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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1876.

ART. I.—1. *The New Testament.* Translated from the Critical Text of Von Tischendorf. With an Introduction on the Criticism, Translation, and Interpretation of the Book. By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D., of Halle, and LL.D. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1875.

2. *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.* A New Translation, on the Basis of the Authorised Version, from a Critically Revised Greek Text, Newly Arranged in Paragraphs, with Analyses, copious References, and Illustrations from Original Authorities, new Chronological and Analytical Harmony of the four Gospels, Notes and Dissertations. By JOHN BROWN MCCLELLAN, M.A., London: Macmillan and Co. 1875.

IT is significant evidence of the growing interest in Biblical translation that not a single year has passed since the establishment of the Revision Committee of the Old and New Testament Translators which has not been marked by the appearance of two or three translations of the New Testament Scriptures, with sundry portions of the Old Testament. There may be, and we believe there will be, a twofold advantage accruing from this continuous multiplication of versions, during the transition period before the advent of the completed version of the revisers. As each new rendering comes forth as a witness to English-speaking Christians, condemning the errors of the Authorised Version and seeking to remove those errors, it must of necessity, in proportion to its merits, prepare the critical judgment of the public for a more cordial and general acceptance of the great version now in preparation. And the revisers themselves cannot fail, if they will keep their eyes open, to

see many hints of the utmost practical value to their own work, in the accumulated stores set before them by independent translators of unquestionable learning and ability, whose single aim is to ascertain the truth, and whose sole ambition is to set it fully forth for the benefit of their fellow-creatures, and the glory of their Redeemer.

Those who are aware of the vast distance which measures the position and privileges of modern Greek scholarship, now in its mature manhood, and that which marked the Greek scholarship of King James's translators—then in its childhood—will at once recognise one very prolific source of the multiplication of translations of the Greek Testament during the last decade of years. Nor is this all. The highest and most authoritative schools of English and German criticism need no longer the admonition of the profound Hermann "to beware of supposing that writers inspired by the Holy Spirit despised the ordinary rules of human language." It is now, on the contrary, become an accepted canon of New Testament criticism, upon which translators have acted, that the language of Greece, in the hands of the inspired penmen, excepting only the artificial structure of its periods (which would have made it unsuitable for translation and for general use), fully retains its marvellous functions of precision and of discrimination, its profound and systematic analogies, and its philosophical characteristics, not a particle overlooked, not a tense altered, not a preposition changed, not an article omitted or superadded. The more we keep the Greek of the Greek Testament under the microscope of our criticism the more we are overcome by a sense of its all-pervading accuracy, and the more clearly do we see the nicely shaded lights, and its verbal meanings dawning upon us, flashing into stronger relief, bringing into clearer outline the forms of truths—historical and doctrinal and moral—which we know to be truths from distinct and independent authorities.

Dr. Davidson and the Rev. J. B. McClellan, our most recent translators, are at one in their aim to devote the resources of our highest Greek scholarship, as exhibited in the labours of the most eminent German and English scholars, to a more accurate rendering of the Greek Testament in English.

"The primary object of a translation," writes Dr. Davidson, "is to express the exact meaning of the original in corresponding words, so far as they can be found in English, with the least

obscurity. It should be literal rather than paraphrastic, giving the sense intended by the author or authors simply and fully in the best terms which the English language supplies. A translation of the New Testament should be in effect a revision of the received one; and the departures from the latter ought to be as few as the necessities of the case require. King James's version should be corrected and improved in such instances only as appear to call for change. The main purpose of a translation of the Bible is, not that it should be read with pleasure, but, rather, that it may clearly express the true sense."

The translation of Dr. Davidson is based on the text of Tischendorf, a text which, in his eyes, assumes a supreme pre-eminence, an importance which he rather exaggerates. Mr. McClellan, who wisely follows no single text exclusively, has, in a preface of remarkable learning and critical though erratic insight, pointed out the danger to sound criticism to which Dr. Davidson's theory renders him especially amenable. Into the vexed question of text it is not our purpose, at least on the present occasion, to enter, contenting ourselves, as we do, with a brief notice of the respective merits and demerits of these most recent translations, in passages undisturbed by the conflicts of conflicting texts, and with a few suggestions for the consideration of future translators.

Mr. McClellan purposes to produce a most faithful and exact English translation, which, while never departing to any unnecessary extent from the style and diction now happily familiar to the English Christian Church, shall yet satisfy the most rigid demands of sound and accurate scholarship. The performance of this translator, we regret to say, lags lamentably behind his professions and promises.

Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

It is true Mr. McClellan corrects many errors in the Authorised Version, but it is equally true that most of his most important alterations are marrings and blotches, rather than amendments and improvements. As a whole, we very much prefer the Authorised Version to the translation of Mr. McClellan. "The most rigid demand of sound and accurate scholarship" cannot, we venture to think, be "satisfied" with the gross blunders which pervade the book from end to end, while the extent to which the translator has "unnecessarily departed from the style and diction now happily familiar to the Church" will shock the sym-

pathies and offend the good taste of all who appreciate the simple beauty and the impressive grandeur of that venerable version. We ask, for example, for any warranty for such substitutions as "Friday" for "Preparation Day," "captain" for "centurion," "battalion" for "band," "constables" for "officers," or "the burning valley" for "hell fire." What we ask are the rigid demands of sound and accurate scholarship which justify such a rendering of *σκανδαλίζη* as "cause thee to fall backward into a deadly snare," and "a *boulder* of a rock" as an equivalent of *πέτρος*? We purpose to take a few instances out of many in which this translator has either carelessly or ignorantly offended against "the most rigid demands of sound and accurate scholarship." Luke i. 14, is thus rendered: "And thou shalt have joy and rejoicing, and many shall rejoice at His birth." Now what the Greek really rigidly expresses here is something of this kind: "And *joy* (*χαρά*) shall be thine, and even *exultation* (*ἀγαλλίασις*), and many shall have joy at His birth" (*χαρήσονται*). The Authorised Version is here preferable to that of the reviser, running thus, "And thou shalt have *joy*, and *gladness*, and many shall *rejoice* at His birth"; for it gives us some representation of the cognate terms of the Greek in "joy" and "rejoice," and does not note any distinctions of "rejoicing" and "rejoice," which have no warrant at all in the Greek. The Authorised Version here is founded on the renderings of Wycliff and Tyndale; but of all versions in English the Rhemish is most in harmony with the Greek, as it reads, "And thou shalt have joye and *exultation*, and many shall rejoyce in His nativitie." In Mr. McClellan's rendering of the first chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, we note many instances of the neglect of accurate scholarship. At v. 17 we find "the *carrying away* into Babylon," for "the *migration* to Babylon" (put euphemistically for the captivity). At v. 20, "Fear not to *take unto thee* Mary, thy wife," where the Greek (*παραλαβεῖν*) rigidly requires "to *take to thy side*," or accept Mary (as thy wife *without delay*), for this is the force of the aorist tense, in the non-indicative mood, as well as the force of the preposition here in composition. At v. 22 the real and rigid force of the perfect *γέγονεν*, "is come to pass," is lost, and "was done" erroneously substituted. The opening chapter of St. Mark's Gospel, as here given, is open to a like charge of careless and unscholarly rendering. At v.

30 we read, "Now Simon's wife's mother *lay sick* of a *fever*." Here the exact force of the preposition in composition (*κατέκειτο*) is lost, though it marks the *utter prostration* of the patient who was suffering, as we learn from St. Luke's account, of the *typhus* fever, called by St. Luke and John by its technical term the *great fever*. At v. 32 we find the imperfect tense *ἔφερον* rendered as an aorist "they brought," although here it evidently marks the *habit* of the people in bringing the sick to our Lord at sunset, to avoid, as some authorities say, the risk of infection by the removal in the day-time. At v. 35 we have a similar blunder, where the imperfect tense follows no fewer than three aorists, and the tense was changed by the writer for the very obvious reason of emphatically marking the *continuance* of the act, as opposed to the non-continuous act expressed by the preceding verb. Mr. McClellan renders the verse, "And early in the morning" (better, we say, *very* early, as the morning was dawning, from the night, *πρωΐ ἔννυχον λίαν*) "He *came* forth, and *went* away into a desert place, and there *prayed*" (better, we say, He *continued in prayer προσηύχετο*). Such are a few of the schoolboy blunders, which we might easily multiply by hundreds, to be found in a work professing to satisfy "the most rigid demand of sound and accurate scholarship." Although Dr. Davidson's version is by no means exempt from many reprehensible errors and unhappy inadvertencies, we are constrained to admit that its merits far outweigh its faults, and that it is as a whole by far the most faithful transcript in English of the inspired original which has yet appeared in print,—an excellence which we attribute to the accurate scholarship of the translator, and his careful study of Winer, Lightfoot, Ellicott, and other authorities—notwithstanding the carelessness and errors which mark and mar many of its pages. That our readers may judge the more fairly of the respective merits of these translators, we give their renderings of the opening of St. John's Gospel.

REV. J. B. MCCLELLAN.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God. And the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that hath been made, no, not one. In Him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men: and the

Light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.

"There was born a man, his name John; the same came for witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all by him might believe. He was not the Light, but to bear witness of the Light. The True Light, which enlighteneth every man, was coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not: He came to His own home, and His own people received Him not. But as many as accepted Him to them gave He liberty to become children of God, even to them that believed in His Name: who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, no, nor of the will of a man, but of God. And the Word became flesh, and dwelt in tabernacle among us; and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father; full of grace and truth."

DR. DAVIDSON.

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through Him; and without Him was nothing made that has been made. In Him is life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shines in the darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John; the same came for witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men might believe through him. He was not the Light, but came to bear witness of the Light. The true Light which lightens every man was coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made through Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own home, and His own people received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave he authority to become children of God, to them that believe in His name, who were begotten not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us, and we beheld His glory, a glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth."

With Mr. McClellan's rendering here we have many faults to find, when compared, or rather contrasted, with Dr. Davidson's. He departs far more from the easy simplicity and quiet beauty of the Authorised Version, which we look upon as a grave fault in any reviser. As an example of this fault, take "And without Him was not anything made that hath been made, *no, not one*," where Dr. Davidson keeps close to the Authorised Version. Then

we have "*dwelt in tabernacle*," where the rival translator, with more simplicity and force, renders it "*tabernacled*," which is the exact equivalent of the Greek, being neither more nor less. There are, moreover, inaccuracies of Mr. McClellan's in the passage, from which Dr. Davidson is happily free. The former translator constantly ignores the real force of διά with the genitive of person, *i.e.* by *means* of, or through the *instrumentality* of; thus he renders, "All things were made *by* him," where Dr. Davidson more correctly renders the preposition "*through* him." This, we must remember, is a question of theology, as well as of Greek, where the one is in perfect harmony with the other, teaching us as it does that God the Father created all things; but that He created them through His Son, a fact upon which St. Paul emphatically dwells in writing to the Ephesian Church (Eph. iii. 9, τῷ Θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), and made equally emphatic by the writer to the Hebrews (Hebrews ii. 10, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα . . . καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα). At verse 6, ἐγένετο is wrongly translated by "then was *born*," where we have evidently the simple for the compound verb παρεγένετο, "presented himself," or "was present," as in St. Mark i. 4, and Matt. iii. 8. Dr. Davidson here more wisely sticks to the English Authorised Version, "there was."

The faults common to both versions of the passage quoted are more or less common to all translators of the New Testament, as well as to the translators before us in other passages of their work. At verse 2 we demur to "*the* same" as a rendering of οὗτος, "this" (one); here an emphatic pronoun, and, according to Bengel, "hic solus," as contrasted with ἐκεῖνος at verse 8 (which should be rendered "*that* one"), and refers to *John* the Baptist. Wicliff and the Rhemish version alone give the right rendering, "*this*." At verse 9, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, is not simply "the true light," but "the light, the true light," if we are to mark the force of the attribute that is here made emphatic by being honoured with an article as well as the noun. Cranmer, in his version of 1539, alone of translators, has most closely approached to the true rendering "that lyght was the true lyght." So in John vi. 22, and iv. 1, the Greek should be rendered "the bread, the true bread," "the vine, the true vine." This is somewhat analogous to our own idiom, which makes the adjective emphatic by the repetition of the noun, as we read in

Shakespeare's *Henry VIII.*, "Then comes a frost, a *killing* frost;" "Farewell, a *long* farewell."

At verse 10 the present and other translators translate the last clause "and the world *knew* him not," where the Greek really warrants the term "*acknowledged*," or "*recognised*." This is very clear by a comparison of the Greek text of Acts xix. 15, and 2 Cor. v. 16, and especially John xvii. 3, and 1 John iv. 20, and iii. 1, 2. At verse 11 both these translators render, "He came unto his *own home*, and his *own people* received Him not." This is a most inconsistent rendering by those who believe that *heaven*, not earth, is the "*home*" of Christ Jesus, who "in the *beginning was with God*," and merely "*tabernacled*" for a time on earth. Wicliff was wiser in his generation when he rendered the passage, "He came unto his own *thengis*." How much more in harmony with the whole tenor of this prologue, which points out the Messiah as the *Creator* of the world, as well as its Redeemer, will it be to render this passage, "He came to His own *creation* (literally, "His own things"), and His own *creatures* received Him not." This preserves not only the purpose and harmony of the context, but it preserves the play on the words of the original, ἴδιοι and ἴδια. At verse 12, "for *as many as* received Him," we prefer, "for *all*, as many as received Him;" where Wicliff rightly has, "For how many *ever* received Hym," for ὅσοι is distinct from all Greek relatives in the fact that it carries the force of universality along with it; as for example, Matt. xiv. 36. In the same verse we find the aorist γένεσθαι rendered simply "become," instead of "become *at once*" ("He gave authority *to become* the children of God"). Now no function of the Greek verb can be more fully demonstrated than the function of the Greek aorist, in its non-indicative moods especially, as marking the *immediateness* and instantaneous character of the act under description. This is another typical case in which we have a perfect harmony between the doctrinal truths of the Gospel and the laws of its language; for no one can question the truth of the Gospel teaching that the moment a soul receives Christ it becomes a child of God, just as the Sacramentalist error tells us that the moment a child is baptised it becomes *de jure* and *de facto* a child of God "by spiritual regeneration." In the Gospel of St. John we may see the following instances of the *immediate*

force of the non-indicative aorist. John v. 8: "Take up *at once* (*ἆρον*) thy bed, and walk" (*περιπάτει*), where the writer marks by contrast the immediate *act* by the aorist, and the *continued* action which was to follow by a present imperative. An Irishman, with the same notion of immediateness in his mind, will say, "Be *after* taking it." In John xi. 44, we render the aorist by "Loose him at once, and at *once allow* him to go on his way," where the two aorists are contrasted with a present tense.

Passing on to other portions of these versions, we venture to point out other defects and errors which they have in common with their rivals, by way of warning their successors against like inadvertencies.

No translator, we believe, has hitherto dealt throughout satisfactorily either with the Greek emphatic attribute or with the force of the Greek aorist, or non-indicative moods, as we have already shown. We have further to complain of a like neglect of diminutives, of particles, of the force of *μὴ* and the personal use of the article, and an obliteration of synonymous distinctions. In Acts i. 18 and 19, the Authorised Version gives us "field" for *χωρίον*, rendered by Dr. Davidson "enclosure," and still more correctly as "a plot of ground" by Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva versions, as the word is strictly a diminutive of *χῶρα*. In St. Matthew xv. 26, we read, Authorised Version, "It is not *lawful* to take the children's bread and to cast it to the *dogs*. But she said, Yea, Lord, for even the *dogs* eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table." Here the old translators are truer to the Greek, for Wicliff, Tyndale, and the Geneva version here render the Greek diminutive (*τοῖς κυναρίοις*) by "*whelpes*," and, we may add, more correctly render *κάλον* by "fair" and "good" than the Authorised Version. By the more correct rendering of the diminutives we preserve the harmony of the original Greek: "the *little children*" and "the *little* dogs."

We are reminded by this passage of 1 Cor. xiv. 20, which the Authorised Version renders: "Brethren, be not *children* in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye *children*, but in understanding be men." Dr. Davidson comes closer to the Greek: "Brethren, become not *children* in your minds: howbeit in viciousness become *babes*, but in your minds become *perfect*." The rendering of *τέλειοι*

by *perfect* has the sanction of Wicliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Rhemish versions, which render "in witte be ye *perfect*." The Geneva has "Be of *ripe* age in understanding," for which the Authorised Version gives, "Be ye *men*," which best expresses the general sense and the special comparison here instituted between the different stages of life—*infancy, childhood,* and *manhood.* To our mind a more correct rendering would be: "Brethren, become not *little children* (παιδία) in understanding, but become rather very *infants* (νηπιάζετε) in malice, and men in understanding."

When the inspired penmen wish to draw special regard to the *continuance* of an action, they do not merely content themselves with an imperfect tense to mark it, but they occasionally employ a participle, with the imperfect of the verb that denotes existence. This has been altogether ignored by all translators. Dr. Davidson, the most recent of translators, for example, renders Acts i., v. 10, 13, 14, "were gazing," "were abiding," "were attending," for "*continued* to gaze," "*continued* to abide," "*continued* to attend," where the Greek is ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν, ἦσαν καταμένοντες, ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες.

Now it is, we acknowledge, one of the many distinguishing merits of Dr. Davidson's version that he has succeeded in translating the same word or phrase in the same manner almost throughout, of course within certain limits. This has been a guiding principle throughout with him, as opposed to the authorised translators who aimed at diversity of phraseology. Our only complaint here is that Dr. Davidson has not carried his excellent theory, adopted from Canon Lightfoot, into the renderings of cognate construction, which, as in the original, would considerably add to the beauty, power, and arresting influence of the language. In many cases St. Paul uses a cognate construction, or plays on a word for the very sake of arresting attention to the very *terms* used in his argument, and we are scarcely representing St. Paul's mind as he represented it himself if we ignore such characteristics of his reasoning and language. 1 Thess. ii., v. 9, is rendered by Dr. Davidson and others "for *God appointed* us not to wrath," where the Greek requires, "For our *Maker* (or Creator) *made* us (or *created* us) not to wrath" (οὐκ ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς), St. Paul here, as some think, using the word θέος in the sense of *Maker,* or disposer (τίθημι),

as we find 1 Cor. xvi., 28, and elsewhere. In Matt. v. 35, we propose to render "the *footstool* of *His feet*," as in the Greek, for "footstool," not, as used by Dr. Davidson and others; so also we prefer to the usual renderings "Do not *treasure your treasure* on earth" (Matt. vi., 19), "For there is nothing *veiled* which shall not be *unveiled*" (Matt. x., 26), "The *creation* which God *created*" (Mark xiii., 19), "None of these is destroyed but the son of *destruction*" (John xvii., 12). The Rhemish version of 1582 boldly gives "The footstoole of His feete." Wicliffe renders Mark vi. 19, "*Treasure* not to yourselves *treasures* upon earth." These, and many samples we have given, show very clearly that our successive versions *lost*, as well as gained, in the process of revision.

The particles which form so pervading and modifying an element in the original Greek, have fared very unhappily at the hands of our translators, not even excepting Dr. Davidson, although he has corrected the most glaring blunders of his predecessors. The most common cases of transgression are his disregard of the full force of the emphatic negative *οὐ μὴ* (not as *a fact*, not as *possibility* or probability, and so *not under any circumstances*). Take an example out of many, Matt. v. 18, which Dr. Davidson renders as it is usually rendered: "For verily I say unto you, till the heaven and the earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law till all take place." The negative here is emphatic in Greek, *οὐ μὴ*, and we prefer to render "shall under *no* circumstance pass." The Authorised Version, "*in no wise*," is closer to the Greek here than Dr. Davidson's and that of many who seek to improve it. There are two other peculiar usages of *μὴ* equally ignored by translators. Take, for a sample of the one usage, 1 Cor. i. 13, "Was Paul crucified for you?" (Davidson), where the Greek requires "Paul *was not* crucified for you, was he?" for such alone is the force of the interrogation *μὴ*. For the other usage of *μὴ* take Heb. ix. 17: "For a *testament* is valid in the case of the dead, since it is of *no* force at all while he that *made* it lives" (Davidson). Here is a double inadvertence, for the translator misses the cognate construction as well as the force of *μὴ*. The right rendering requires: "For a *testament* is valid in the case of the dead, since one *cannot suppose* (*μή* —the *hypothetical* negative) a time (*πότε*) in which it has force when the *testator* (the cognate term) is living."

