." From this it may easily be judged what kind of things can be said of him. Those who turn to this volume, asking—What mental struggles had this man? How did he bear himself in the great fight with doubt? How did he win his way to "the larger faith?" will find no answer to their questions. There is nothing but clear-eyed faith. The daily experience of this most healthy-minded, cheery worker, seems to have been—triumph. We commend the book heartily, as setting forth the active side of ministerial life and work; and we re-echo Dr. Punshon's wish that the Giver of good gifts may multiply "evangelists" of this type and pattern.

END OF VOL. XLII.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XLII.

- 'Acadian Geology,' Dawson's, 28.
 Adams's 'Elements of the English Language,' 147.
 'Adulterations of Food,' Atcherley's, 247.
 'Albigensis et l'Inquisition, Les,' Peyrat's, 497.
 Alcock's 'Capital of the Tycoon,' 83.
 'Anatomy of the Vertebrated Animals, The,' Huxley's, 343.
 Ancient Classics for English Readers—Plato,' Collins's, 241.
 'Anna, Countess zu Stolberg-Wernigerode,' 262.
 'Annus Domini,' C. Rossetti's, 494.
 'Antiquity of Man, The,' 28; Sir Charles Lyell, 39; Danish antiquity, 31; peat in Denmark, 83; chronology of the antiquaries, 37; hints, 41; M. Boucher de Perthes, 43; the Valley of the Somme, 45.
 Arnold's 'Higher Schools and Universities in Germany,' 518.
 'Autobiography of Thomas Guthrie,' 209.
 Bain's 'Higher English Grammar,' 147.
 'Bards of the Bible,' Gillfillan's, 495.
 Berlioz's 'Slave Trade in Africa,' 71.
 Blunt's 'Dictionary of Sects,' 453.
 'Books of Genesis and Exodus, The,' Morris's, 264.
 Bridge's 'History of French Literature,' 521.
 Brooke's 'Theology in the English Poets,' 465.
 Brown's 'Divine Glory of Christ,' 493.
 'Cambrian Literature,' 335; Welsh and English, 327; Dr. William Morgan, 331; larger editions of Scriptures, 333; Rev. Thomas Gouge, M.A., 337; present literature in Wales, 341.
 Captain Colomb's 'Slave Catching in the Indian Ocean,' 71.
 'Catalogue of Landseer's Works,' 49.
 'Characteristics of Christian Morality,' Smith's, 219.
 'Christianisme au XIX^e Siècle, Le,' 182 and 265.
 'Churches, the Many and the One,' Garratt's, 484.
 'Coal,' 121; the Duke of Argyll's commission, 123; the supply of the future, 125; causes of dearthness, 129; question of export duty, 131; free trade, 133; Sir Rowland Hill's scheme, 134; effects of a coal tax, 137; distribution of coalfields, 139; Eastern and African coalfields, 141; conclusions, 145.
 Collins's 'Ancient Classics for English Readers,' 241.
 Conder's 'Child's History of Jerusalem,' 260.
 Conington's 'Odes of Horace,' 1.
 'Conservation of Energy,' Stewart's, 243.
 'Contributions to Solar Physics,' Lockyer's, 252.
 Cox's 'History of Greece,' 502.
 'Daily and Weekly Newspapers,' 122.
 'Daily Devotion,' Moore's, 495.
 'Dante and His Circle,' 299; his personality, 301; the Vita Nuova, 303; a hard passage, 305; allegorical sestina, 309; the quality of Dante's hate, 311.