In many cases the translators would have done far better by keeping more to the literal meaning of words, especially where the language is figurative. Take, for example, Matt. ii. 6, where Dr. Davidson rightly renders "who shall *shepherd* (ποιμανεῖ) My people Israel," though he paraphrases ἐσχάτως (Mark v. 23) "in her *last* (stage)." By the way, it is curious to remark that our older English supplies us with a most literal rendering of ἀναίρεσις "taking off," as in Shakespeare's "Deep damnation of his *taking off*" (murder).

Many of the terms used by the inspired writers are technical, legal or military terms, used with a special purpose, which our translators have failed to notice or represent. Take, for example μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς ("do not *embezzle*)" Mark x. 19, which Dr. Davidson and others render "*defraud not.*" Take again Acts xxv. 24, τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομενης, "after having entered upon a *previous examination*," where Dr. Davidson follows his predecessors by rendering "after examination," ignoring here and elsewhere the technical force of the term, to the manifest marring of the sense.

Amongst the questionable renderings of his predecessors Dr. Davidson has left uncorrected 1 Tim. v. 2, which he renders "*Honour* widows that are widows indeed;" and also v. 17, "Let the elders which preside well be counted worthy of double *honour*." In each case the Greek word here includes at least "pay," or "pension" or a *honorarium* (this is the exact equivalent). This is clear from St. Paul's argument at v. 17: "For the Scripture says, Thou shalt not muzzle an ox," "The labourer is worthy of his hire." This is certainly an argument in favour of *payment*, and not in favour of *honour* alone.

We trust these brief comments of ours upon the translations before us will be accepted by the revisers in the spirit in which they are made; we contend from a sincere spirit of deepest devotion for the purity and power of God's Holy Word, and a jealous anxiety for as perfect a reproduction of it as our English language will permit, for the spiritual edification of all who speak our tongue.

These brief comments must suffice for the present; they are but slight contributions to a very great subject, which will come before us again. Meanwhile, we cannot conclude without acknowledging the great service to the cause of revision which this last labour of Dr. Davidson has rendered.

ART. II.—1. *Quarterly Statements of the Palestine Exploration Fund* 1869-1875. Bentley and Son.

2. *Recovery of Jerusalem.* Bentley and Son. 1872.

3. *Our Work in Palestine.* Bentley and Son. 1875.

4. *Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem.* Stanford. 1865.

IT is a trite saying that an age seldom knows its greatest men. It would appear that this melancholy observation is equally applicable to its greatest societies. Here, for example, is the Palestine Exploration Fund, which was started ten years ago under the patronage of the Queen, has always been supported by the greatest names in theology, literature, and science, and exists to explain and illustrate the Bible; yet from its birth until now it has been continually suffering from

> "That eternal want of pence
> Which vexes public men."

A paltry £5,000 a year would enable the great work to be carried on without difficulty or delay. It would surely require no effort to raise so trifling a sum in the wealthiest country on earth, if the nature of the work were more widely known. It is quite unnecessary to prove to the age of Layard that floods of light will be thrown upon the sacred history by topographical and archæological research. There is always an intimate connection between an event and the locality in which it occurs, but this is the case *par excellence* in Palestine. The "Land" and the "Book" are indissolubly associated. The one cannot be fully understood without the other. The land must be seen through the eyes of the book, and the book through the eyes of the land. M. Renan, in a memorable passage, describes the surprise with which he discovered the harmony existing between the gospel narrative and the places to which it refers. He declares that the scenes of our Lord's life are *un cinquième évangile*. A visit to the native land of the Bible makes the Bible almost a new book. Its once dry and unintelligible catalogues of names become instinct with life and significance. As Sir H. Rawlinson has happily observed, events which once appeared like the dreamy and uncertain outline of an ancient legend, take

the familiar features of practical life. Our interest is excited. Our faith is confirmed. Can any enterprise be comparable with one which reveals fresh beauty and meaning in the Word of God? We do not realise the preciousness of that Holy Book. Too many of us will hereafter—with far greater cause—share the dying regret of the gifted and saintly Adolphe Monod, that he had not cherished more ardently, and studied more profoundly, the Book of books.

What was known, when the Palestine Exploration Fund was started, of the spots and scenes to which this incomparable Book refers? Scarcely anything. The great work on the topography of Palestine was still Reland's *Palæstina ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata*, published in 1714. With all our modern enlightenment, we had not advanced beyond the point reached by that learned and laborious Dutchman 150 years ago. When *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible* was projected, Mr. George Grove, who wrote the chief articles on the topography of the Bible, found himself compelled again and again to make the humiliating confession that the scenes of the most famous events were unknown. Mr. Grove and his collaborators, feeling that this shameful ignorance could be endured no longer, determined to start a Palestine Exploration Fund. The first public meeting of the Fund was held in Willis's Rooms on June 22nd, 1865, when the Archbishop of York, president of the society, occupied the chair, and addresses were delivered by the Bishop of London, Lord Strangford, Mr. Layard, the Count de Vogüe, the Dean of Westminster, the Dean of Canterbury, Sir Roderick Murchison, Mr. Gifford Palgrave, Professor Owen, Rev. H. B. Tristram, and Mr. Gilbert Scott. It was announced that the society contemplated five principal objects of investigation—the archæology, the manners and customs, the topography, the geology, and the natural sciences (botany, zoology, meteorology) of Palestine. The way had already been prepared. The coast line of Palestine, carefully surveyed by British officers, had recently been published in Admiralty charts. Another excellent work, just accomplished, furnished them with a model, and pointed out an efficient leader for their first expedition. In 1864 it had been discovered that Jerusalem had become one of the most unhealthy places in the world, chiefly through the inferior quality of its water. Before any scheme for improving the water supply could

be carried out, it was necessary to obtain an accurate plan of the city. Lady Coutts, with her usual sagacious munificence, gave £500 for this purpose. The Secretary of State for War allowed the survey to be made by a party of Royal Engineers from the Ordnance Survey, under the direction of Sir Henry James. Captain (now Major) Wilson, R.E., took command of the party, and accomplished his work in an admirable manner. We owe to him the only trustworthy map of Jerusalem we possess, a splendid map executed with the scientific accuracy which distinguishes the Ordnance Survey. It was universally felt that Captain Wilson was the man to make the Reconnaissance Survey of Palestine with which the Palestine Exploration Committee proposed to commence their work. The good fortune which marked their first choice has attended the committee ever since. They have been invariably successful in securing the services of gentlemen eminently qualified for the peculiar and arduous task of exploring Palestine.

Captain Wilson, accompanied by Lieutenant Anderson, and Corporal Phillips as photographer, landed at Beyrout on Nov. 8th, 1865. On the first day of the new year the party entered Palestine proper near Banias. Banias is probably the site of "Baal Gad, in the valley of Lebanon, under Mount Hermon" (Joshua xi. 17), the northernmost point of Joshua's conquests. Here Herod erected a temple in honour of Augustus Cæsar, and round this temple Philip the Tetrarch afterwards built a city which he named Cæsarea Philippi. In this neighbourhood our Lord asked the momentous question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" (Matt. xvi. 13), and a few days afterwards was transfigured before the three disciples upon "an high mountain apart," probably one of the lower summits of mighty Hermon, whose "white snow" (Mark ix. 3) suggested to Peter an illustration of the heavenly radiance which lit up the "raiment" of the Lord. About three-quarters of an hour's ride from Banias lies a curious grassy mound called in Arabic Tel el Kady, i.e, "the mound of the Judge." But "judge" in Hebrew is Dan (דָּן), so that this spot is really "the mound or ruined heap of Dan." In this singular manner the very name of Dan, the frontier city of Israel, is preserved in another language. This remarkable persistence of names, even after the original name has been translated into a foreign

language, is characteristic of the stationary East, and has proved of invaluable service in the identification of forgotten sites. On this secluded fertile spot "where there is no want of anything that is in the earth" (Judges xviii. 10), the Zidonian colonists dwelt "careless, quiet, and secure" (v. 7) until the 600 Danite adventurers went up and "smote them with the edge of the sword, and burnt the city with fire. And there was no deliverer, because it was far from Zidon, and they had no business with any man" (v. 27, 28). Here one of the tributaries of the Jordan, called by Josephus the lesser Jordan, was examined and traced down to the exact spot in the valley where all the principal tributaries united in a channel ninety feet wide. From this point to Lake Hûleh (the waters of Merom) seven miles off, the whole of the plain is marshy, and the lower part covered with babeer canes. We must not leave this famous and sacred stream without referring to "Rob Roy on the Jordan." That delightful and immortal canoe has done what no other living creature could have done. No man, no horse, no camel, no ordinary boat, nothing but such an amphibious, ubiquitous, ethereal creature as she is (Mr. Macgregor is quite confident about her sex) could have unravelled the intricacies, and flitted over the cane-choked marshes of the Jordan. Mr. Macgregor's work is as valuable as it is entertaining; and the beautifully clear maps with which he illustrates his pages, remove for ever the mystery which has hitherto hung over the sources of the Nile of Palestine.

Leaving the Jordan valley, the survey party ultimately arrived at Abil, the probable site of Abel of Beth-maachah, which the speech of the "wise woman," and a more tangible argument—the decapitated head of Sheba—saved from the fury of the terrible Joab (2 Sam. xx. 22). On the rising ground beyond Abel they reached the watershed of the country, the great geographical line separating the waters of the Mediterranean from those of the Jordan. The principal object of the Reconnaissance Survey was to trace this line accurately from the northern frontier to Jerusalem. We may so far anticipate the sequel as to say that this was successfully accomplished. Crossing the hills of Naphtali, which were well wooded with oak, the surveyors entered the plain of Zaanaim, where Heber the Kenite "pitched his tent," in which the haughty Sisera met with an untimely and ignominious death (Judges iv. 11).

In the middle of the western side of the valley is the undoubted site of Kedesh Naphtali (Kedes), the northern city of refuge, and the birthplace of Barak. A short distance to the south-east of Kedesh stands a hill now called Tel Hara. It was visited for the first time by Major Wilson's party, who found on its summit the remains of a very ancient fortress, which both Major Wilson and Lieutenant Anderson identified with the long-lost Hazor, the city of Jabin, who, with his tributary kings, was overthrown by Joshua at "the waters of Merom" (Joshua xi.), and of that later Jabin, "the King of Canaan," whose great general Sisera was ruinously defeated by Barak (Judges iv.) Dr. Robinson had selected Tel Kureibeh as the probable site of Hazor, but at Tel Kureibeh there are no old ruins and no cisterns. Tel Hara, however, says Captain Anderson, "answers exactly the description of the Jewish historian, and it overlooks immediately the waters of Merom, and the plain adjoining," where, without doubt, "Jabin, King of Hazor, collected the vast host to fight Joshua; and the track of the fugitives is in full view, up the valley, past our first camp at Banias, and into the ravines of Lebanon, 'till none remained.'" *

Near Kefer Birim, where the watershed was again reached, an old Jewish tomb was explored. "The mouth of each loculus had at one time been *sealed with a stone*."† (Comp. John xi. 38: "It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it.") "The principal entrance of the tomb is so low that it is *necessary to stoop* in order to get in." (Comp. John xx., 5: "And he, stooping down, saw the linen clothes lying.") These are two specimens of a countless number of individually trivial facts, which collectively form an overwhelming proof of the minute, scrupulous, almost incredible accuracy of the sacred writings, even in the most unimportant details. The surveying party now proceeded to the lake of Galilee, after Jerusalem the most interesting spot in Palestine, and prepared the only accurate map of the lake ever published. We must quote Major Wilson's description of the lake district, which Dean Stanley declares to be the most "accurate and vivid" ever penned.

"There are, it is true, no pine-clad hills rising from the very edge of the lake; no bold headlands break the outline of its

* *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 450. † *Ibid.*, p. 452.

shores, and no lofty precipices throw their shadow over its waters; but it has, nevertheless, a beauty of its own, which would always make it remarkable. The hills, except at Khan Minyeh, where there is a small cliff, are recessed from the shore of the lake, or rise gradually from it; they are of no great elevation, and their outline, especially on the eastern side, is not broken by any prominent peak, but everywhere from the southern end the snow-capped peak of Hermon is visible, standing out so sharp and clear in the bright sky that it appears almost within reach; and, towards the north, the western ridge is cut through by a wild gorge—'the Valley of Doves'—over which rise the twin peaks, or horns, of Hattin. The shore line, for the most part regular, is broken on the north into a series of little bays of exquisite beauty, nowhere more beautiful than at Gennesareth, where the beaches, pearly white with myriads of minute shells, are on one side washed by the limpid waters of the lake, and on the other shut in by a fringe of oleanders, rich in May with their 'blossoms red and bright.' The surrounding hills are of a uniform brown colour, and would be monotonous if it were not for the ever-changing lights and the brilliant tints at sunrise and sunset. It is, however, under the pale light of a full moon that the lake is seen to the greatest advantage, for there is then a softness in the outlines, a calm on the water in which the stars are so brightly mirrored, and a perfect quiet in all around which harmonises well with the feelings that cannot fail to arise on its shores. It is, perhaps, difficult to realise that the borders of this lake, now so silent and desolate, were once enlivened by the busy hum of towns and villages; and that on its waters hostile navies contended for supremacy. But there is one feature which must strike every visitor, and that is, the harmony of the Gospel narrative with the places which it describes, giving us, as M. Renan happily expresses it, 'un cinquième évangile, lacéré, mais lisible encore.'"—*Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 339.

This beautiful picture is soon followed by an equally graphic description of a sudden storm on the lake, which, as the only complete description by an eye-witness ever published, must also be quoted at length:—

"The morning was delightful; a gentle easterly breeze, and not a cloud in the sky to give warning of what was coming. Suddenly, about midday, there was a sound of distant thunder, and a small cloud, 'no bigger than a man's hand,' was seen rising over the heights of Lubieh to the west. In a few moments the cloud appeared to spread, and heavy black masses came rolling down the hills towards the lake, completely obscuring Tabor and Hattin. At this moment the breeze died away, there were a few minutes of perfect calm, during which the sun shone out with

intense power, and the surface of the lake was smooth and even as a mirror; Tiberias, Mejdel, and other buildings stood out in sharp relief from the gloom behind; but they were soon lost sight of as the thunder gust swept past them, and, rapidly advancing across the lake, lifted the placid water into a perfect sheet of foam: in another moment it reached the ruins, driving myself and companion to take refuge in a cistern, where, for nearly an hour, we were confined, listening to the rattling peals of thunder and torrents of rain. The effect of half the lake in perfect rest, whilst the other half was in wild confusion, was extremely grand: it would have fared badly with any light craft caught in mid-lake by the storm; and we could not help thinking of that memorable occasion on which the storm is so graphically described as 'coming down' upon the lake."—*Ibid.*, p. 341.

The survey party commenced their circuit of the lake at the point where the Jordan enters it. Not far from the eastern bank of the river are traces of an ancient village which Major Wilson, like Dr. Thomson, identifies with Bethsaida Julias, the burial-place of Philip the Tetrarch, who had rebuilt it, and named it Julias, after the Emperor's daughter. On the western bank of the Jordan are a few small mounds and heaps of stones, called Abu Zany, the site, according to Dr. Thomson, of "Bethsaida of Galilee," the birthplace of Peter, Andrew, and Philip. Two miles from the Jordan, on the western edge of the lake, is Tel Hum, where Major Wilson encamped and employed a party of Arabs to clear out a large portion of the interior of the "White Synagogue." We can imagine the intense interest with which he and his companions watched the clumsy workmen, for the problem was no less than the identification of the long-lost Capernaum. The synagogue was found to lie within the ruins of a later building, which may be those of the church which Epiphanius says was built at Capernaum, and was described by Antoninus, A.D. 600, as a basilica inclosing the house of Peter. Major Wilson was able to determine with absolute certainty that the original ruin at Tel Hum was the ruin, not of a church or temple, but of a Jewish synagogue. Everything on the spot favoured the supposition that Tel Hum was the Capernaum of the Bible. On the other hand, the excavations at Khan Minyeh, the rival site, did not reveal the remains of any building of great size, and even indicated that "the ruins are of modern date." Moreover, the ruins of

Khan Minyeh "cover an extent of ground small in comparison with those of Tel Hum," whereas Capernaum, where a detachment of soldiers was quartered, must have been a considerable town. The partial similarity between Tel Hum and Caperna-um is not unworthy of notice. A deserted site is generally called "Tel," and often only the final syllable in old names is preserved; e.g., Zib, for Achzib. Proceeding southward from Tel Hum, Major Wilson made a discovery which, in the language of so great an authority as Dr. Stanley, "at once elevates the claims of Tel Hum to be the ancient Capernaum to the very highest rank," and is almost decisive. He discovered that the track round the rock of Khan Minyeh is an aqueduct carrying the waters of the fountain of Tabigah into the plain of Gennesareth. This identifies the fountain of Tabigah with the "fountain of Capharnaum" mentioned by Josephus. On the whole there seems now to be very little doubt that Tel Hum is the ruins of the city which was so highly favoured and so terribly condemned. The "White Synagogue" is, in that case, the synagogue which was built by the Roman centurion who loved the Jewish nation (Luke vii. 5). The very stones, laboriously moved by Major Wilson's Arabs, once echoed the mysterious but life-giving discourse recorded in the sixth chapter of John's gospel. Who does not share the strong thrill of emotion which passed through the explorers when, turning over a huge block in the fallen synagogue, they found that the pot of manna was engraven on its face, and remembered how in that famous discourse our Lord exclaimed—perhaps pointing, as was his wont, to that very engraving—"I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead" (John vii. 48, 49).

Two and a half miles from the shore of the lake is Kerazeh, which the determination of the site of Capernaum enables us to identify decisively with Chorazin. One or two previous travellers had visited the spot, but it was left for Major Wilson's party to discover the extent and significance of the ruins, which cover an area as large, if not larger, than that of Capernaum. If there be a Western as well as an Eastern Bethsaida, it is naturally identified with Khan Minyeh; but it is doubtful whether the MSS. allow of two places of that name.

We need not follow the explorers round the lake, but

refer our readers to Major Wilson's interesting paper in the *Recovery of Jerusalem.* We must add, however, that a careful exploration of the almost unknown eastern shore of the lake, enabled them to identify the precise spot where "the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea" (Matt. viii. 32). Their decision has been confirmed since by Mr. Macgregor, who visited the spot in his canoe. This illustrates the immense service which accurate topographical information may render to the sacred history. How many plausible objections to the literal truthfulness of the Bible have been found to rest upon no other basis than the ignorance of the objector and his readers! On the left bank of Wady Semakh are the ruins of Khersa, which is evidently Gergesa.

"About a mile south of this, the hills, which everywhere else on the eastern side are recessed from a half to three quarters of a mile from the water's edge, approach within forty feet of it; they do not terminate abruptly, but there is a steep, even slope, which we would identify with the 'steep] place' down which the herd of swine ran violently into the sea, and so were choked. . . . That the meeting of our Lord with the two demoniacs took place on the eastern shore of the lake is plain from Matt. ix. 1; and it is equally evident, on an examination of the ground, that there is only one place on that side where the herd of swine could have run down a steep place into the lake, the place mentioned above." *Restoration of Jerusalem,* p. 369.