- Davidson's 'Fresh Revision of the English Old Testament,' 221.
- Dawson's 'Story of the Earth and Man,' 28.
- 'Day of Rest, The,' 258.
- Debrett's 'Peerage and Baronetage,' 261.
- 'Dhow Chasing in Zanzibar Waters,' Captain Sullivah's, 71.
- 'Dictionary of Artists of the English School, A,' Redgrave's, 225.
- Döllinger's 'Prophecies in the Christian Era,' 223.
- 'Dr. Dixon,' 868; Thomas Jackson and James Dixon, 869; Gibraltar, 873; Popery, 875; character of his preaching, 877; an ecclesiastical 'statist' 881; influence of Methodism, 887; 'Christianity in earnest,' 891.
- Eddy 'On the Natural Distribution of Coal,' 122.
- Edgar's 'Philosophy of the Cross,' 496.
- 'Elements of Comparative Anatomy,' Huxley's, 343.
- 'English Grammar,' 147; three classes of grammars, 149; American pronunciation, 155; classification of parts of speech, 157; nouns, 159; syntax, 175; requisites of an English grammar, 177; connection between grammar and logic, 179.
- 'Entwickelungs-geschichte der Natur,' Rathke's, 343.
- 'Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans,' Godwin's, 460.
- 'Etudes Bibliques,' Godet's, 417.
- 'Evangeliste, L', Journal Religieux,' 163 and 265.
- Eyre's 'Lays of a Knight Errant,' 260.
- 'Fables in Song,' Robert Lord Lytton's, 233.
- 'Feng-ahul, or Natural Science in China,' Eitel's, 222.
- 'First Principles of Moral Science,' Birks's, 216.
- 'Fooda,' Smith's, 247.
- 'Forget thine own People,' Vaughan's, 478.
- 'French Reformed Church, The,' 182; first synod, 183; organisation and confession, 185; second historical epoch, 187; Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 189; effects of Napoleon's policy, 195; Revolution of 1848, 197; the critical school, 199; M. Babut's inaugural sermon, 208.
- 'French Reformed Church' (continued), 264; the first decisive vote, 267; the confession of faith, 269; M. Pécaut's ideal of a Church, 273; Athanasius Coquerel and Guizot, 277; unity in diversity, 281; the Confession of Faith adopted, 285; the Permanent Commission, 289; Church and State, 290; MacMahon's decree, 295; weakness and power, 297.
- 'Friendship of Books, The,' Maurice's, 236.
- Geikie's 'Great Ice Age, and its Relation to the Antiquity of Man,' 531.
- 'Geological Evidencea,' Lyell's, 81.
- 'George Grote,' 333; home life at Beckenham, 397; the first hint of the History, 401; the 'myth,' 406; Parliamentary work, 407; 'Plato and his followers,' 409; Sir G. O. Lewis on early Roman History, 413.
- 'Gerard's Monument,' Pfeiffer's, 225.
- 'Godet on the Person of Christ,' 417; sinlessness of Jesus, 419; the temptation, 423; the struggle of Christ's sanctity, 427; the transfiguration, 429; the Eternal Sonship, 431; the incarnation, 435; deopotantiation, 439; the Eutyebian Christ, 441; the ex-ination, 443; soteriology, 443; the one Christ, 451.
- Godkin's 'Ireland, Primitive, Papal, and Protestant,' 314.
- Goodair's 'Abstract of Papers,' 243.
- 'Grammar of the English Language,' Morrell's, 147.
- 'Handbook of the English Tongue,' Angus's, 147.
- 'High Price of Coal, The,' 121.
- 'Histoire du Synode Général de l'Eglise Réformée de France,' Bersier's, 163 and 265.
- 'History of Booksellers,' Curwen's, 517.
- 'History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales,' Rees's, 325.
- 'History of Sicily,' Lloyd's, 242.
- 'Home Rule Conference,' 314.
- 'Home Rule for Ireland,' 314; civilisation in Ireland, 317; emigration, 319; the new Parliament, 321; the priesthood, 323.
- 'Homes of Old English Writers,' Christopher's, 259.

- Humbert's 'Japan as It Is,' 83.
 'Hunterian Lectures,' Owen's, 343.
 Huxley's 'Croonian Lecture,' 343.
- 'Introduction to the Classification of Animals,' Huxley's, 343.
 'Introduction to the Pauline Epistles,' Gloag's, 487.
 'Ireland in 1868,' Fitzgibbon's, 314.
 'Irish Federalism,' Butt's, 314.
- Jamieson's 'Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures,' 223.
- 'Japan,' 83; attitude toward Christianity, 85; Marco Polo's account of Japan, 87; difficulties in the way of intercourse, 91; modern contact with Great Powers, 95; Lord Elgin's mission, 97; social precedence in Japan, 101; civil war, 107; Mr. Fortune's book, 118; peasantry happy under Daimios' rule, 115; Mr. Mitford's 'Old Japan,' 117.
- Jenkins's 'Glances at Inner England,' 534.
- Jenkins 'On Building Contracts,' 254.
- Jevons's 'Coal Question,' 122.
- Kidder's 'Treatise on Homiletics,' 495.
- 'Landseer,' 49; his father, 51; as a sportsman, 55; poetry of his art, 59; are his beasts animals, or men disguised? 61; pictorial *vers de société*, 65; popularity in art, 69.
- Layrie's 'Le Japon en 1867,' 83.
- 'Life of James Dixon, The,' 368.
- 'Life of the Rev. Alfred Cookman,' Ridgway's, 537.
- 'Life of Thomas Vasey, The,' 215.
- 'Llyfryddiaeth y Cymry,' Rowlands's, 325.
- Lockyer's 'Contributions to Solar Physics,' 252.
- Lonsdale and Lee's 'Odes of Horace,' 1.
- Lyell's 'Geological Evidences,' 28.
- Lytton's 'Odes of Horace,' 1.
- Makins's 'Manual of Metallurgy,' 251.
- 'Manuals of Religious Instruction,' 481.
- Martin's 'Odes of Horace,' 1.
- 'Mary and Charles Lamb,' Haslitt's, 518.
- Mason's 'English Grammar,' 147.
- Mathews's 'Odes of Horace,' 1.
- 'Maud Vivian, a Drama; and Poems,' Rew's, 236.
- Maurice's 'Friendship of Books,' 236.
- 'Memoirs of Sir E. Landseer,' Stephens's, 49.
- 'Memorial of the late Rev. Thomas Binney,' 527.
- 'Minea,' 121.
- 'Minor Works of George Grote,' Bain's, 393.
- 'Mission of Lord Elgin, The,' Olliphant's, 83.
- 'Modern Painters,' Tytler's, 229.
- Morris's 'French Revolution,' 506.
- 'Mountain, Meadow, and Mere,' Davies's, 259.
- 'National Education in Greece,' A. S. Wilkins's, 239.
- 'New Japan,' Rosman's, 83.
- Newman's 'Odes of Horace,' 1.
- 'New Testament,' Winter's, 481.
- Norris's 'Catechism and Liturgy,' 481.
- 'Odes of Horace and Recent Translators, The,' 1; characteristics of Horace as a lyric poet, 5; his love poetry, 7; Burns and Horace compared, 9; faults of Lord Lytton's version, 13; Prof. Conington's version, 17; Mr. Martin's version, 21; faults of all translators, 25.
- 'Old Testament,' Gregory's, 481.
- 'On the Smokeless Fireplace,' Arnott's, 122.
- 'Origines du Catharisme,' Réville's, 497.
- 'Outline Study of Man,' Hopkins's, 519.
- Owen's 'Report on the Vertebrate Skeleton,' 343.
- 'Papers Relating to Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions,' 122.
- 'Pastoral Epistles,' Fairbairn's, 486.
- Faxton Hood's 'Villages of the Bible,' 263.
- 'Pelican Papers, The,' Noble's, 261.
- 'People's Encyclopædia, The,' Colclange's, 251.
- 'Personal Life of George Grote,' 393.
- Pettigrew's 'Animal Locomotion,' 246.
- 'Plea for the Home Government of Ireland, A,' McCarthy's, 314.
- 'Plea for the Support and Spread of Methodism,' Jobson's, 224.
- 'Poems and Fragments of Catullus,' Ellis's, 506.
- 'Popular Objections to Revealed Truth,' 216.
- 'Preacher's Lantern, The,' 495.