The apparent discrepancies arising from the fact that in some MSS. the name of Gergesa is used, in others Gerasa, and in others Gadera, are easily explained by supposing that Gergesa, the undoubted scene of the occurrence, was under the jurisdiction of Gadara, and also in the region (χώρα) of Gerasa. Jerome says that in his day the name Gerasa was used to designate the whole country of Gilead. As the city of Gerasa is twenty miles east of the Jordan, no one ever imagined that the healing of the demoniacs could have taken place there; but it is an amusing instance of the blunders into which neglect of sacred topography betrays us to find that even the *Dictionary of the Bible* places the scene of the miracle at Gadara, from which spot, as Major Wilson observes, with irresistible humour, the swine would have had "a hard gallop of two hours" before reaching the lake.

From the Sea of Galilee Major Wilson and his party returned to the watershed of the country. They found

that the characteristic features of Zebulon were low ridges of hills, enclosing fertile strips of plain. Gradually the ridges became less elevated, and the plains more raised, until at last plain and ridge were "blended together in a vast plateau, ending abruptly near Nazareth, where a range of hills forms the great natural step leading to the great plain (of Esdraelon). There is something very striking in the position of Nazareth. It is completely shut in by hills, which cluster round it on all sides, and shelter it from the bleak winds."* There is but one well in Nazareth, and the whole water supply is drawn from that source. Here on the hill-side, when the sun was setting, Major Wilson found a cluster of women waiting for their turn to draw water. The East does not change. In such a waiting group, nineteen centuries ago, there must often have appeared a Judæan mother, humbly bearing her pitcher, undistinguishable in appearance from the rest. But the angels knew that she was highly favoured, and beside her stood the Child who through the tender mercy of God had visited us to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.

After visiting Mount Tabor, two hours' journey east of Nazareth, the explorers descended by a deep gorge into the great plain of Esdraelon, the battle-field of Palestine. Crossing the wide valley they reached Mount Gilboa, which had witnessed the overthrow of the Midianitish horde by the stratagem of the intrepid Gideon. The beautiful spring at which the faithful 300 "lapped," still gushes forth to slake the traveller's thirst. But the pathetic lament of David has associated the "mountains of Gilboa" yet more memorably with the awful death of Saul. Major Wilson and Captain Anderson have made this tragical page in Jewish history more vivid than ever. "We can now trace exactly," says Captain Anderson, step by step, Saul's dangerous and difficult journey from Jezreel, where his army was encamped, round the shoulder of the opposite hill to the village of Endor, at the back of Little Hermon, six and a half miles off. There, in one of the numerous caves which are still inhabited, he had his weird and tragical interview with the witch. We realise with new force the hopeless straits to which the unhappy king must

* *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 454.

have been reduced before he would run the desperate risk of taking in the dark, with only two companions, a stealthy journey which left the Philistine host between him and his own troops. Drowning men clutch even at a straw. The doomed Saul, when every other hope was gone, vainly sought comfort in witchcraft. On the morrow the mighty fell, and the shield of the mighty was vilely cast away.

Ascending the southern side of the valley of Esdraelon, the surveying party entered the highlands of Manasseh. On the rising ground they reached Dotan, recognised in our own day as the site of Dothan, where Joseph found his brothers when he was sent by his father from the encampment at Hebron to inquire after their welfare. Captain Anderson relates the interesting discovery that there still exist at Dothan numerous rock-hewn cisterns, any one of which "would furnish a suitable pit in which 'Joseph's brothers' might have thrust him; and as these cisterns are shaped like a bottle, with a narrow mouth, it would be impossible for anyone imprisoned within to extricate himself without assistance." *

Some time was naturally spent at Nablûs, the ancient Shechem, unrivalled for beauty and luxuriance, and second only to Jerusalem in sacred Jewish memories. The whole of Mount Gerizim was thoroughly examined, and the octagonal building which stands in the centre of a more ancient enclosure, proved to be a church, Major Wilson thinks, of the age of Justinian. The older foundations, upon which it was built, were "probably those of the old Samaritan temple." Jacob's Well—one of the most indisputable spots upon earth—was found to be 75 feet deep, which is probably about half its original depth.

After leaving Nablûs the surveyors entered the Jordan valley, to fix the confluence of the Zerka (the Jubbok), the great highway from the east. Returning to the uplands, the work of tracing the watershed was continued. At Seilûn, the site of Shiloh, where the ark first rested after the capture of Jericho and Ai, and where Joshua divided the newly conquered Canaan among the tribes, the explorers noticed "a curious excavation in the rock in the side of the hill, which might have been the actual spot where the ark rested, for its custodians would naturally

* *Ibid.*, p. 463.

select a place sheltered from the bleak winds that prevail in these highlands."* About half a mile from the ruins are the spring and well of Shiloh, where the maidens of Shiloh came forth to dance, and were rudely interrupted by the Sabine rape of Jewish history. Nine miles south of Shiloh is Beitîn, the site of Bethel. On the adjoining hill, east of Bethel, are the remains of a fortified Christian church, which was probably built by the early Christians to consecrate the spot where Abraham erected his second altar in the promised land, and where Lot separated from him. This hill is in the exact position indicated by Gen. xii. 8, and enjoys the commanding view required by Gen. xiii. 10. The determination of this site affords an illustration of the way in which one discovery brings others in its train. From the time of Josephus to the present day writers have placed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah on the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. But it is evident from Gen. xiii. 10 that, when Lot "lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan," he was actually looking down upon Sodom and Gomorrah. Those cities must therefore have been on the north of the Dead Sea, and right out in the middle of the plain, or they could not have been seen from Bethel. That the middle of the plain was once "well watered everywhere, as the garden of the Lord," is proved, says Major Wilson, "by numerous traces of former irrigation found on a careful examination of the ground." The conclusion we have now reached is further confirmed by the direct testimony of Gen. xiii. 11, that "Lot journeyed east." Had Sodom been on the south of the Dead Sea Lot would have travelled almost due south. The very name by which the cities are known—"the cities of the plain," i.e., "the plain of Jordan"—is decisive. The plain of Jordan could not have been extended below the point at which the river enters the Dead Sea.

But to return to Bethel, Major Wilson's party were able not only to identify the site of Abraham's altar, but to discover the long-lost Ai. East of the hill on which the altar was built is a ruined hill-top, called by the Arabs Et Tel. Here, without doubt, Ai once stood. The configuration of this spot corresponds exactly with the requirements of the sacred narrative. "And all the people," we read in Joshua viii. 11, "even the people of war that were with him, went

* *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 468.

up and drew nigh, and came before the city, and pitched on the north side of Ai: now there was a valley between them and Ai." Such a broad valley (Wady el 'Asas) protects the northern face of Et Tel, and then runs straight down to the Jordan valley. "And he took about 5,000 men, and set them to lie in ambush between Bethel and Ai, on the west side of the city" (verse 12). On this side a steep knoll of rocky masses, called Burjmus, rises to a narrow summit, and is divided from Et Tel by the head of a valley running south. This valley ultimately opens into the Wady Suwaynit near Michmash. The course of the ambush party is therefore plain. They would ascend the great Suwaynit valley as far as Michmash, and then, turning into the valley we have described, would gradually ascend until they reached Ai. The knoll of Burjmus, and the high ground near it, enabled them to approach within a quarter of a mile of Ai, without ever appearing in sight. "That night" the main body of the Israelites moved down from their encampment "into the midst of the valley" on the north (verse 13). On the morrow the king of Ai, elated by his former success, "rose up early," and "hasted" into the broad valley to crush his foe. The Israelites "made as if they were beaten before" the men of Ai, and fled down the valley to the east (verse 5). On the rocky knoll of Burjmus, within view of both sections of the Israelitish army, the figure of Joshua stood out in bold relief. He was thus able simultaneously to watch the feigned flight of the main body, and to control the movements of the ambush. At the right moment his mighty spear is seen stretched out against the sky. The impatient ambush "arise quickly and run" into the unprotected city and fire it. The retreating Israelites see "the smoke of the city ascending up to heaven," and turn round fiercely. The hapless men of Ai, caught between two hosts, are annihilated, and Ai itself is "burnt and made an heap for ever" (verse 28). It is a remarkable fact that the Hebrew word תֵּל (Tel), translated in our version a "heap" (verse 28) corresponds exactly with the Arab name which the spot still bears. Thus, to use Dr. Trench's happy expression, a true tradition has been "fossilized" in the very nomenclature of the place. We should add that Lieut. Conder re-examined this locality in 1873, and confirmed the conclusions of Major Wilson. Our description of the stratagem

is derived from his fuller account. With the record of this brilliant and valuable discovery, we take leave of the first expedition within four hours' journey of their goal at Jerusalem. While much has necessarily been omitted, we have said enough to prove the success of this tentative expedition, and to justify the determination of the committee to continue the work upon a more extensive scale.

Major Wilson being no longer able to engage in the work, the Committee, with their usual good fortune, secured the services of Capt. Warren, R.E., who, with three non-commissioned officers of the same scientific corps, set out for the East at the close of the year, and landed at Jaffa on February 15th, 1867. His party, from first to last, consisted of Sergeant Birtles, and Corporals Phillips, Hancock, Turner, Mackenzie, Cook, Ellis, Hanson, and Duncan. Capt. Warren has borne frequent and emphatic testimony to the good conduct, intelligence, and ability of these fellow-labourers. It was determined that Capt. Warren should concentrate his main strength upon excavations at Jerusalem. Here the work was carried on almost uninterruptedly until April, 1870, when, judging that he had done all that the means at his command, and the restrictions imposed by the Turkish authorities, permitted, Capt. Warren returned home. In the autumn of the same year *The Recovery of Jerusalem* was published, containing a full account of his discoveries, and also papers by Major Wilson, Capt. Anderson, Rev. F. W. Holland, and others, on all the branches of the work up to that date. Those who cannot procure this costly repertory of interesting information, should get the cheap and admirable little volume entitled, *Our Work in Palestine*, which contains all that is most valuable in the larger work, and a great deal of additional information, that renders the entire subject intelligible and attractive to the general reader.

It is hard to realise how great were the difficulties by which Captain Warren was beset, difficulties arising partly from the superstitious prejudices of the Turks, and partly from the arduous and dangerous nature of the work itself. The vizierial letter from Constantinople, which gave him permission to excavate, expressly excluded him from "the Noble Sanctuary and the various Moslem and Christian shrines." This characteristic document, keeping the word of promise to the ear, and breaking it to the hope, was fatal to complete success, and might have wrecked the whole

undertaking, had not Captain Warren ingeniously outwitted his tormenters:—

"My idea was as follows: the Pacha strictly prohibited our working nearer to the walls than forty feet; but he was quite unaware of our powers of mining, and felt quite safe so long as we were not near the wall above ground. My object then was to commence at the required distance, and mine up to the wall; obtain the necessary information; publish it; and then, when it was known at Constantinople, to commence again on the surface about twenty feet off, and if stopped to protest, on the plea that we had already been up to the wall; that it was known at the Porte; and that the custom was established, custom being all powerful in the East."—*Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 44.

The work itself was attended by real danger. They had to sink deep shafts through loose "shingle" which "ran like water." Their galleries were liable to be destroyed in a moment by an avalanche of stones. Large pieces of masonry lay loosely huddled together over their heads, ready to collapse at the slightest movement beneath. The soil in the Tyropœon valley was impregnated with poisonous matter, probably very ancient sewage, which made the slightest scratch a festering sore. Sergeant Birtles was once "injured so severely, that he could barely crawl out into the open air. He suffered from this injury for some months." In their dark, mole-like wanderings, they were sometimes almost suffocated by the stifling heat, sometimes plunged for hours up to their neck in the freezing waters of a subterranean torrent, sometimes blocked up for a long time by a fallen mass without light or escape. Indeed, they might almost flatter themselves at having passed through all those processes of moral purification by air, water, and fire which Anchises assured Æneas were employed with most satisfactory results in Elysium:—

> "Aliæ panduntur inanes
> Suspensæ ad ventos: aliis sub gurgite vasto
> Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni."

Jerusalem has been besieged at least twenty-seven times, and is in a unique sense "builded upon her own heap" (Jer. xxx. 18.) Solomon, Nehemiah, Herod, Hadrian, Constantine, Omar, Godfrey, Saladin, Suleiman, each in turn represents a city built upon the ruins of its predecessor. Under the debris of all these cities—in some places

120 feet deep, lie the remains of the city of Solomon. Cowper tells us that—

> "We build with what we deem eternal rock:
> A distant age asks where the fabric stood;
> And in the dust, sifted and search'd in vain,
> The undiscoverable secret sleeps."

Had the gentle poet lived to our own day, Captain Warren would have compelled him to modify that melancholy sentiment. "The dust" of thirty centuries has not been "sifted and search'd in vain," and the sleeping "secret" is beginning to awake.

When Captain Warren began, the only undisputed fact in the topography of Jerusalem was that upon some part of the Haram Area stood in succession the temples of Solomon, Zerubbabel, and Herod. He therefore wisely made his principal excavations on Mount Moriah. Jealously excluded from the interior of the Area he industriously sunk a great number of shafts all round the enclosure. Bearing in mind the notorious indolence of Arab workmen, we are astonished at the number of shafts. A partial explanation is doubtless to be found in the fact that Captain Warren "had a Jewish overseer, that is, a man who kept above ground, and beat the men with his corbatch when they were idling. He was a first-rate fellow, and was called by the fellahîn "the devil." When any man was grossly idle, he was given "the option of a licking with the corbatch and a deduction of pay instead of dismissal, and he generally chose the former," not being a disciple of Mr. Peter Taylor.

As Captain Warren's work at Jerusalem has already been described in this REVIEW, we shall dwell only on the principal results.

Commencing with the western wall of the Haram Area, the first shaft was sunk under Wilson's Arch. At a depth of twenty-four feet they came upon a mass of broken voussoirs and bevelled stones, evidently the ruins of a fallen arch. Hence Wilson's Arch, which is probably the work of Herod or Hadrian, stands upon the site of an older one. "This seems to point very clearly to its having been one of the four gates mentioned by Josephus."* At a depth of fifty-four feet they reached the hard rock (mezzeh) upon which the bottom course of the great

* *Our Work in Palestine*, p. 106.

sanctuary wall rests. This is "probably one of the oldest portions of the sanctuary now existing, and may have formed part of the original enclosure wall of the temple."* When first built, it was apparently exposed to view from the very bottom, towering to the great height of seventy-five feet six inches. At the foundation of the wall was found a stream of water; periodical observations, extended over two years, proved that this stream, buried under seventy feet of debris, ran perpetually. Its source and destination remain to be discovered. At a depth of twenty-five feet a landing was made in the shaft, and a lateral gallery driven a considerable distance along the sanctuary wall to the south, in search of the second suburban gate, as given in Fergusson's Restoration of the Temple. No trace was discovered, and Captain Warren concluded that if such a gate had existed south of Wilson's Arch, "it would have been visible in the shafts or gallery, or in some part of the Sanctuary wall exposed in the chambers underneath the Hall of Justice." †

The next shaft uncovered the pier of Wilson's Arch, and galleries running out from this to the west revealed the existence of a very singular viaduct of arches and vaults, supporting the causeway which connected the gate at Wilson's Arch with the upper city.

Mejir ed-Din, an Arabic writer of the 13th century, says that the street of David was "so named from a subterranean gallery which David caused to be made from the Gate of the Chain to the citadel called the Mihrab of David." ‡ This secret passage was discovered south of the arches of the causeway just named, and immediately under the present street of David. Captain Warren actually followed it up to a distance of 250 feet. He thinks, however, that it is of a much later date than the time of David.

The next series of shafts was sunk at Robinson's Arch. It had long been disputed whether the masonry projection from the wall, known as "Robinson's Arch," was the fragment of a bridge, or merely a skewback placed there in anticipation of some future want. This controversy was ended by the discovery of the pier of the arch, forty-one feet six inches from the wall. Of this gigantic pier only the three lower courses were still *in situ*, hidden under forty feet of debris. Galleries driven round them revealed that the pier

* *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 78. † *Ibid.*, p. 79. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

was fifty-one feet six inches long, and twelve feet two inches thick. On a pavement stretching from the base of the pier to the sanctuary wall, the fallen voussoirs and debris of the arch itself were actually discovered. The pavement when broken through was found to rest upon a mass of rubbish twenty-three feet deep. At the bottom of this rubbish they reached a remarkable aqueduct cut in the solid rock. The roof of the aqueduct had at this point been broken by the falling of two large voussoirs. These voussoirs must of course have belonged to an arch older than "Robinson's Arch," whose ruins lay on the pavement twenty-three feet above. The rock-cut aqueduct was cleared of the mud which filled it, and followed north and south for some hundreds of feet. It was discovered that at one point it was *cut through* by the foundations of the sanctuary wall.* This was a discovery of the greatest moment, because it proved that the south-west portion of the western wall was of a later date than the aqueduct.

At the Moor's or Prophet's Gate, Captain Warren sank a shaft, and found the sill of the enormous lintel called "Barclay's Gateway," at about twenty-three feet below the surface. This ancient gate was discovered to be about thirty feet high and nineteen feet wide. Here, then, is one old gate of the Temple. Robinson's Arch and Wilson's Arch are two more. Josephus speaks of four; where is the fourth? Captain Warren, as we have seen, considers his excavations to have proved that it does not exist south of Wilson's Arch, and he thinks that he has found it on the north, at a large cistern twenty feet south of the Gate of the Bath. This cistern "runs east and west, and is shown as piercing the Sanctuary wall. On plan it is singularly like the vaulted passage leading from the Prophet's Gate; it is of the same width, and runs the same distance into the Sanctuary." † It is extremely desirable that the plaster with which this part of the wall is covered should be removed, to ascertain whether there is a lintel over the cistern similar to that over Barclay's Gateway.

We turn now to the south wall of the Sanctuary. The excavations here showed that the present configuration of the soil is totally different from the original lay of the rock. The south-west corner of the Sanctuary wall is actually built, not, as everyone supposed, upon the eastern, but

---

* *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 107. † *Ibid.*, p. 116.

upon the *western* slope of the Tyropœon Valley. The true bottom of the valley is ninety feet to the east of the south-west angle of the wall, at a depth of eighty-eight feet below the present surface. The whole of that enormous space is filled up with the accumulated ruins of ages. The most important result of the excavations along the south wall was the startling discovery that the south-west portion of the Sanctuary wall—from Barclay's Gateway on the west to the Double, or Huldah, Gate on the south—is apparently of later date than the rest of the western and southern walls. Captain Warren supports this revolutionary conclusion with five arguments:—1. The southern portion of the west wall is, as we have seen, built over the rock-cut aqueduct, and is therefore later than the aqueduct. 2. From Wilson's Arch to Barclay's Gateway the drafted stones have their faces finely worked, and therefore were probably at first above ground and visible. But in the wall south of Barclay's Gateway, at a higher level than the finely-worked stones on the north side, there are stones with rough faces, which were evidently underground from the first. These rough stones could not have been laid until the slowly accumulating debris had raised the soil to a much higher level than that which existed when the section between Wilson's Arch and Barclay's Gateway was built. 3. A similar train of reasoning arises from the fact that the stones of the south wall near the south-west angle are rough up to a certain pavement, which was probably made about the time of Herod. 4. A course of great stones runs from the south-east angle along the south wall to the Double Gate, where it suddenly stops. 5. The south-west angle of the wall is built on the *western* slope of the Tyropœon Valley. This would not have been attempted until the accumulating debris had to a considerable extent filled up the valley. If this apparently irresistible conclusion be correct Mr. Fergusson's brilliant and fascinating theory of the position of the Temple collapses at once. A similar *coup de grâce* is given to every other theory based upon the idea that the south-west angle of Solomon's Temple coincided with the south-west angle of the existing Sanctuary wall.

Passing to the eastern side of the Sanctuary Captain Warren's first effort was to find the true bed of the Kedron. After several shafts had been completely smashed in by the running shingle, perseverance was rewarded by the discovery of the true bed ninety feet to the west of the present

false bed, and at a depth of thirty-eight and a half feet below it.

At the south-east angle of the Sanctuary wall Captain Warren made his most sensational discoveries. At the enormous depth of eighty feet below the present surface he found the huge foundation courses of the original wall, *in situ* and uninjured, resting upon very hard rock (mezzeh). Above the mezzeh is a layer of soft rock, about two feet thick, and upon the soft rock lies from eight to ten feet of fat mould, abounding in potsherds. It is noteworthy that this mould does not lie close up against the Sanctuary wall, but is at the top, about a foot from it, and gradually closes in to it, the intervening space being now filled up with the debris of later times. It is evident, therefore, that the ten feet of mould was in existence when the wall was built. It and the soft rock were cut through in order to lay the lowest stones upon a solid foundation. Perhaps upon this bank of earth Solomon and Hiram stood to watch the progress of their great work. Everything discovered by Captain Warren favours the romantic supposition. In a hole scooped out of the rock was found a little earthenware jar, "standing upright, as though it had been purposely placed there."* Did the owner intend that it should be buried with the foundation, or did one of Hiram's Tyrian masons leave it there by accident to be found by an inquisitive Englishman after an interval of nearly 3,000 years? On the layer of fat mould Captain Warren found six vase handles; "on each handle Phœnician letters appear, and these, in two instances, have been interpreted by Dr. Birch of the British Museum, and imply that the vessels were made for the royal use, or, at all events, in a royally-privileged manufactory." †

But the most important and exciting event was the discovery of letters, or characters upon the foundation stones; some incised and others in red paint, apparently put on with a brush, the larger characters being five inches high. The gifted and lamented Deutch, having examined these characters, reached the following conclusions:—

"1. The signs cut or painted were on the stones when they were first laid in their present places. 2. They do not represent any inscription. 3. They are Phœnician. I consider them to be partly letters, partly numerals, and partly special masons' or

* *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 141. † *Ibid.*, p. 474.

quarry signs. Some of them were recognisable at once as well-known Phœnician characters; others, hitherto unknown in Phœnician epigraphy, I had the rare satisfaction of being able to identify on absolutely undoubted antique Phœnician structures in Syria."

Here, then, in all probability, are marks made by the Phœnician quarrymen in the "great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones" which were "brought to lay the foundation of the House" of God. For we read that "Solomon's builders and *Hiram's builders* did hew them *and bevel them*" * (1 Kings v. 17, 18). The singular circumstances that no signs of stone-dressing are found about these ancient foundations, and that horizontal drafts on adjoining stones are altogether unlike, combine to prove that "the House, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither: so that there was neither hammer nor axe, nor any tool of iron, heard in the House while it was in building" (1 Kings vi. 7).

> "No workman's steel, no ponderous axes rang;
> Like some tall palm the noiseless fabric sprang."

There is a singular tradition among the Mohametans that Jerusalem will not remain permanently in their hands, and that the conquering Christians will re-enter the city through the Golden Gate in the eastern wall. As if to hinder as much as possible the fulfilment of this prediction, they have blocked up that entrance, and would resist to the utmost all attempts at excavation near it. Captain Warren was therefore obliged to open a gallery lower down in the Kedron Valley, and drive it in a direction perpendicular to the wall. Unfortunately, at about fifty feet in front of the Golden Gate, his underground stratagem was suddenly arrested by a buried wall of immense thickness, which proved as impenetrable as the prejudices of the Moslems above ground. He succeeded, however, in ascertaining that near the Golden Gate the Sanctuary wall extends from thirty to forty feet below the present surface.

At the N.E. corner of the Sanctuary Enclosure Capt. Warren made a startling discovery. The valley which begins at Herod's Gate (Bâb az Zahiré) in the northern city wall, passes—not as was supposed to the north side of

* This intelligible and appropriate rendering is obtained by a slight change in the Hebrew text.

the Sanctuary avoiding the Haram Area altogether—but under the north-eastern portion of the Area, and runs out into the Kedron Valley somewhere between the N.E. angle of the Sanctuary Wall and the Golden Gate. Just as it was found that the S.W. angle of the Sanctuary wall rests on the western, and not on the eastern, slope of the Tyropœon Valley, so it is now discovered that the N.E. angle is situated, not on the western, but near the *eastern* side of the valley which passes from Herod's Gate through the Birket Israil. In consequence of this the present surface course of the wall midway between St. Stephen's Gate and the Golden Gate is actually 125ft. above the rock! This is the largest accumulation of debris yet discovered. Some of our readers have probably been asking ere this why we always assume that the original surface was near the rock. Captain Warren shall reply:—

"Wherever we have excavated we have found the rock at the bottom of our shafts to be cut away in steps, or bevelled, or otherwise showing that the hand of man had been applied to it; and on this rock we generally find two feet or three feet of red earth (the natural colour of the soil of this part), and all above it is stone-chippings and shingle, mixed up with pieces of red pottery, or black earth formed of rubbish from the city."—*Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 170.

It is evident, therefore, that in ancient times the rock at Jerusalem was nearly bare, or at most covered with two or three feet of red earth.

On the north side of the Sanctuary the great object of interest is the Birket Israil, an immense pool nearly 400 feet long, and originally eighty feet deep. Excavations in the Pool revealed that it has a hard smooth bottom of cement and concrete, and therefore was originally, not a ditch as some have supposed, but a reservoir. The modern tradition which identifies the Birket with the pool of Bethesda (John v. 2) is universally rejected. A discovery made while Capt. Warren was at Jerusalem seems to have revealed that long-lost Pool. Major Wilson had described in the *Ordnance Survey Notes* a large pool existing under the convent of the Sisters of Zion, which is situated near the Via Dolorosa. While the convent was being extended to the east a second large pool was discovered parallel to the one already known, and separated from it only by a pier

five feet thick. These extensive *twin* pools answer to the descriptions of the most ancient Christian writers. Eusebius, in the "Onomasticon," tells us that Bethesda is "a pool at Jerusalem which had formerly five porches, and now is pointed out as the *twin* pools" (ἐν ταῖς λίμναις διδύμοις). The Bordeaux Pilgrim (A.D. 333) says that "there are at Jerusalem two great pools at the side of the Temple." These may reasonably be identified with the Birket Israil and the pool which is known to have existed in the Middle Ages near the Church of St. Anne. "But more within the city," continues the Pilgrim, "are *twin* pools *(piscinæ gemellares)*, having five porches, which are called Bethsaida (Bethesda)." No other "twin pools" are known. There is, therefore, much reason to suppose that we have found the memorable spot upon which the infirmity of eight-and-thirty years fled at the bidding of the glorious Healer. M. Ganneau, however, is very confident that Bethesda must be identified with the Church of St. Anne.

When Captain Warren was examining the twin pools under the convent of the sisters of Zion he discovered a splendid rock-cut passage running out of one of them in a southerly direction. He followed this passage for more than 200 feet, when he was stopped by a block of masonry. In 1871, after Captain Warren had left Jerusalem, Mr. Schick, the resident Prussian architect, discovered another large segment of this splendid aqueduct, which he traced from the Damascus gate to the twin pools. Major Wilson believes that this aqueduct derived its supply of water from the pool near the Tomb of the Kings, and he identifies that pool with the "upper pool" of 2 Kings xviii. 17, Isaiah vii. 3, and Isaiah xxxvi. 2, and also with the "upper water *source* (inaccurately rendered 'course' in A. V.) of Gihon," stopped by Hezekiah when he brought its waters "straight down to the *west* side of the city of David" (2 Chron. xxxii. 30). If this be correct it incidentally proves that the ancient Zion was not the western hill now called Zion, but some part of Moriah, a supposition which has an astonishing amount of apparent support in Scripture. It also follows that the fine aqueduct, of which so large a portion is now recovered, was "the conduit of the upper pool," by which Rabshakeh stood when he addressed the Jews on the wall of the city (2 Kings xviii. 17). Major Wilson would complete the theory by identifying the

Pool of Siloam with Lower Gihon or Gihon-in-the-valley (2 Chron. xxxiii. 14), where, by command of David, Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet, anointed Solomon in hot haste King over Israel (1 Kings i. 33). This view is strengthened by the singular fact that the Targum of Jonathan, and the Syriac and Arabic Versions, have Shiloha (*i.e.* Siloam) for Gihon in 1 Kings i. 33, 38, 45.

Captain Warren, although forbidden to sink a single shaft inside the Sanctuary Wall, was permitted to wander freely over the Haram Area. From a careful examination of the cisterns and substructures with which the Area is honeycombed in every direction, he concluded that its present level surface rests upon a vast system of vaults. It would have been too Herculean a task to fill up the great natural depressions of Moriah with earth.

We may briefly enumerate the remaining results of Captain Warren's indefatigable labours. The substructures at the south-east of the Haram Area, called "Solomon's Stables," were proved to be a modern reconstruction. Mr. Fergusson and Mr. Lewin made the east wall of Herod's Temple coincident with the west wall of a passage which leads up from the Triple Gate to the Platform; but Captain Warren found that "there is nothing whatever in this wall that can give it the slightest pretensions to be considered as the interior wall of the Temple."* The so-called "Gate Gennath" was re-examined, and proved to be Roman. The long-disputed existence of a considerable valley, running from the Jaffa Gate to the Tyropœon Valley, was finally established.

But next in importance to the discoveries round the sanctuary wall were those which were made in Ophel. Ophel is the name given by Dr. Robinson to that portion of Moriah which lies between the south wall of the Temple Enclosure and the Pool of Siloam. Here Captain Warren sank upwards of fifty shafts, and discovered a remarkable wall, fourteen feet six inches thick, from forty to sixty feet high, according to the configuration of the soil, and seven hundred feet long. This gigantic wall commences at the south-east of the Sanctuary Area, and follows the ridge of the wall. Several towers project from the wall, and one in particular, which Captain Warren suggests is that "tower which lieth out," the identification of which will be one of the principal

* *Recovery of Jerusalem*, p. 231.

clues to the restoration of ancient Jerusalem. As this wall is not built on the mezzeh, but upon the layer of clay, and as its stones are not squared below a depth of thirty feet, it is evident that it was not erected until long after the Sanctuary Wall. The remains of another great buried wall —apparently a recess from the Ophel wall—were found running in the direction of the Triple Gate. South of the Triple Gate itself was discovered a cavern, which Captain Warren says greatly resembles a fuller's shop. This singular suggestion inevitably recalls the touching tradition of James, the brother of our Lord, related by Hegesippus, and preserved in the writings of Eusebius. After describing how the Scribes and Pharisees cast James over the southern wall of the Temple Enclosure, the ancient tradition continues thus:—"And they began to stone him, for he was not killed by the fall; but he turned round, and knelt down, and cried, 'I beseech Thee Lord God Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' And whilst they were stoning him, one of the priests, of the sons of Rechab, a son of the Rechabites to whom Jeremiah the prophet bears testimony, cried out and said, 'Stop! what are you about? The just one is praying for you!' Then one of them, who was a *fuller*, took the club with which he pressed the clothes, and brought it down on the head of the just one. And so he bore his witness." Each shaft sunk in Ophel revealed the remains of buildings, drains, etc.; proving that this portion of Moriah, now extra-mural, was once covered with houses.

This *résumé* of Captain Warren's work at Jerusalem may disappoint those who have not realised the enormous difficulties of his task, and who are unable to appreciate the extreme value of the negative results which he obtained. But those who know how many plausible theories he has exploded, and how greatly he has narrowed the area of future investigation, will not need to be told that whoever may hereafter climb over the stepping-stones now provided, to complete success, Captain Warren's name is imperishably associated with "the recovery of Jerusalem."

We should not conclude our record of Captain Warren's expedition without adding that he was accustomed to utilize the intervals of enforced rest from the arduous work at Jerusalem by taking long and laborious journeys through Palestine, surveying, photographing, observing latitudes and longitudes, drawing plans of temples and other ruins,

identifying Bible sites, and accumulating a surprising amount of information that would be of considerable service when the survey of Palestine was definitely and systematically undertaken. These reconnaissance journeys were made to Philistia, the Valley of the Jordan, districts east of the Jordan—hitherto unvisited—and the Lebanon.

After Captain Warren's return, the barbarous and horrible war between France and Germany greatly interfered with the plans of the Palestine Exploration Committee, as well as with many other good enterprises which we might have imagined would be outside the range of that masterpiece of madness. In the meantime a committee had been formed in America, on the initiation of G. Hanneh, Esq., librarian of the Long Island Historical Society, to co-operate with the British Committee. Dr. Allon and Dr. Mullens, during a visit to New York, rendered valuable assistance in the organisation of the committee there. The English committee felt that the time was now come to complete the survey of Palestine west of the Jordan, and they invited their American brethren to undertake a simultaneous survey of the almost entirely unknown, but exceedingly interesting, country east of the Jordan. The New York Committee cheerfully acceded to this proposed division of labour.

In the autumn of 1871 the third English expedition started for the East. It consisted of three Royal Engineers, Captain R. W. Stewart, Sergeant Black, and Corporal Armstrong. The committee were also fortunate enough to secure the services of Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake, whose experience as fellow-traveller with Professor E. H. Palmer through "the Desert of the Exodus," and with Captain Burton through "Unexplored Syria," made him an invaluable acquisition. Captain Stewart reached Jaffa on November 11th, 1871. It was found that the tops of the Tower of the Forty Martyrs at Ramleh, and of the Greek Convent at Lydda, were admirable positions for trigonometrical observations. When every preliminary arrangement had been made, Captain Stewart was suddenly attacked with congestion of the liver, and, after hoping against hope, was compelled by medical advice to return home. Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake, hastily summoned from Damascus by telegraph, arrived in time to take charge of the work on the first day of 1872. A base line four miles long was measured on the plain south-east of Lydda and

Ramleh. The measurement was made with steel chains brought from England, and was repeated twice. After obtaining the base line, the plan adopted was to establish a camp from which to extend the survey within a radius of five to seven miles; when that was finished the camp would be pitched some ten miles further on, and the same process repeated. In this way the camp moved up from the Maritime Plain to the Shephalah, and from the Shephalah to the mountain district, which forms the backbone of the country. Mr. Drake calls attention here to the fact that the word "shephalah" (שְׁפֵלָה) is wrongly rendered "valley" and "plain" in Josh. xv. 33, and Zech. viii. 7, "It is in fact the district of rolling hills situated between the mountains and the plain, and forms a most marked feature in the physical geography of the country." Existing maps represent it as "a series of spurs or shoulders running down from the main range, which in reality it is not."

After a complete connection had been established by triangulation between Jaffa and Jerusalem, the surveyors turned northwards, and in June, 1872, we find the camp advanced as far as Kuzah—two hours south of Nablûs (Shechem). In the meantime the committee had applied to the War Office for a successor to Captain Stewart, and had secured Lieutenant Claude R. Conder, R.E., who has had charge of the survey during the three years that have since elapsed, and has proved himself a worthy successor of the officers whose names, like his own, will ever be associated with this great undertaking.

In the autumn the survey reached the great plain of Esdraelon, where a second base line was measured to check the triangulation. The result was most satisfactory. They found a difference of only about ·03 per cent. of its length of four-and-a-half miles between the base as calculated from the triangulation and the base as measured on the plain. From the Valley of Esdraelon the survey was carried round Carmel into the Maritime Plain. The party was now strengthened by the addition of Corporal Brophy, R.E., who had been employed for sixteen years on the Ordnance Survey of England.

During 1873-4 the committee, in addition to continuing the survey, employed M. Clermont Ganneau upon a special archæological mission, for which his services were granted for one year by the French Foreign Office. This learned

and diligent explorer first became widely known as the possessor of two large fragments of the Moabite Stone. As "Drogman-Chancelier" of the French Consulate at Jerusalem, he had acquired a perfect familiarity with Arabic, both classical and colloquial, which, added to his natural genius for keen archæological investigation, made him an invaluable acquisition. The results of his mission have already been partly published in the "Quarterly Statements," but the committee have announced that they will all be published this year, with numerous illustrations, in a companion volume to the *Recovery of Jerusalem*.

To return to the survey. When the work on the plain of Sharon was completed, Lieutenant Conder moved his camp to Beit 'Atab, south of Jerusalem, that he might finish the west and south of the Jerusalem sheet of the survey. They were now in the district associated with the romantic exploits of Samson, and they identified most of the scenes of his life. His birthplace, Zorah (Judges xiii. 2), had already been identified with Sera, and Timnath with Tibneh. To Sergeant Black belongs the credit of suggesting that the site of their camp, Beit 'Atab, was the "rock Etam." This remarkable rocky knoll, although from its form, and because surrounded by lower hills, a very conspicuous point, is yet really low compared with the main ridge at the watershed. Hence the perfect accuracy of the singular statement that the "3000 men of Judah went *down* (marginal reading) to the *top* of the rock Etam" (Judges xv. 11) to find Samson. Judges xv. 8 states that after the great slaughter of the Philistines, Samson "went down and dwelt in the top of the rock (or cliff) Etam." This should be rendered "in a cleft or cave (סְעִיף) of the cliff Etam." Lieutenant Conder found such a cleft in a singular rock tunnel running from the middle of the village eastwards for a considerable distance towards the principal spring. "The valley of Sorek" (xvi. 4), the birthplace of the fatal Delilah, was probably the Wady Surár. Samson was "buried between Zorah and Eshtaol (which Sergeant Black identified with Eshú'a)." About a quarter of a mile north-east of Zorah (Será) "are the remains of a rock-cut cemetery, the tombs being broken and filled with rubbish, and among them is a large tomb. It is highly probable that here we have the burial-

place of the strong ruler, and the patrimony of his father Manoah."*

From Beit 'Atab the camp was moved successively to Bethlehem, Mar Saba, and 'Ain el Sultan, the great fountain a mile or two north-west of Jericho. Lieutenant Conder says that 'Ain el Sultan is the undoubted site of the Jericho which Joshua destroyed. As the only spot in the entire neighbourhood which is well supplied with water it is the only natural site for a city. The flight of the spies to the hills confirms this conclusion. From modern Jericho flight in any direction would be equally dangerous, but from 'Ain el Sultan a deep ravine, covered with bushes and filled with jungle, leads up to "the mountain" (Joshua ii. 16) of Koruntil, amongst whose caves and rocky precipices the spies could easily be hid.

The great event in the history of the camp at 'Ain el Sultan was the discovery of Gilgal. Dr. Robinson had heard years before that the name Jiljul, or Jiljilia, existed in the neighbourhood, and in 1865 Herr Zschokke, chaplain of the Austrian Consulate at Jerusalem, had published a pamphlet upon the subject. But the definite and final identification was left for Lieutenant Conder. He found a certain pool, a little more than a mile to the east of modern Jericho (Eriha). The Bedouins who accompanied him did not know its name, but a few of the oldest inhabitants of Eriha called it Birket Jiljulieh. The name of Gilgal was therefore almost extinct. South-east of the pool Lieutenant Conder found a number of small mounds, apparently artificial, known as the Tellayla't Jiljulieh. These, he believes, are "traces of the permanent Israelite camp on the spot."

In February, 1874, the survey party commenced their difficult and trying work in the Jordan Valley. The first results were the exploration of 'Ain Fasail (the Phasælis of Herod) and the discovery of the true junction of Wady Far'a, seven miles lower down than it had ever been fixed before. Their second camp was erected in this wady, at the foot of the mysterious Kurn Surtabeh. Here Lieut. Conder made his most startling—we had almost said sensational—discovery. Every Bible reader will remember the thrilling story narrated in the twenty-second chapter of Joshua. When Canaan was conquered and divided, Joshua

* *Quarterly Statement*, January, 1874.

dismissed the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh to their possessions on the east of the Jordan. "And when they came unto the borders of Jordan, the children of Reuben and the children of Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh built there an altar by Jordan, a great altar to see to." (v. 10.) When intelligence of this act reached the western tribes, they were thrown into the wildest excitement of terror and indignation. Suspecting some idolatrous design, their first thought was to declare war against the apostates. Upon calmer reflection, they decided that a deputation of their most eminent men should seek an explanation. The suspected tribes repudiated in the most vehement manner the imputed design, and declared with solemn asseverations that their sole object was to perpetuate the memory of their oneness with Israel, and their adherence to the worship of Jehovah. Greatly relieved, the deputation returned to their own land, and the whole nation received their report with unbounded joy. "And the children of Reuben and the children of Gad called the altar Ed (*i.e.*, a Witness): for it shall be a witness between us that the Lord is God" (v. 34). Until last year it was supposed that this altar of Ed—the memorial of one of the most remarkable and thrilling events in Jewish history—had utterly perished.