- 'Prophecies in the Christian Era,' Döllinger's, 223.
 'Prose Works of Longfellow,' 515.
 'Quedah,' Captain Osborne's, 82.
 Rathke 'Ueber der Entwicklung der Geschlechtswerkzeuge,' 343.
 Ravensworth's 'Odes of Horace,' 1.
 Redgrave's 'Dictionary of Artists of the English School,' 225.
 'Report from the Select Committee on Coal,' 121.
 'Report of Commissioners on Coal,' 121.
 'Resurgens,' 257.
 'Richardson's 'Popular Treatise on Ventilation,' 122.
 Rogers's 'Superhuman Origin of the Bible,' 488.
 Rossetti's 'Dante and His Circle,' 299.
 'Sacramental Confession,' Howson's, 482.
 'Selections from the Poems of Charlotte Elliott,' 263.
 'Slang Dictionary, The,' 519.
 'Slave Trade in Africa,' 71; Mahometanism and Slavery, 73; Dhow catching, 77; missions and civilisation, 79; England and the Slave Trade, 81.
 Smith's 'School Manual of English Grammar,' 147.
 'Spectroscopes and its Applications, The,' Lockyer's, 252.
 'Spirit and the Muse, The,' Perring's, 263.
 Stewart's 'Conservation of Energy,' 243.
 'Story of the Earth and Man,' Dawson's, 23.
 'Study, The,' Dickinson's, 495.
 Swinburne's 'Bothwell,' 508.
 'Tales of Old Japan,' Mitford's, 83.
 'Traditional Tales of English and Scottish Peasantry,' Cunningham's, 517.
 Travers's 'Pure Benevolence of Creation,' 476.
 'Treasury of Languages, The,' 248.
 'Treatise on Sermons,' Broadus's, 470.
 Tytler's 'Modern Painters,' 229.
 'Ueber die Bedeutung der Schädelknochen,' Oken's, 343.
 Vaughan's 'Words of Hope,' 224.
 'Vergleichende Entwickelunggeschichte,' Reichert's, 343.
 'Vérité sur la Langue d'Oc, La,' Buset's, 231.
 'Vertebrate Animals,' 343; architecture of organisms, 345; the unity and diversity of nature, 349; vertebræ, 355; ganoid fishes, 359; 'culminating types,' 361; fishes quasi-reptilian, 365.
 'Villages of the Bible, The,' Paxton Hood's, 263.
 'Wilkes, Sheridan, Fox,' Rae's, 255.
 Wilkins's 'National Education in Greece,' 239.
 Willshire's 'Introduction to the Study of Ancient Prints,' 227.
 'Yedo and Peking,' Fortune's, 83.
 'Yr Eurgawn,' 325.