The most conspicuous object in the Jordan Valley is the sharp high cone of the Kurn Surtabeh. The culminating summit of an almost isolated block of hills which close in the broader part of the Jordan Valley on the north, it is visible from the Dead Sea, from Galilee, from Judæa, and from Gilead. In shape a small Matterhorn, it arrests the attention of the most careless traveller. Hitherto eager curiosity has received the disappointing answer that it is of no historical importance. Henceforth it will be crowned with a romantic memory worthy of its conspicuous position. By a series of the most skilful arguments Lieut. Conder has proved that the Kurn Surtabeh is the site of the great Witness Altar.

In the first place, that altar must have been in or near the direct route of the Reubenites from Shiloh (Seilun) to the oak forests of Gilead and the rich pastures of Bashan. This route is clearly defined. From Shiloh a mountain road leads to the broad Wady Far'ah. Opposite the juncture of this wady with the Jordan Valley lies the well-known Damieh Ford—the highway from Central Palestine

to every part of the Eastern uplands. The Kurn Surtabeh stands above the Damieh Ford, close beside the direct route to the East.

Notice, in the second place, the exact description in the 10th verse. The Transjordanic tribes built their altar when "they came unto the *borders* (גְּלִילוֹת Geliloth) of Jordan." Dean Stanley had already pointed out in *Sinai and Palestine*, that this curious word, Geliloth—which he renders "the circles"—is used to describe the *Ghor*, or upper plain of the Jordan, as distinguished from the Ciccar (כִּכָּר), which he renders "the round." The Ciccar, now called the Zor, is the lower river channel. Lieut. Conder pushes this distinction a little further, and argues, with apparent accuracy, that the term Geliloth was not applied to the Ghor generally, but to the "isolated fragments" into which the Ghor is frequently broken up. Sometimes the Ghor is a continuous line of cliff; sometimes it almost disappears; but "more generally there are broad water channels and low marshy creeks, with salt springs and mud flats which run irregularly, leaving *round* islands with flat tops on the level of the Ghor." Such are the "circles" of the Jordan. Now the ground at the foot of the Kurn Surtabeh is exactly of this nature.

Again, the 10th verse states that the altar was built "by (עַל) Jordan." We should give this particle its primary meaning—"*above* Jordan." It was also "a great altar to see to," *i.e.*, to behold (LXX. τοῦ ἰδεῖν). It was conspicuous from afar. We need scarcely say how exactly both of these statements suit Kurn Surtabeh, which is "above Jordan," and is visible even thirty miles off.

It is further obvious that the altar was erected on the western side of the Jordan, or it would not have been a perpetual sign that Reuben and Gad—although beyond Jordan—still had their "part in the Lord," and "in the tabernacle of the Lord." Indeed the 10th verse states expressly that they erected the altar "when they came to the circles of Jordan," *i.e.*, before they crossed over. It is true that the 11th verse states that the altar was built "over against (אֶל־מוּל) the land of Canaan;" but this compound preposition may mean "before" (*in conspectu, coram*) as well as "over against." The strikingly conspicuous peak of Kurn Surtabeh is most properly described

as standing before the eyes, or in the presence of the land of Canaan.

Again, the Witness Altar was "a great altar" (v. 10), a monument of gigantic size. Lieut. Conder's careful examination of the extraordinary cone of the Kurn revealed that it was only in part natural. On the summit is "a great platform eighteen feet high, consisting of ten courses of stones beautifully cut, and averaging three or four feet in length, with a broad marginal draft." A mass of fallen masonry on the eastern base of the cone shows that the huge monument was once larger or probably loftier than at present.

One other fact completes and clinches the chain of argument. The natural ascent to the Kurn is from the north. On that side is a valley called Tal'at Abu 'Ayd, *i. e.* "the ascent of the father of Ayd." The peculiar use in the vernacular Arabic of the word Abu, as meaning that which produces, or leads to, or possesses, would make the natural translation of this term to be, "*The going up which leads to 'Ayd.*" Everyone sees at once the identity between the Arabic 'Ayd and the Hebrew Ed (עֵד). Thus the real name, although lost by the famous summit itself, still lingers in the ascent to the summit by which the warriors of the eastern tribes went up to erect their great Witness Altar.

The Wady Far'a was the scene of another and yet more interesting identification. At the head of this wady was found the "Ænon near to Salim" (John iii. 23) at which John baptised multitudes. Dr. Robinson had already pointed out that due east of Nablûs (Sychar) lies a village called Salim, and that north of this place there is a broad open valley with copious springs. Lieut. Conder has now placed this probable identification beyond dispute, by adding that three or four miles north of the springs is a village which still bears the name of *'Aynún* (Ænon). This picturesque and romantic spot was admirably suited to the ministry of John. It is on one of the main lines through the country from Jerusalem to Nazareth, and "the whole course of the valley presents here a succession of springs, and the flat slopes on either side allow the approach of an unlimited crowd to the banks of the stream."

This discovery is not only interesting in itself, but in a most unexpected manner throws light upon our Saviour's

language in John iv. 35—38, "Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for *they are white already to harvest.* And *he that reapeth* receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal: that both *he that soweth* and *he that reapeth* may rejoice together. *And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth.*" What do the expressions that we have italicised mean? What possible connection have these sayings with what has preceded them? We were unable to explain the language of Christ until we learned that Ænon was near Sychar, and that therefore it was in this very neighbourhood that the Baptist had just been baptising with remarkable success. The meaning of our Lord's words is quite plain now. "The fields were white already to harvest" because John had so mightily influenced the people. That was why the Samaritans were so unusually ready to receive the teaching of Christ. "He that soweth" is John; "He that reapeth" is Christ; and in the unwonted success of Christ's ministry in Samaria they both "rejoice together." "Herein" was "that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth." John sowed at Ænon, and Jesus reaped at Sychar. Who would have imagined that the discovery of Ænon could explain the memorable words spoken at Jacob's well?

From Wady Far'a the camp was moved to Wady Maleh, a desolate and deadly spot, from which they passed as soon as possible to Beisan (Bethshan). Let the reader now turn to the seventh of Judges. When the lamented Luke Wiseman wrote his admirable sketches from this book five years ago, he was obliged to confess that "none of the places" so carefully enumerated in this chapter had "yet been satisfactorily identified."* Had the esteemed author lived to revise another edition, that remark would have been omitted. The survey of the Jordan valley last year threw a flood of light upon that stirring chapter of history. The nomadic horde of Midian, like the Arabs of to-day, came up "the broad and fertile valley of Jezreel, and their encampment lay, as the black Arab tents do now in spring, at the foot of the hill Moreh (Nebi Dahy), opposite to the high limestone knoll on which Jezreel (Zer'ain) stands."† The "well" or rather "spring" (עין) of Harod, at which

* *Men of Faith*, p. 202. † *Quarterly Statement*, July, 1874, p. 182.

the "three hundred men that lapped" were chosen, still exists as the 'Ain Julúd, "a fine spring at the foot of Gilboa, issuing blue and clear from a cavern, and forming a pool, with rushy banks and a pebbly bottom, more than one hundred yards in length. The water is sweet, and there is ample space for the gathering of a great number of men."* "The graphic description of the midnight attack," writes Lieutenant Conder, "can be most readily realised on the spot, and the flight of the nomadic horde most easily traced on the map."† "And the host fled to Beth-shittah in Zererath, and to the border of Abel-meholah" (Judges vii. 22). These places were all now identified for the first time. Beth-shittah ("the House of the Acacia") remains as the modern village of Shatta. Abel-meholah ("the meadow of the dance)" or Abelmea, as it was called in Jerome's time, survives in the name of the Wady Maleh. Zererath, connected with the Zerthan and Zeretan of other passages, is a district name of which traces still exist in the Arabic 'Ain Zahrah and Tullúl Zahrah, three miles west of Beisan. Thus the immediate pursuit drove the enemy some ten or fifteen miles towards the Jordan. After despatching urgent messages to the Ephraimites to cut off the Midianitish retreat, Gideon crossed the Jordan by the fords near Succoth, at its southern extremity (the modern Makhathet Abu Sús), and continued the chase, "faint yet pursuing," along the left bank of the river. In the meantime, a portion of the Midianites had fled along the right bank, intending doubtless to cross over at Jericho. But the men of Ephraim, roused by the eager messengers of Gideon, had forestalled them. When they reached the lower fords at Beth-barah (v. 24)—the traditionary Bethabara, near Kasr el Yehúd, east of Jericho—the panic-stricken fugitives fell an easy prey to the embittered and exulting Israelites. Among the slain were two great princes, Oreb ("the Raven") and Zeeb ("the Wolf"). The ground upon which it had long been supposed that the terrible meeting between Ephraim and Midian took place near Jericho, was the obvious identity between Beth-bara and "Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptising" (John i. 28). But of late years the true reading in John has been proved to be not "Bethabara," but "Bethany," a spot whose very name has disappeared.

* *Ibid.*, p. 183. † *Ibid.*, p. 183.

Hence the only ground for supposing that the Raven and the Wolf were slain near Jericho, no longer existed; in addition to which it was argued that the Midianites would not have fled so far south. It has therefore been customary of late years to suppose that Beth-bara must have been somewhere near the scene of Gideon's victory. Two singular discoveries of Lieutenant Conder's have renewed the old tradition, and justified the description of the flight we have just given. Overlooking the broad plain north of Jericho, is a sharp conical peak, called the 'Ash el *Ghor'ab*, *i.e.* "the rock of Oreb;" and two miles north-west of this are a wady and mound known as the Tuweil el *Dhiáb*, *i.e.* "the Den of Zeeb." The prominent Rock of Oreb formed a most suitable place for a public execution. There the vengeance wreaked upon the greater of the two princes "would be visible to the whole multitude beneath."* Thus, after an interval of 3,000 years, the names which still cling with Oriental immobility to mountain-peak and wild ravine, confirm the Word of God, and testify that the avenging men of Ephraim "took two princes of the Midianites, Oreb and Zeeb; and they slew Oreb upon the rock Oreb, and Zeeb they slew at the wine-press of Zeeb, and pursued Midian, and brought the heads of Oreb and Zeeb to Gideon on the other side Jordan" (v. 25).

The identification of Zererath, Zarthan, or Zaretan, not only illustrates the history of Gideon, but throws singularly interesting light upon the miraculous passage of the Jordan. We read that when the priests that bare the ark dipped their feet in the brim of the river, "the waters which came down from above stood and rose up upon an heap very far from the city Adam, that is beside Zaritan," or as it would be more accurately rendered, "stood and rose up upon a heap, very far *off*, *by* Adam, the city that is beside Zarthan" (Joshua iii. 16.) Now, in the district of Zarthan, discovered by Lieutenant Conder, the Ghor, or upper plain of the Jordan, is not continuous. At several places the cliffs approach one another so closely that one of those shocks of earthquake which from the earliest historical period have been constantly felt in this volcanic valley, would easily cause a blockage of the river. After such a blockage at one of these narrow places, the bed of the river below would be dry for a considerable time,

* *Ibid.*, p. 184.

while a lake would gradually form in the wider basins above. "A rise of more than fifty feet, with a width of nearly a mile, could be obtained in place of a river some twenty yards in breadth." * This corresponds exactly with the description quoted above from Joshua.

It will have been seen that the survey of the hitherto unknown Jordan Valley was most fruitful in illustrating and confirming the sacred history. But these precious results were obtained at a lamentable price. Mr. Tyrwhitt Drake fell a martyr to the fatal climate of the Jordan valley, at the early age of twenty-eight. A man of the most gifted and versatile nature, he joined the survey party in the capacity of Arabic scholar, interpreter, naturalist, and archæologist. At the emergency created by the sudden illness of Captain Stewart, he revealed another of his many accomplishments, by taking the sole charge of the survey for eight months, during which time he carried it on in the most vigorous and competent manner. Always an invalid, and therefore anticipating an early death, it was his young ambition to do something worthy before he died. That wish was gratified. His name will be associated for ever with the exploration of—

> "Those holy fields,
> Over whose acres walked those blessed feet,
> Which, eighteen hundred years ago, were nailed,
> For our advantage, on the bitter cross."

After the survey had been carried to within a few miles of the Sea of Galilee, Lieutenant Conder marched across the Valley of Esdraelon to the Maritime Plain, where his party completed a portion of the survey which had been omitted, and confirmed Major Wilson's identification of Antipatris (Acts xxiii. 31) with the ruins of Kala 'at Ras el 'Ani. The ordinary identification with Kefr Saba was shown to be a very improbable one.

From the Maritime Plain the surveying party returned to Jerusalem, to prepare for the autumnal campaign. While in this neighbourhood, Lieutenant Conder had already identified the scene of Jonathan's chivalrous enterprise (1 Sam. xiv.) at Gibeah (Jeb'a) near Mickmash (Mukhmas). As usual the actual site exactly corresponded with the sacred narrative and the minute description of Josephus. Between the two camps were the "teeth of the cliff" or

* *Ibid.*, p. 184.

"sharp rocks" Bozez and Seneh (v. 4). The name Bozez, if it means "shining," applies well to the smooth and polished rocks on the side of the ravine. Seneh Mr. Drake identified with Suwaynit, the modern name of the wady. The Hebrew word, Senah, means a thorn bush, and Josephus speaks of the place as full of thorns.

A very interesting problem, which occupied Lieutenant Conder's attention about this time, was the history of the Tabernacle of the Lord after the fatal battle "beside Ebenezer" (1 Sam. iv. 1). The history of the sacred ark is well known. It was carried into Philistia, and after strange wanderings brought back to Mount Moriah in Jerusalem. But what became of the tabernacle? In the time of Samuel Mizpeh appears to have been the great religious rendezvous of the nation (1 Sam. vii. 5; x. 17). It is probable therefore that the tabernacle was erected here on its removal from Shiloh. At a later period, however, we find the priest, the shewbread, the ephod (1 Sam. xxi. 2, 6, 9), and therefore, doubtless, the tabernacle, at Nob. Still later the tabernacle is at "the high place at Gibeon" (2 Chron. i. 3). We have consequently before us three places, Mizpeh, Nob, and the high place at Gibeon. Dean Stanley had already conclusively identified the high place at Gibeon with the remarkable "lofty peaked eminence" of Neby Samwil, "the highest elevation in the whole country south of Hermon."* Lieutenant Conder boldly identifies Nob (which means "a hill" or "high place") with the high place of Gibeon, and argues with some force that Neby Samwil satisfies the requirements of Isaiah x. 32. It is a military position of great importance, within sight of Jerusalem, and not far from Michmash and Geba. It was also directly in David's way on his flight from Ramah to Gath (1 Sam. xxi.). Mizpeh, which appears in connection with Gibeon in Joshua xviii. 25, and Neh. iii. 7, had already been placed by Dr. Robinson on Neby Samwil, and Lieutenant Conder adopts this view. He argues especially that, as the word Mizpeh does not occur in the careful and exhaustive passage in the Talmud which describes the movements of the tabernacle, either the tabernacle was never at Mizpeh (which is improbable), or Mizpeh must be identical with Nob or Gibeon, both of which names occur in the Talmud. We might add that

* *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 214.

the word Mizpeh is always used with the article—meaning "*the* watch-tower" *par excellence*—and there is no spot in the whole district so suitable for a watch-tower as the prominent peak of Neby Samwîl. Lieutenant Conder thus cuts the Gordian knot, by absolutely identifying Mizpeh, Nob, and the high place at Gibeon. This startling conclusion is warmly contested by Major Wilson, and awaits confirmation. However, in any case it is certain that Neby Samwîl was one of the sites of the tabernacle, and Lieutenant Conder states that "traces of the exterior court of the tabernacle in this great high place are yet discoverable on the summit of the hill." *

The autumn campaign last year commenced in the hill country south of Judah, a little known, but most important part of Palestine. Among other interesting results, light was thrown upon the thrilling episode recorded in 2 Chron. xx., when Jehoshaphat learnt that "the battle" was not his, "but God's" (v. 15). Every place was identified. The Moabite host, after encamping at Engedi (v. 2), came up "by the cliff (marg. ascent) of Ziz" (v. 16), the pass by which the Arabs still ascend on their marauding expeditions. The direct road leads towards Tekoa (Teku'a), but an important pass branches off towards the village of Beth Anoth (Beit 'Ainun), and in this pass, hidden between the hills, well watered, and surrounded by gardens, lies the village of *S'air*, which Lieutenant Conder for the first time identifies with the Seir of whose inhabitants the invaders "made an end" (v. 23). On their return to the main route towards Tekoa, they quarrelled over their rich booty, until they turned their swords against one another. The children of Judah did not "need to fight" (v. 17). When they reached "the watch-tower in the wilderness" of Tekoa, "on the edge of the higher hills, whence the view extends over the long succession of rolling chalk hills which lie between Engedi and the watershed" † they saw only "dead bodies fallen to the earth," and "spoil so much" that they were three days gathering it. On the fourth day they assembled in the valley of Berachah (Blessing) (v. 26), the wide, rich, well-watered Wady 'Arrûb, not far from Tekoa, in which there would be ample room for the triumphant host to meet and "bless the Lord." The identification of Seir throws quite a fresh light upon the hitherto unexplained collapse of the invasion.

* *Quarterly Statement*, January, 1875, p. 39. † *Ibid.*, April, 1875, p. 71.

The hill country of Judah was the scene of David's outlaw life, and the Survey has vividly illustrated that romantic chapter of his history. David fled from Gibeah of Benjamin (Jeb'a) *viâ* Nob (Neby Samwil) to Gath (1 Samuel xxi. 10), a Philistine capital which is probably identical with the great white mound of Tell el Safi, on the borders of the Maritime Plain. From Gath David fled to the famous cave of Adullam, to the identification of which place we shall presently refer at length. From Adullam David went to Moab, to seek an asylum for his parents (1 Samuel xxii. 3). He then spent some time "in the hold" (מְצוּדָה i.e. stronghold, or fortress), which some identify with the mighty Masada, now Sebbeh. Thence, we are told, he "departed and came into the *forest* of Hareth" (v. 5). The Septuagint in this place has a striking variation from the Hebrew text. It reads *καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν πόλει Σαρίκ*, "and he dwelt in the *city* of Hareth." Josephus also has "city" instead of "forest"—"coming to the *city* Hareth he remained there." This change in the meaning is obtained by the transposition of a single letter in the Hebrew word (עִיר instead of יַעַר). Josephus and the LXX. are probably correct, because there is the strongest evidence that no "forest" ever existed in that neighbourhood. We must search, then, for the "town," and not for the "forest," of Hareth, or Khareth (חָרֶת). From Khareth David went to rescue Keilah from a Philistine attack (1 Samuel xxiii. 1). As David was not bound to Keilah by any special tie whatever, there is no imaginable reason why he should march to its relief, except the fact that it must have been in the immediate neighbourhood. Lieutenant Conder therefore looked for Khareth in the vicinity of Keilah (now Kilah), a well-known spot. "Up higher in the hills, on the north side of Wady Arneba, one of the heads of the Valley of Elah," he was fortunate enough to discover "the small village of *Kharâs*, a name embodying all the essential letters of Hareth, though with a slightly different termination. The site is an ancient one, with the usual indications—ancient wells, cisterns, and rough caves in the hill-side." *

From the ungrateful city of Keilah David escaped yet farther south a distance of fifteen miles, and "abode in the wilderness in strongholds, and remained in a mountain

* *Quarterly Statement*, January, 1875, p. 44.

in the wilderness of Ziph" (v. 14). The next verse states that "David was in the wilderness of Ziph *in a wood* (חֹרֶשׁ choresh)," and that Jonathan "went to David *into the wood*." Here again the LXX. and Josephus differ remarkably from the Hebrew text. The LXX. states that David was *ἐν τῇ Καινῇ Ζίφ*, "in the *New Place* of Ziph"; and that Jonathan came *πρὸς Δαυὶδ εἰς Καινὴν* "to David to the *New Place*" (v. 16). The Hebrew word that would be translated *καινη* (New Place) differs from the word in the Hebrew text only in the tittle of the Daleth (חרש instead of חורש) and in the vowel points. Lieutenant Conder is wrong in the statement that the difference is "merely of points." However, the difference at most is so slight that a scribe might easily substitute one word for the other. Josephus, agreeing with the LXX., states that the touching interview between David and Jonathan took place "in a certain place called the *New Place*, belonging to Ziph" (Ant., VI., xiii. 2). The variation is certainly of sufficient weight to make it most probable that the "wood" of Ziph must follow the "forest" of Hareth into the world of imagination. Ziph has long been identified with Tell Zif. About a mile south of that spot Lieutenant Conder discovered the ruins of an ancient village called Khirbet *Khoreisa*, in which name he finds traces of the *Choresh* of Ziph, which would therefore be a village belonging to the larger town at Tell Ziph. What renders this solution of the difficulty very probable is the fact that "the existence at any time of a 'wood' in this part of the country is geologically almost an impossibility." * David is next found "in the wilderness of Maon, in the plain on the south of Jesimon" (v. 24), or rather "the Jeshimon" (the article is invariably used), i.e. "south of the Waste." As Peor and Pisgah faced the Jeshimon, or Waste (Numbers xxi. 20), it is probably the dreary barren waste of the hills lying immediately west of the Dead Sea. Maon was previously identified with Tell Ma'in, "the most prominent object in the landscape, a huge knoll, some hundred feet high."

Lieutenant Conder identifies the "rock" (v. 25) of Maon with the Wady el Wa'r, "the Valley of Rocks." We find the fugitive next at Engedi (1 Samuel xxiv. 1), then in "the wilderness of Paran" (1 Samuel xxv. 2) at the

* *Quarterly Statement*, January, 1875, p. 45.

extreme south of Judah, where he comes into collision with the surly Nabal, "a man of Maon, whose possessions were in Carmel," two miles from Maon. The last meeting between Saul and David was "in the hill of Hachilah" (1 Samuel xxvi. 1). There are two passages which define the position of the hill of Hachilah. 1 Samuel xxiii. 19, states that "the hill of Hachilah is on the south of the Jeshimon." Lieutenant Conder translates this literally "on the right hand of the Jeshimon," and then explains it as meaning on the west, "speaking from Gibeah." But that is a questionable rendering. The familiar Hebrew idiom seems to require the rendering of the Authorised Version —"on the south." The other passage which defines the position of the Hill of Hachilah is 1 Samuel xxvi. 1, which states that it is "before (*πρόσωπον*) the Jeshimon." Lieutenant Conder asserts that "the probable site of Hachilah is the high hill, bounded by deep valleys north and south, on which the ruins of Yekin, or *Hakin*, now stand. Between Hakin and Hakila (Hachilah) there is a very strong affinity, and it is unnecessary to state that the n and the l are frequently interchanged."* The spot exactly corresponds with the requirements of the sacred history, and the road to which Josephus refers exists on the side of the hill. Lieutenant Conder suggests that "the trench" (1 Samuel xxvi. 5) may mean a portion of the road which lies low, and has steep cliffs on either side. Here, sheltered from view, and near to water, after the Arab fashion of hiding an encampment, he thinks Saul would pitch his tents. But the explanation in the margin of the English Bible is a much more probable one, especially when the passage is compared with Chapter xvii. 20. The reference seems to be to the rude rampart of waggons, or chariots, by which the camp was encircled and protected. This is the view taken also by the Septuagint.

Until the south of Judæa was surveyed nothing was known of the principle upon which the groups of towns are collected in the topographical lists of the Book of Joshua. Lieutenant Conder has made the pregnant discovery that "the list given in the 12th Chapter of Joshua, and preceding all other topographical lists, forms the key to the whole." The thirty-one towns in this list were royal cities of the Canaanites.

---

* *Quarterly Statement*, January, 1875, p. 47.

"They reappear in the succeeding lists, and it will be found that, with one exception easily explained, every separate group of towns contains a royal city. The larger groups occurring in the plains and lowlands contain naturally more than one, but the country is at once divided by these royal cities into districts, which will, on inspection, be found to have natural boundaries, and to be, to a certain extent, preserved to the present day."—*Ibid.*, Jan. 1875, p. 49.

Of the thirty-one towns twenty-six have been long known. M. Ganneau added another by the discovery of Gezer. Lasharon, Libnah, and Makkedah remain to be found. The only other—Debir—was most ingeniously discovered by Lieut. Conder last year. Debir had been erroneously identified with Dewir Ban, which is the name not of an ancient site, but merely of a hill-top. Debir is first mentioned in Josh. x. 38—40. From Lachish and Eglon Joshua advanced up the main pass of Wady Duweimeh and captured Hebron. He then "returned" or turned back (v. 38) to Debir. This verb indicates that Debir was not in the direct line of his march to Gilgal, but required a special *détour*. Hence Debir must be south of Hebron. Again, in the group of eleven cities (Josh. xv. 49—52), of which Debir is the capital, Debir stands between Socoh and 'Anáb, near Dannah. Dr. Robinson correctly fixed Socoh at Shueikeh. But his mistaken identification of 'Anáb has thrown all successive explorers off the right track. The discovery of the true site of 'Anáb on a ridge immediately west of El Dhoheriyeh, and the identification of Dannah with Domeh, has confined the area in which Debir must be found within narrow limits. There is one other clue to the position of Debir which will make assurance doubly sure. In Joshua xv. and Judges i. we have an account of the second capture of Debir by Othniel, who received as his reward the hand of his cousin Achsah. Then follows the well-known request of the bride: "Give me a blessing (i.e. a gift); for thou hast given me a south land (rather, 'the Negeb,' i.e. the dry or arid land); give me also springs of water. And he gave her the upper springs and the nether springs." (Josh. xv. 19; comp. Judges i. 15.) Hence we must look for Debir south-west of Hebron, between Socoh and 'Anáb, near Dannah, and in a district itself destitute of springs, but yet in the vicinity of a valley so well watered that "bubbling fountains" gush

forth at its head and at "lower" levels. Such a spot, thus minutely determined, is the village of El Dhoheriyeh, the only ancient site within the possible area. About six and a half miles from El Dhoheriyeh is the Seil El Dilbeh, a secluded valley, copiously watered by fountains and springs.

"On visiting this beautiful spot," says Lieut. Conder, "in the very end of October [the height of the dry season], I found a considerable brook running in the midst, and extending through the small gardens a distance of four or five miles. Such a supply of water is indeed a phenomenon in Palestine, and yet more extraordinary in the Negeb, where no others occur. There are also very copious upper and lower springs. . . . The site thus discovered exists, as would be expected, not exactly in the natural territory of Debir, but on its extreme north-east limit; so that it could, at the request of Achsah, be added to the Negeb country which she already possessed."—*Ibid.*, Jan. 1875, p. 55.

We have scarcely referred to M. Clermont Ganneau, because the forthcoming volume which he has promised will furnish the most suitable materials for a *résumé* of his work; but we must mention two splendid identifications due to him, and since confirmed by Lieut. Conder—Gezer and Adullam.

Gezer was a royal Canaanite city, whose king and fighting men were slain by Joshua (Josh. x. 33; xii. 12). The city itself became the western limit of the territory of Ephraim (1 Chron. vii. 28), and was allotted with its suburbs to the Kohathite Levites (Josh. xxi. 21; 1 Chron. vi. 67). Its primitive inhabitants, though spared by the Israelites, were massacred by one of the Pharaohs, who captured the city and gave it to his daughter, Solomon's queen (1 Kings ix. 16). Solomon immediately reconstructed it. Being a place of great strategic importance, it afterwards played a considerable part in the struggles of the Maccabees.

The site of this important royal and Levitical city was unknown until 1870. In that year M. Ganneau, while reading an old Arab chronicler, Mejr ed Deen, lighted on an incident that happened in the year 900 of the Hegira. The chronicler, describing a skirmish in the district of Ramleh, said that the cries of the combatants reached as far as the village of Khulda (now well known), and were distinctly heard at another village, called Tell el *Jezer*, i.e. the Hill or Mound of *Jezer*. Jezer corresponds

exactly with Gezer, especially if the initial letter be pronounced soft as in Egypt; and the tract of country was the one in which the lost city undoubtedly existed. The statement of Mejr ed Deen is corroborated by Yakut, an Arab geographer of the thirteenth century, who speaks of Tell el Jezer, a strong place in the neighbourhood of Falestin (Ramleh). At less than three miles from Khulda, close to Aboo Shushel, M. Ganneau—put on the right track by these ancient Arab writers—found "the site of a large town presenting all the characteristics of a stronghold, and answering to every one of the required conditions." In 1874, when revisiting the spot in the service of the Palestine Exploration Fund, M. Ganneau found a bilingual inscription engraved on a slab of rock. It begins with the Greek word *ΑΑΚΙΟ* . . . in characters of classical epoch. This truncated form has not been explained. Perhaps it was the name of some priest or governor of Gezer. The Greek is immediately followed by the following words in Hebrew letters of ancient square form:—גזר + תחם. The first of these words is the ancient *scriptio defectiva* of תחום, a word meaning "limit," and frequently used in the Talmud to determine the distance that must not be exceeded on the Sabbath day. The second word is *the very name of Gezer just as it is written in the Bible.* The Hebrew inscription must, therefore, be translated "the *limit of Gezer*," and "marks without doubt the priestly limit, or Sabbatic zone, which surrounded the place." * A few days afterwards, M. Ganneau discovered a second inscription, an exact reproduction and a most startling confirmation of the first. These extraordinary and most valuable discoveries enable us (1) to identify absolutely the site of Gezer; (2) to determine exactly the Sabbath day's journey of the New Testament; and (3) to fix the boundaries of Dan, Ephraim, and Judah.

We come now to Adullam and its famous cave. Gen. xxxviii. 1, states that Judah "went *down*" (i.e. to the Shephalah) from Hebron to visit Hirah the Adullamite. Adullam must therefore be on the Shephalah. In Joshua xv. 35, Adullam is placed in the territory of Judah, between Jarmuth (Yarmúk) and Socoh (Shuweikeh); in the list of kings defeated by Joshua (Joshua xii. 15), the king of

* *Quarterly Statement*, October, 1874.

Adullam stands between the kings of Libnah and Makkedah; in Neh. xi. 30, Adullam is named with Jarmuth and Zanoah; and in Micah i. 15, it is associated with Mareshah. It is evident, therefore, that we must look for Adullam in the neighbourhood of Jarmuth and Socoh, and at no great distance from the northern towns of the Libnah district, or from Mareshah. It is further evident that Adullam was a place of great natural strength, because David made it his retreat (1 Sam. xxii. 1), and it was fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chron. xi. 7). Lastly, there must have been in the neighbourhood one or more habitable caves to harbour David's 400 men. Upon the western slope of the great valley which separates the Shephalah from the high hills, between Keilah and Socoh, there are the remains of an ancient city, discovered by M. Ganneau, and since carefully examined by Lieutenant Conder, which satisfies all the topographical conditions we have just enumerated. Here, too, was found the cave. There was not, indeed, a vast cavern, such as the untravelled English imagination probably pictures to itself. Caverns of that kind are, and ever have been, avoided by the troglodytic peasantry. Their dampness, unhealthiness, and general inconvenience render them unfit for human habitation. The caves which they do use are much smaller, only twenty or thirty paces across. In such caves the site abounds. "There is plenty of accommodation for the band of outlaws who surrounded David." * The identification was crowned by a trace of the Biblical name. A heap of stones and ruined walls low down in the branch valley is called *'Aid el Mieh*, a name which contains all the letters of the Hebrew word Adullam (A, D, L, M), and no others of vital importance.

We must not conclude without a reference to the most praiseworthy and valuable work which Mr. H. Maudslay, C.E., is executing at his own expense upon modern Zion. He has laid bare the foundation of the circuit wall of Jerusalem, and discovered distinct traces of three of the sixty towers with which it was crowned. If permission could be obtained to trace the further course of the ancient city wall so happily recovered, it would undoubtedly lead to the solution of some of the most important problems in the topography of the Biblical Jerusalem.

---

* *Quarterly Statement*, July, 1875, p. 148.

There is but little to be added at present to the history of the third English expedition. When Lieutenant Conder had completed the survey of Southern Palestine, except about two hundred square miles left for the present, the party proceeded to the north of the sea of Galilee, where they were busily at work when, we deeply regret to say, they were murderously attacked by the natives. Happily no death occurred, but Lieutenant Conder was wounded, and the work has been temporarily suspended. The Government have the matter in hand, and are doubtless taking such vigorous steps as will effectually prevent a similar outrage in the future.

We should not conclude without stating that the many valuable and interesting identifications which we have enumerated, and the many more which Lieutenant Conder has made, are supplemental to his proper work. They are so many proofs of his spontaneous zeal and ability. The sole work for which he is responsible to the Committee is the Survey of Palestine, on the scale of one inch to the mile, after the model of the Ordnance map of England. That great undertaking is now rapidly approaching completion. Unless the unhappy event to which we have just referred disarranges the calculations of the committee, it is confidently expected that a complete and exhaustive map of the whole of Western Palestine will be brought to England in the autumn of this year, and given to the world in 1877.

The map of Eastern Palestine is also progressing. Colonel S. Lane, the leader of the second American expedition, passed through London in July last. He proposes to triangulate a strip of country from the south of the Dead Sea to Damascus, with an average width of forty miles, and believes that he shall complete the survey in 1877.

The millions who speak the English tongue may therefore anticipate that in a very few years they will possess, for the first time in human history, a perfect map of the Land, to explain, illustrate, and confirm that revision of the best translation of the Book which is now so happily progressing.

ART. III.—1. *Leonardo da Vinci and his Works.* Consisting of a Life of Leonardo da Vinci, by Mrs. CHARLES W. HEATON; an Essay on his Scientific and Literary Works by Charles Christopher Black, M.A., and an Account of his most Important Paintings. London: Macmillan and Co. 1874.

2. *Histoire de Léonard de Vinci.* Par ARSENE HOUSSAYE. Paris: Didier et Cie. 1869.

3. *Léonard de Vinci et son Ecole.* Par A. F. RIO. Paris: Ambroise Bray. 1855.

IN his recent interesting work on the Renaissance in Italy, Mr. Symonds points to two dates, the date, namely, of the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, and of the sack of Rome by the Imperialists in 1527, as marking the beginning and the close of the culminating period of the Renaissance. These dates also define very nearly the span of Leonardo da Vinci's life. With the exception of the years that followed the issuing of the "decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed," it may safely be said that no similar period of equal importance has occurred in the history of mankind. Events and movements of incalculable importance crowd and jostle one another. The revival of classic learning, the first general application of printing in any popular sense, the most superb of art manifestations, the discovery of the New World, the Reformation—these are indeed enough to make those seventy-five years of time for ever memorable. Against that background it is difficult for any single human figure, unless of heroic and almost superhuman proportions, not to look dwarfed and stunted. Among the great actors in that great drama it is not easy to avoid insignificance. Leonardo has no such danger to fear. The age in all its intellectual and artistic splendour forms no more than a fitting setting for his stately and august presence. There is not one of his contemporaries more pre-eminent, or better assured in his pride of place —not one whose fame time has less dimmed. *Nec pluribus impar*, was the proud motto of the French king; but *he*

realised more than this, being superior to many, and in that wherein they excelled.

"The richest gifts," says Vasari, "are occasionally seen to be showered, as by celestial influence, on certain human beings; nay, they sometimes supernaturally and marvellously congregate in one sole person; beauty, grace, and talent being united in such a manner that to whatever the man thus favoured may turn himself, his every action is so divine as to leave all other men far behind him, and manifestly to prove that he has been specially endowed by the hand of God Himself. This was specially seen and acknowledged of all men in the case of Leonardo da Vinci."

We turn, we confess, with more than usual reverence, with a feeling akin to awe, a sense as of our own presumption, to the study of the works and character of this greatly gifted artist, natural philosopher, and engineer. Who are we that we should attempt such a portrait? Who are we to dole out praise or blame for such life-work?

Nor is the study, even apart from the singular many-sidedness of the subject, an easy one. The materials on which to base anything like a firm and complete judgment are painfully deficient. Time, as we have said, has been powerless to tarnish the lustre of the reputation. It has taken its revenge on the works. Of those painters who have any claim to be called his peers, there is not one whose productions we cannot scrutinise with less of doubt as regards authenticity of workmanship, not one who does not present himself more unreservedly to our gaze. Raphael still lives for us, as he did for his contemporaries, in the great mass of his work. So does Michael Angelo. The Titan world of the Sixtine chapel is neither more nor less remote from the pontificate of Pius IX. than from that of the warrior Pope, Julius II.; and as to the man himself, how much of his soul has he not laid bare in his sonnets? So too with Titian and Tintoret, or, turning to other lands and schools of art, with Van Eyck, and Dürer, and Holbein, and Velasquez, and Rubens, and Rembrandt. The bulk of that legacy of beauty which they left behind is still ours to enjoy. Doubtless in each case something has been squandered. We can easily imagine that "the wronged great souls of the ancient masters," if they ever turned towards the scene of their former labours, and if speech were vouchsafed to them, would tell us of many a

noble work hopelessly lost, would lament over many another irretrievably ruined by want of care, or the clumsy hand of the restorer, would express surprise, and, maybe, some indignation at certain productions, of which they altogether declined the responsibility, being foisted upon them. On the whole, however, being placable, as one may hope in virtue of their greatness, they would, we think, recognise that fate had not dealt too hardly with them,—that if much was gone, more remained,—enough at any rate to enable any diligent student, who might possess the necessary power of insight and critical ability, to enter into the soul of their work. But Leonardo da Vinci—is any such proportion left to us of the few works which his fastidious hand deigned to fashion to completion? You may almost count upon your fingers the finished pictures from his easel that are of undoubted authenticity, and unspoilt by rash repaintings and additions. His masterpiece, that Holy Supper on which he expended all the strength of his splendid maturity, is a mere wreck. Little remains but the large rhythm of the composition, that is almost indestructible. His colossal equestrian model for a statue of Francesco Sforza perished within a few years of its completion. Vasari mentions many works hopelessly lost, so that his praises of them sound piteous in our ears. Some few drawings we undoubtedly do possess, studies of marvellous delicacy and beauty, but these are probably only the haphazard gleanings of chance from a field originally rich with much grain. So also of the master's notes on art, science, and mechanics. They are but jottings, memoranda of passing thoughts, records of uncompleted experiments, unpublished to a great extent, and requiring the most careful and cautious collating. The manuscripts themselves lie scattered at Paris, Milan, in England. Some are jealously guarded and inaccessible. All are difficult to decipher, owing to the handwriting being reversed—one knows not why—so as to be only legible in a mirror. Of original letters or documents giving any insight into character, there are very few. Altogether the problem offered to the critical student is most difficult. The riddles of this great sphinx are hard to read, and our replies for the most part can have little more than the value of doubtful conjectures.

In offering them, however, such as they are, we shall at least not incur the reproach of rushing in, with unhallowed

feet, to a sanctuary which all others have feared to enter. Many are the critics, great and small, who have visited the temple of this great fame. To name but a few, there was Goethe—and that was truly an imperial visit, as from a king to the shrine of a king—and then, but only casually, and for a few moments at a time Mr. Ruskin and Hallam; and then again, more recently still, and more lingeringly, M. Arsène Houssaye, who is perhaps a little too much the "man of sentiment," but in this matter is full of real and intelligent devotion; and Mr. Pater, the graceful Epicurean dilettante; and M. Michelet, mingling his worship with that of the Rights of Man; and M. Théophile Gautier, the literary colourist and voluptuary; and M. Rio, carrying with him that torch of Roman Catholicism in whose light he sees everything, though not unfairly; and M. Taine, who is so ready with his explanations; and M. Clément and M. Charles Blanc; and then again by Mrs. Heaton and Mr. C. C. Black, and a recent Edinburgh reviewer, who may serve to keep us in countenance, if they will allow us to say so, among so many greater personages. For, indeed, it is not the respectful silence of criticism that should warn us from speaking in this hallowed fane; but rather, if anything, the eloquence and weight of the voices that have already sounded therein. Still as those voices have not in all things been fully accordant, and as some of the speakers, in the uncertainty which hangs about the object of their devotion, seem to us to have unduly made Leonardo utter their speech and express their thoughts—why there may, we hope, be room for one speaker more, who, at any rate, will give his conjectures as conjectures, and recognise the doubtfulness of his conclusions.

And first, let us lay a foundation with such few facts as we possess. Leonardo was born in 1452, at Castello da Vinci, in the Val d'Arno, near Florence. His father, Ser Piero Antonio da Vinci, was a notary of the Republic, and a man of substance and repute. The child was illegitimate; for though Ser Piero was thrice married, yet Leonardo's mother, Catarina, never became his wife, and the bare fact of her subsequent marriage, apparently to another inhabitant of Vinci, is all that is known of her. It was an age, however, when the social disadvantages of irregular birth might be very little felt. In the fierce governing families of Italy personal qualities of daring and craftiness were of so much greater importance than lawful right, that

it was no rare thing for the wilding branches to take the place of the legitimate stock. And even in a humbler sphere personal promise might easily be taken as equivalent to the fullest of family claims. Be that as it may, the lad was never treated as anything but a member of the paternal household. His father acknowledged him fully. Tradition says that his successive stepmothers regarded him with kindness and affection; and, at a later period, we find him claiming, quite as a matter of right, his share in the estate of a deceased uncle.

Vasari has somewhat to tell of the brilliant promise of Leonard's youth—that dawnlight in a great man's life which catches such a bright after-radiance from the splendour of the midday and the close—and we can well believe that every grace of boyhood and adolescence was his. He appears to have been carefully educated, and trained in all the exercises befitting a young gentleman of fair means and station. His tastes, even thus early, were almost universal. Some drawings which he had executed were shown by his father to Andrea Verrochio, an artist who, according to the liberal practice of the time, did not confine himself to one branch of art, but was both painter and goldsmith, and the result was that Leonardo entered his studio as a pupil. Here he made the acquaintance of a fellow-student, Peter Perugino, great himself, and the master of a still greater master, Raphael. And here he perfected his skill of hand and power of eye, until, as tradition says—that tradition which so often arises when the scholar outgrows the teacher—he painted an angel in one of Verrochio's pictures that caused the latter almost to forswear the use of the brush. Of these early years, and of the succeeding years of manhood until he left Florence at the age of twenty-nine, very little is accurately known. A few pictures are pretty well ascertained to belong to this period,—notably that Medusa's head which lives, even for those who may never have seen it, in Shelley's lines—and one or two dates may still be recoverable. We know, too, or almost know, that for some unexplained reason, the princely Medici neglected his rising genius, and gave him no commissions. But for the rest all is conjecture. The data are a young man of splendid gifts—physical, artistic, intellectual, social—placed in a world of magnificent activities. Let us fill in the picture of those years with all the brightest hues of hope. They

will, we dare to say, be less glowing than was the reality.

In about the year 1481, however, we touch for a moment on solid ground. A letter of Leonardo's addressed to Lodovico Sforza, and making offer of his services, is a fact, and to be reverenced as such. We can easily theorise it into quicksand, or even, with a little ill-natured ingenuity, into quagmire; but meanwhile it is firm beneath our feet. Here are his words:—

"Having, most illustrious lord, seen and duly considered the experiments of all those who repute themselves masters in the art of inventing instruments of war, and having found that their instruments are useless, or else such as are in common use, I will endeavour, without wishing to injure anyone else, to make known to your excellency certain secrets of my own; and at an opportune time, should you see fit to put them into execution, I hope to be able to effect all the things enumerated briefly below:—

"1. I know how to construct very light bridges, easy to transport from one place to another, by aid of which the enemy may be pursued and put to flight. Also others of a stronger kind that resist fire and attack. They are easy to fix and to remove. I have means also for destroying and burning those of the enemy.

"2. In case of siege I can remove the water from the ditches, and make an infinite variety of scaling ladders and other instruments suitable for such purposes.

"3. Item. If by reason of the heights of the defences or strength of the position the place cannot be bombarded, I have other means whereby any fortress may be destroyed, provided it is not founded on stone.

"4. I have also means of making a kind of cannon that is easy and convenient to carry, and that will throw out inflammable matters, causing great affright and damage to the enemy, and putting him to much confusion.

"5. Item. By means of excavations and tortuous paths made without noise, I can reach any given point, even if necessary to pass under ditches and rivers.

"6. Item. I can make covered waggons, secure and indestructible, which, entering with artillery among the enemy, will break the strongest bodies of men. Behind these the army can follow safely and without any impediment.

"7. I can, if needful, make cannon, mortars, and field pieces, of beautiful and useful shape, and different from those in common use.

"8. Where the use of cannon is impracticable, I replace them by mangonels, balistæ, and other engines of great efficacy, and

not in common use. In short, according as the case may be, I can make varied and infinite engines of offence.

"9. And in case of the conflict being at sea, I have means of making many engines of offence and defence, and vessels that will be able to resist the most powerful bombardment. And powders or vapours.

"10. In time of peace, I believe I can equal all others in architecture, in designing both public and private edifices, and in conducting water from one place to another.

"Item. I can undertake in sculpture works in marble, bronze, or terra-cotta; likewise in painting I can do what can be done equal to any other, whoever he may be.

"Furthermore, I will undertake the execution of the bronze horse, that will be to the immortal glory and eternal honour of my lord your father, of happy memory, and of the illustrious house of Sforza.

"And if any of the above-mentioned things seem to any impossible and impracticable, I offer to make trial of them in your park, or in any other place that may please your excellency, to whom I commend myself with all possible humility."

And here, quitting at once the solid vantage ground of fact, what comment shall we make on this communication? Shall we speak of the sublime self-confidence of genius, of its proud assurance, and disregard for the petty conventionalities of false modesty? Shall we regret that even in the very greatest men some taint of vain-glory may occasionally be found? Shall we surmise that Leonardo had his reasons for believing, that in order to gain the ear of the patron he was addressing it would be necessary to place his own merits in a candlestick, so that their light might be full in view? All such explanations are vain. This only is sure, that when this letter was written the writer was, *longo intervallo*, the first military and civil engineer of the time, and—for Michael Angelo and Titian were but children, and Raphael yet unborn—the first artist. And this, too, is noteworthy, that in his offer of service Leonardo lays more stress on his engineering than his artistic skill. As to how far the prodigies which he undertook to perform were in advance of the then state of military science—whether they, in fact, partook, like his discoveries in pure science, of the nature of prophecies only to be realised by later generations—we confess that our knowledge of the history of military engineering is not sufficient to determine. That he was speaking in any way at random is not believable.

And now, what was the prince to whom this letter was addressed, and to enter into whose service Leonardo shortly afterwards left Florence? Lodovico Sforza was the son of Francesco Sforza, a low-born soldier of fortune and successful captain of mercenaries, who by force and fraud had won for himself the Duchy of Milan, and ruled therein with wisdom and power. Lodovico was not the first-born son; but his elder brother Galeazzo, one of the most hellish human pests of even that bad time, had been assassinated for his crimes,* on the 26th Dec. 1476, and Galeazzo's son, John Galeazzo, who was a child at the time of his father's death, developed neither capacity for rule nor force of character as he grew in years, so that Lodovico found no difficulty in seizing the reins of power and retaining them in his own hands. Nor when the nephew died (on the 20th of October, 1494,) was there wanting the usual suspicion of the time, that poison had been used to hasten an end which the uncle could not but regard as desirable.

Notwithstanding this grave suspicion, however, M. Michelet does not hesitate to declare that Lodovico "was, taken altogether, the ablest and best prince in Italy," and there is no doubt that even a proved murder or two would still leave the balance of atrocities greatly to the disadvantage of most of his contemporaries. For he was not systematically cruel—indeed rather the reverse,—and could at any rate plead reasons of State for most of his acts. That he should be dissolute of life, unscrupulously ambitious, tortuous shifty and intriguing in policy, was almost a matter of course. True, also, that to him belongs the infamy, perhaps more apparent than real, of having first called the stranger to take part in the internal politics of Italy, for it was at his instigation that Charles VIII. of France set the example of those foreign incursions into the Southern Peninsula, from the accumulated horrors of which she is but just recovering. But an act of this kind cannot justly be judged by its after effects, or by the political morality of another age. A French ally against an Italian enemy would not then be deemed an unnatural combination. Savonarola, who certainly

* Sismondi gives a graphic account of the murder, which might almost be called a righteous execution. One of the assassins, when being tortured to death, exclaimed, "This is a bitter death, but the fame of my deed will be eternal," and thanked God that he had succeeded.

wanted neither elevation of character nor patriotism, hailed the coming of the king from beyond the Alps, who was to purge the land from its iniquities, with something like enthusiasm; and it would seem that in certain parts of the country a very general feeling of the kind existed. Moreover, Lodovico Sforza was in one sense only the accidental cause of the catastrophe. He fired the train, but the mine had been prepared by a long series of antecedent circumstance, and it was impossible that he should be able to foresee the force of the explosion. Quite independently of any act of his a foreign invasion of the country was inevitable. And finally, if he sinned at all, he suffered grievously. The reed on which he had leant pierced his own hand—the last years of his life came to an end miserably in a French dungeon.

Meanwhile, however, life was going on merrily enough in Milan. Lodovico was, says Michelet again, "in the highest degree active, intelligent, easy of access, gentle of speech, and equal-tempered." As he took occasion to remind the people in one of the later crises of his career, he had always been just in his dealings with them, ready to listen to their complaints, active in all the duties of government.* If he had spent much of the public money, he had spent a notable proportion in works of public utility—in a splendid system of irrigation, in improving and beautifying the city, in buildings, statues, and paintings of durable worth and magnificence. It was not an unjust claim, as the Milanese recognised after a few months of a different rule. One does not wonder that in this court, at once gay and full of activity and life, Leonardo spent the best, most fertile years of his career. We have seen the letter in which he recommended himself to Lodovico. He no sooner came than he conquered. His skill as a musician—he had fashioned for himself a silver instrument, shaped like a horse's head, of peculiar resonance and sweetness; his singular conversational gifts—which made the Duke declare that listening to his speech was like listening to the sound of music; his proficiency in all manly accomplishments—he was an undaunted rider, an adept in fencing, an excellent dancer—all these were sure passports to court favour. Here was a man who could perform any task that was

* Sismondi—year 1499.

required of him, and yet of the most facile and entertaining companionship. What wonder if he was popular and courted? What wonder if the Duke delighted in his society?

So here he remained at Milan as long as the Sforza rule lasted, utilising his great gifts in every direction, eating a bread that was something amazingly different from that of idleness. It was he who organised the court pageants and festivals; he who superintended works and canal diggings; he who painted the notabilities of the court, or such other pictures as the Duke might require, and especially the portraits of his wife and mistresses. One of the latter, Lucrezia Crivelli, is according to the most probable opinion that "Belle Ferronière" of the Louvre, whom M. Arsène Houssaye regards as "heartless and without any charm," but whose firm and impressive countenance, with its perfect shape and superb mouth, we venture to regard with very different eyes. And, in addition to labours such as these, he founded a painting academy, and taught therein; sat on committees of taste—for strange to say they settled questions by committees even in those days; devoted long years to the modelling of that statue of Francesco Sforza, the great captain and founder of the race, which so excited the admiration of contemporaries, but, owing to the troubles of the time, was never cast in bronze, and perished miserably; studied anatomy with the great anatomist, Della Torre, and executed drawings of the human frame which great surgeons have since seen reason to praise; and cast the lynx eyes of his curiosity far, far in every direction through the realms of physical science. We catch a glimpse of him at his work through the eyes of Bandello, a contemporary.

"This painter," says he, "always liked those who saw his pictures to tell him freely what they thought about them. He often came in the very early morning to the convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie (where he was then designing his 'Last Supper'), and of this I have myself been witness. He would leap on to his scaffolding; and there, forgetting even to take any food, he would never leave his brushes from the rising of the sun till the night was so dark as to make it absolutely impossible for him to go on with his work. At other times he would remain two or three days without touching it, only coming for an hour or two to stand before the figures, with folded arms, and apparently to criticise them in his own mind. I have seen him

again, in the full glare of noon, when the sun of the dog days had driven everyone from the streets of Milan, start from the citadel, where he was then modelling his colossal horse in clay, and run to the convent by the shortest way, and without care of shade; and then, after hastily giving one or two strokes of the brush to his heads, go away as he had come."

Shall we follow the direction which this quotation seems to indicate? It leads us in thought to that convent refectory, some 120 feet long by 30 feet broad, and 15 feet high, at one end of which, 8 feet from the ground, stands the great picture of the "Last Supper." Time, ill-usage, and mischance have done their worst. The picture, as we have already said, is little more than a wreck. What we have before us is but the ruin of a once stately and beautiful edifice. The plan is there, that magnificent harmony of all the parts, that exquisiteness of proportion, which make certain buildings, as Salisbury Cathedral for example, a feast for the eye and for the mind. Certain details too are comparatively uninjured. For the rest, one must reconstruct in thought, toilsomely and uncertainly, with the help of original sketch, and early copy, and later engraving—and then doubt of the result. Francis I. wished to remove the whole into France; but, alas, the damp ill-situated wall, which from the first has acted like a gross and earthly body in its union with the soul of beauty confided to its keeping, was declared to be immovable. The French king might have had the picture, and welcome. No artistic possession should be begrudged to those who will adequately preserve it.

As to Leonardo's intention in this great work, as to the standpoint from which he wished it to be regarded—what shall we say? A whole literature has collected round it. Commentators of every school have spun their cobwebs over it. Reflected lights from every class of mind play upon its surface. For M. Rio it is a timely prophetic protest in favour of the dogma of Transubstantiation so soon to be brutally assailed by the Reformers; for Mr. Pater an effort to clear away the mysticism of the past, symbolising in its present state of faint unreality the effect of criticism on the history of Christ; for M. Athanase Coquerel a page of liberal Protestantism, a right representation of our Lord in the purely human aspect of sorrowing over the betrayal and unworthiness of his friends; for Goethe an unidealised piece of realism, a too literal embodiment of the actual

life which the painter had around him; and for us, who may perhaps be allowed to spin our cobweb like our betters, for us,—how shall we translate into words our impression of this masterpiece?

Realistic? Yet it is so unmistakably. And it is unmystical likewise. The moment chosen by Leonardo is not that when our Lord "took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it and gave unto" his disciples saying, "This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me;" and likewise also the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." There is here evidently no reference direct or indirect to the great miracle which, according to Roman Catholic theology, was first effected during that supper, and was to be repeated day after day, from age to age, by Christ's hearers and their successors. There is no trace of the rapt devotion with which those words, with that meaning, would have been uttered; none of the ecstatic fervour of adoration with which they would have been received. Neither is there any sign of special cup or loaf as distinguished from the rest. Nothing but controversial ingenuity could torture this into being a pamphlet in favour —or, we are quite ready to admit, in defiance—of Transubstantiation. No, the moment selected is that when our Lord's terrible words have fallen among His disciples: "But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." Those words have just fallen from His lips. His hands, half in the natural action of speech, half in the weariness of a great sorrow, have sunk outstretched on the table. The expression of pain is still upon the beautiful face which yet retains its gracious and divine serenity—that godlike calm which passed unaltered through all the terrible scenes of the Passion, save for one brief moment when, as it were, the pent-up anguish of humanity found a voice through the mouth of the Son of Man—"My God, why hast thou forsaken me"? And the disciples —how does the message of pain and unworthiness affect them? John, the one "whom Jesus loved," and in whose countenance love has developed, as it sometimes most beautifully does, a likeness to his loved Master—John feels the sorrow as his Master feels it, and folds his hands in resignation. Peter bends forwards eagerly to urge him to further questionings, and by a half-involuntary action clutches his knife. Andrew, who is seated next to his

brother, lifts up his hands in horror and surprise. James, the Son of Alphæus, repeats Peter's action less impetuously, and touches him on the shoulder to know the truth. Bartholomew, who is farthest from our Lord, rises from his seat in anxious expectation, half doubting whether he has heard aright. On the other side James the Great, Thomas, and Philip are moved by the terrible declaration they have just heard, as the leaves of the forest by a sudden and bitter blast. James starts back in almost incredulous indignation; Philip rises in sorrowfully passionate protest; Thomas threatens the yet undiscovered traitor. Next to these Matthew seems to confirm the purport of our Lord's words, uttered no doubt in the low tones of sorrow, to Simon, who is placed at the end of the table, and who seems to ask, can this thing be? While, between them Thaddæus averts his head, shrinking back, even in thought, from the contemplation of such perfidy. And the traitor Judas, upon whom this sudden thunderbolt has fallen, he sits not apart, as in earlier representations of this scene, relegated to a solitary stool of infamy in front of the table. The evil and base passions written in dark lines on a face that had originally great potentialities of beauty mark him out sufficiently, though not so as to outrage the laws of probability, from the rest of the apostles, albeit he sits between John the beloved, and Peter the master-spirit. A slight disarrangement on the table before him, and the clutch of the money-bag, show the start with which he has heard that his treachery is not covered. He crouches like some ill beast at bay, half in terror and half in malice, looking at the Lord, and doubtful of what may befall. And behind, through the windows of that upper chamber, lies a quiet landscape of far hills, and water, and still sky, symbolising, we suppose Mr. Pater would say, that great calm of nature which enfolds like a slumber even the troubles and sorrows of a Christ and his Apostles—or, as we should say, the rest in the central person of this great picture which remaineth for the people of God, the peace which passeth understanding.

Did we echo Goethe's statement that this painting of the "Last Supper" is the work of a realistic hand? Let us utter a *distinguo* however. Think for a moment what a modern realist, Mr. Holman Hunt for instance, would have done? How careful he would have been to secure a correct representation of the Jewish race in all these thirteen

figures; to place them in attitudes usually occupied at an Eastern meal; and what accuracy of local colour he would have preserved in every accessory—the room itself, the food, the table utensils, the landscape without. As the French would say, we are here only stating, and not discussing. The relative advantages or disadvantages of this method are not now in question. Our point merely is that in this sense Leonardo was not a realist. Though his ethnograpical and archæological knowledge was only that of his time, he yet certainly may be supposed to have known that Christ and the apostles were Jews, and probably was aware that they did not sit at a table for their meals. But for literal exactitude in these particulars he cares not at all. He *does*, however, take the greatest trouble to discover both from Holy Writ and traditions as yet uncrumbled by the fingers of Protestant criticism, what were the characters of the men he had to portray, what their antecedents, how those characters and antecedents would have been impressed upon their countenances, how they would be affected by the terrible revelation falling in their midst like a lightning flash. And that he deliberately chose models realising more or less fully his conception of each Apostle, and departed as little as might be from the actual facts of life in his final representation, seems also very probable. His sketches bear witness to it. Marked character as distinguished from idealised beauty can be obtained only by such means. And so far Goethe's statement is unassailable. But that the man who, while doing all this, could yet lift these heads, without impairing the individuality, into a region of noble and permanent beauty; who in his representation of our Lord's countenance* rose almost "to the height of his great argument," and gave the type which all after times have recognised as least unworthy; who, moreover, by balance and harmony of composition, group answering to group as the strophe and anti-strophe in a perfect ode, so set these figures that the manner of their juxta-position should be a feast to the eye for ever—that this man, we say, was too literal, too mere a transcriber of actual fact—this, we think, is a position untenable.

Indeed the accusation, if we may venture to say so, springs from the unique position occupied by Leonardo's

* Vasari says unaccountably that our Lord's head was never completed. There is some unexplained mystery in this.

art. "There was a touch of Germany in that genius," says Mr. Pater. There was more than a touch. That study of character, of marked individuality which the great Germans carried to such perfection, which was indeed, difficult as it seems to realise, the form in which they worshipped beauty—he pursued it too. A striking face would call out his pencil at any time. We are told that he used to gather round him the common people to a feast, urge them to merriment by his convivial wit, and so catch their humours flying. Some of his burgher figures might almost be taken for those of Holbein or Dürer. But while with those masters character—the visible work of the soul within, and of the external accidents of life, and of time, in moulding the human form and countenance—was the great object of art, for the sake of which they were content almost to ignore beauty of line in face, figure, or composition, with Leonardo it was not so. He would go with them to any distance. Nay, in one way he even went beyond them, taking a pleasure in characteristic deformities as such—in faces shattered by disease, as cretins and the like, or almost bestialised out of resemblance to humanity, or twisted out of shape by the coarse hand of ignoble old age. But he would not go with them exclusively. There was quite another side to his genius. We may, if we please, regard him as a great master of the Gothic as opposed to the Classic school—a realist, a student of fact, of character. We shall then see no more than half. He was this, but he was more. In him, as we think, the two schools culminated.

For the same hand that found a strange delight in drawing monstrosities is also that to which we owe some of the most exquisite creations of the human pencil. Love of beauty—that according to Mr. Ruskin is Leonardo's distinguishing trait. Who but an Italian could have grouped the figures in the "Last Supper," in the "Virgin of the Rocks," or conceived the dainty, delicate, ethereal grace of those exquisite women and children? Character? Yes, they have character enough, no doubt,—of that more anon. But have they not beauty, too? Look at that small statuesque drawing of a young man, who might be a Greek god, among the treasures at the British Museum, or that exquisite "Madonna," somewhat sterner perhaps than usual, but how beautiful, in the same collection, or all those sketches in the Louvre, at Milan, Florence, Venice, and

Vienna, reproduced for us, by the autotype process, with as near an approach to exact *fac simile* as the unapproachable delicacy of the human hand will allow. Look at that study at Vienna for the Madonna in one of the Louvre pictures—the Madonna who is seated on her mother's knee, and bends forward towards the Holy Child playing with the lamb. What a subtle combination of mother-happiness, tenderness, pity, and almost arch-grace,—what an inexpressible mingling of evanescent emotions in the face. Look, indeed, at all the series of wonderful women sketches —the one at Florence with the half-closed eyes and strange suspicion of a smile; or the one at the Louvre, terrible, tragic, full of a masculine kind of fierce power, a Judith among her sisters; or the queenly and proud beauty at Milan; or, at the Louvre again, that sweet pensive face turned downwards, full of thought, and the sorrow of thought, and of a yearning unutterable. Examine again the "*Vierge aux Rochers*," not merely for its composition, but for the exquisite grace of the figures, the refined beauty of the countenances. There she sits in a kind of weird grotto by the sea, not a queenly peasant maiden like the Virgins of Raphael, but the queenly descendant of a race of kings, with the refinement of many generations in her pure face, and motions, and delicate hands. Her look is singularly sweet, and full of solemn thoughtfulness as she draws St. John forward towards the little serious child who holds up his tiny fingers in act to bless; while at the side a gracious angel, knowable as such not by greater ethereality but rather by a grand and august beauty, supports the Saviour with its arm. Here in all this work, and we have more to say respecting the great living unruined masterpiece of the Joconde—there is quite a different side of Leonardo's art. We are no longer dealing with mere facts, reproductions, photographs of the pencil. Those facts have been fused in the crucible of a great genius. The dross has been rejected and the gold remains; and that gold itself has been beaten by the imagination into shapes of imperishable ideal beauty. There were in this man, we repeat, two artists,—the Gothic follower of the characteristic fact, and the classical follower of the beauty that can be detached from that fact. To ourselves we picture him as one of those peaks in the Southern Alps, that on the one side look towards the rugged summits, the glaciers, and rocks, and stony valleys

of the north, and on the other, over belt on belt of beauty to the blue horizon, towards the plains of Italy.

What after this great and puissant duality most strikes us in the work of Leonardo, and that in his scientific work, so far as we are capable of judging, as well as in his artistic work, is its singular modernness. No doubt there is one point of view in which every great production of human art belongs to the present as well as to the past, inasmuch as it belongs to all time. Milton's prose, apart from any special interest of subject to a contemporary, is as full of literary interest, as recognisably massive and powerful now, as the day it was written. It is, however, as unlike a page of modern English as it can well be. It is grand, but archaic. No one, except by an act of conscious imitation, would think of writing in the same style to-day. There are passages on the other hand in Latimer which would excite no surprise if quoted as extracts from some able pamphlet on a question of the moment. There are countless expressions and descriptions in Shakespeare—to quote but one, the word-picture of Cleopatra's barge,—which are as fresh now, two hundred and fifty years after they were written, as much in the fashion of the hour, as if they had first appeared in Mr. Tennyson's last volume. It is not merely that these things are great. They are great in a modern way. And similarly Leonardo is the modern among the ancients. Born in 1452, twenty-three years before Michael Angelo, thirty-one before Raphael, he yet, in this sense, is by far the youngest of the three. There is in many of his faces a subtlety, a complexity of thought and feeling, a "something of that wayward modern mind dissecting passion," a lurking of ironical doubt, which belong essentially to these later times of multiplied and divergent intellectual experience. Looked at beside one of those superb and characterless human creatures on the friezes of the Parthenon, no doubt a statue of Michael Angelo or a Virgin of Raphael appears to be a complex being. Looked at beside a figure of Leonardo the statue seems to belong to an earlier, larger, simpler, Titanic form of humanity—the Virgin, in her sweet purity, to an age untroubled by doubt or sin. M. Michelet, in his passionate manner, seeking in history for the echo of his own voice, wonders whether the Urbinates "impassive Madonnas knew at all what their living sisters had to suffer from Borgia at the sack of Forli and of

Capua," whether "that Psyche, twice painted by Raphael with so great a charm through every scene in her long history has not heard the fearful cry of Milan, tortured by the Spaniards, who will be at Rome to-morrow." Be sure that the women of Leonardo had heard those cries, and were wise with a bitter knowledge of the wickedness of men. Not that that knowledge ruffled the perfect balance of their faculties. They are too great for that. In the multiplied experiences of the world of thought, feeling, and action, they are familiar with wrong, but familiar also with what is right and beautiful. Perhaps through over-thinking, over-refining, over-experiencing, weighing the problems of life too doubtfully—through that thought-weariness of which Goethe spoke—they may look upon both somewhat too indifferently. A kind of smile on their lips seems to tell of half-contemptuous doubt, like the "what is truth?" of Pilate. It is that smile which M. Rio, the serenity of whose faith is ruffled by it, calls *banal*,—trivial, empty, meaningless. The epithet is ill-chosen. For ourselves, if we wished to translate it into words, we should seek them in the book of Ecclesiastes.

We might illustrate our own view of the modernness of Leonardo's work, of its peculiar subtle quality, by reference to many of his pictures and drawings—his St. John the Baptist at the Louvre, or the "Vanity and Modesty" whom Charles Lamb loved and rechristened "Lady Blanch" and "The Abbess," or the drawing of which we have already spoken, in the same collection, of the pensive girl looking downward—it might have been done to-day if one could find a hand of equal power—and to very many beside. But we will refer to only one more—to that portrait of the "green, pale, wicked woman," as Miss Thackeray calls her in one of her graceful stories*—"the pale woman with the unfathomable face"—the incomparable Joconde.

Of the painting of this picture and of its subject, this much is known: that Leonardo spent four years in its execution, touching and retouching, and never satisfied, and then retouching again. Merely the delight of dallying by the fair sitter, surmises M. Clément, somewhat flippantly. Rather, we would reply, the desire, constantly baffled and then leaping up anew, to adequately render the

* The *Story of Elizabeth*.

ideal of unfathomable grace which existed in his own mind, and of which this woman gave him certain gleams fitfully. Her name, which the painter has immortalised, was Mona Lisa del Giocondo; and Vasari relates how, as she sat to Leonardo, he would have someone at hand to play, or sing, or talk to her, that her face might ever retain its natural look, and the evanescent course of the emotions pass unchecked. Afterwards the picture was sold to Francis I. for the then enormous sum of 4,000 gold crowns, such the estimation in which monarch and painter held it.

Was the wife of Francesco del Giocondo a "wicked woman" one wonders? Doubtless she may have seemed so to the slight conventionalised men and women of Miss Thackeray's world, who are so strangely passionless, so much like thistledown in yielding their affections to every light breeze of chance and circumstance. But of direct evidence that should affect our thought of her for good or evil, there is absolutely not one tittle; and we prefer to hold the contrary. Why because this woman's face was lovingly painted by a great painter should we assume that he loved her as anything but a model? There is such a thing as love of art.

However that may be, there she stands, crowned by his hand, queen even in the hall of masterpieces in the art-palace of the Louvre. Successive generations of men have done her homage. Poets have sung her praises. Critics innumerable, from Vasari to our own time, have declared themselves her subjects. And she, on each she bestows the same inscrutable smile, to each she presents, sphinxlike, the same riddle of her look. And each offers his solution, and passes on. To-day it is Mr. Pater, in whose philosophy the world and its experiences are as a rose-garden full of dainty delights, which it is the wise man's part delicately to enjoy, and who, by a weird fancy, would have us look upon the face as reflecting the experiences, not of one life only but of many, as if this strange creature had lived on from generation to generation, and her countenance had grown into its present shape and aspect to the sound of the "music of humanity," like the walls of Ilion to the sound of Apollo's lute. Yesterday, it was M. Théophile Gautier, the voluptuary, who in the face saw the memory and promise of all sensual pleasure. And the day before—but why complete the catalogue?

Each in this woman would fain see something of himself; and she standing in the green gloaming against the background of fantastic rocks, with her perfect hands crossed calmly, and her face enveloped in the folds of some diaphanous tissue which time has blackened into mourning, she looks back at them, secure in her clueless labyrinth, her strange complexity of being.

We have already spoken of the accusation of over-realism brought against Leonardo. It seems only necessary to place the recent statement of the *Edinburgh Review*, that he was a mere painter of matter-of-fact in the full light of such a picture as this,—and then to pass on. Another accusation, however, deserves to be sifted more thoroughly, both because it has been brought against him by a very competent critic, and also because its examination will furnish us with an opportunity of considering the technical merit of his work.

For Mr. Hamerton has said that Leonardo da Vinci's "artistic power was never developed beyond the point of elaborately careful labour"—and Mr. Hamerton "is an honourable man," not usually throwing his words about at random. Let us examine this question seriously therefore. And first we are struck with the fact that he had a cause to serve when he made this statement—he was trying to show that no man can do very many things very well; and no opinion used in argument is quite so good as one expressed without ulterior object. And secondly, as he proceeds to illustrate his meaning by contrasting Leonardo's work with that of Titian, Veronese, Velasquez, and Rubens, we are compelled to say, with surprise, and some diffidence, and yet firmly too, that he seems to be under some misapprehension. Titian, Veronese, Velasquez, and Rubens were all colourists. They belonged to schools in which colour was the prime object of worship. A certain free method of handling, a kind of brio of the brush, if we may so express ourselves, were the result. Having a certain class of truths to express they expressed them by the means best adapted to their ends. Leonardo's aims were quite other. Where they saw colour he saw form. What he strove for was the power of presenting to the eye the exact shape of every object, not only, of course, in its outline, but in all the delicacies and subtleties of its surface. Nor is it as if he had been singular in this respect. Form was the worship of the Florentine school from which he sprang,

and, with the great exception of Venice, of nearly all the schools of North Italy. In that drier, more careful and cautious method of using the brush, he was not more widely separated from the great colourists named by Mr. Hamerton than were Raphael and Perugino, or, to go out of Italy, than Holbein. It cannot seriously be contended that they too, and the countless other great masters who in this old, old debate as to the respective merits of colour and draughtmanship took the side of the latter, never attained to more than a certain mechanical correctness. Mr. Ruskin, whom as humble art critics we regard with a kind of awful admiration, even when we most deplore his errors, much as a Grenadier in the Grand Army may have regarded the Great Napoleon—Mr. Ruskin has discussed this whole question in his *Modern Painters*, with all his power and knowledge, and more than his usual sobriety, using Leonardo's work largely in illustration. He has shown how the colourists worked, and how the draughtsmen worked, and the incompatibility of their methods, and though he himself awards the palm of higher nobleness to the former he does not impute the want of technical skill or fire to the men of form. Let us listen to Leonardo's own words on the subject, for he too has a right to be heard:—

"The first object of a painter," he says, "is to make a simple flat surface appear like a sculpture in relief, and some of its parts detached from the ground; he who excels all others in this part of the art deserves the greatest praise. This perfection of the art depends on the correct distribution of lights and shades, called chiaro-oscuro. If the painter then avoids shadows, he may be said to avoid the glory of the art, and to render his work dspicable to real connoisseurs for the sake of acquiring the esteem of vulgar and ignorant admirers of fine colours, who never have any knowledge of relievo."

It may be that we misconceive the grounds of Mr. Hamerton's judgment. But having in view the unsurpassed marvels of delicacy in the way of modelling which Leonardo executed with brush and pencil, the dainty intricacies of fleeting expression into which his art penetrated, we confess that that judgment itself is incomprehensible to us. Could mere "care," "elaborateness," "labour," have made a man one of the very first draughtsmen of all time?

We have said that in our opinion that character of modernness which is so striking in Leonardo da Vinci's pictures is also observable in his scientific work. On this subject, however, we must be understood to speak with great diffidence, for several reasons—and for this among others, that the results of his labours in science are much less accessible than in art, existing for the most part in manuscript, and being sadly in want of careful collation and editing. Nevertheless the passages quoted in Mr. Black's very interesting essay, and such other books as we have consulted, do, we think, bear us out. Take these as the utterances of a man speaking full a century before the *Novum Organum* and the *De Argumentis*: "Experience never deceives; only man's judgment deceives when promising effects which are not supported by experiment." And again: "If then you ask me what fruit do your rules yield,"—he is referring to his careful rules for the conduct of experiments—"or for what they are good? I reply that they bridle investigators, and prevent them from promising impossibilities to themselves and others, and so being rated as fools or cheats." And yet again this protest, so successfully reuttered by Bacon, against authority in scientific matters: "Many will think themselves warranted in blaming me, alleging that my proofs are contrary to the authority of certain men whom they hold in high reverence, . . . not considering that my facts are obtained by simple pure experiment, which is our real mistress." With these principles to guide him, and habits of observation singularly keen and alert, and reasoning powers wonderfully sane and cautious—and possessing moreover that faculty of imagination which, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, is indispensable to all great conquests in the realms of science—what wonder that his achievements were so marvellous? The parachute, the steam-gun, the camera-obscura, the burning-glass, the telescope, the pendulum, the common wheel-barrow, the lathe for turning ovals, these are among the inventions of which hints, not really very vague, or complete descriptions may be found in his memoranda. Of his scientific discoveries and surmises Hallam, whose strict sobriety of statement is unimpeachable, says, that—

"According to our common estimate of the age in which Leonardo da Vinci lived, they are more like revelations of

physical truths vouchsafed to a single mind than the superstructure of its reasoning upon any established basis. The discoveries which made Galileo, Kepler, Castelli, and other names illustrious, —the system of Copernicus—the very theories of recent geologists, are anticipated by him in the compass of a few pages, not perhaps in the most precise language, or on the most conclusive reasoning, but so as to strike us with something like the awe of preternatural knowledge."

Nor are these discoveries in themselves less extraordinary to our minds than the singularly modern directness of language with which they are enunciated. There is here none of the scientific and alchemical jargon that makes the reading of treatises on natural philosophy, down to a much later time, so difficult and tedious. Even of Bacon, Lord Macaulay remarked that "he sometimes appeared strangely deficient in the power of distinguishing rational from fanciful analogies, analogies which are arguments from analogies which are mere illustrations," and occasionally in perusing his works it is necessary to translate them mentally into a modern form. But in Leonardo all is generally straightforward and direct, and the result of an experiment, the explanation of the phenomena, and the theory deduced from them, are stated with perfect simplicity. As Mr. Black remarks, "a lecturer of the present day would scarcely use different terms" to the following, for example: "If we heat water which is turbid by reason of mud, it soon becomes clear; and this takes place because by heating the water it expands, and in expanding becomes rarified, and being rarified can no longer support whatever bodies heavier than itself may be found in it."

But all this while we have been losing ourselves among the labyrinths of Leonardo's work, totally forgetful of all chronological order and sequence. Let us resume and curtly follow the thread of his life to its end. We left him, it will be remembered, at Milan, multiplying himself in the service of Duke Sforza, painting for him one of the world's masterpieces in that convent of Delle Grazie, which the sad and beautiful duchess had been wont to frequent for prayer and meditation up to a few hours before her death—which her remorseful husband in the agony of his sorrow and remorse had determined to enrich with the choicest treasures of art for her sake. But these days of toil and pleasure at Milan were not to endure. Like the

horse in the fable, Lodovico Sforza was to perish by the allies he had been the first to call to his help. Attacked in the rear by the Venetians, betrayed by his incompetent and venal generals, deserted by his soldiers, he fled before Louis XII., who, in October, 1499, entered Milan, amid the acclamations of the fickle inhabitants. And though by great efforts, and with the help, such as it was, of the Emperor Maximilian, he succeeded in raising another army and re-entered his capital, not without similar acclamations, in the February of the ensuing year, yet this was but a last flicker of prosperity. His rule was played out; and the gloomy prison of Loches shortly afterwards received him. How these events were regarded by Da Vinci, and with what feelings he witnessed the ruin of his old and generous patron, we cannot tell, and conjecture is idle. We only know that still early in the same year, 1500, he left Milan, and went thence for a brief space to Venice, and thence again to his native city of Florence, still palpitating with the death of Savonarola.

Here he was received with all honour. Our Royal Academy possesses a cartoon of the Madonna, St. Anne, and the Infant Christ,* executed at this time, which seems to have been received with something akin to the fervent acclamation that had greeted the works of the older masters as special gifts from God. Vasari tells how, "when finished, the chamber wherein it stood was crowded for two days by men and women, old and young, as if going to a solemn festival, all hastening to behold this marvel of Leonardo's which amazed the whole population." And again, when, after spending the year 1502 in military engineering for the infamous Cæsar Borgia, he returned to Florence, he was commissioned by the Government to paint one of the walls of the hall in which the Grand Council met—another being assigned to Michael Angelo.

A picturesque incident truly, that two such masters should be placed in such juxtaposition. Andrea del Sarto, in Mr. Browning's poem, yearns that after his failures in this life there may be vouchsafed to him—

> "One more chance—
> Four great walls in the new Jerusalem
> Meted on each side by the angel's reed,
> For Leonard, Rafael, Angelo, and me
> To cover."

* It is, like the rest of the works of art belonging to the Academy, un-

And here were two of the masters at work together, each on his wall, and the third, Raphael, as yet but a mighty fledgling, looking on. So there they wrought, Michael Angelo in the early summer of his strength, and Leonardo in its autumn; the first choosing, from the Florentine wars, an incident that gave him an opportunity of exhibiting his skill in drawing the human form; the latter a troop of horsemen locked in deadly strife round a standard—a fury of raging horses and tussling men. Alas, the picture was never more than begun, and the cartoon has perished like so much beside! We know the design only from a partial copy by Rubens—through the furnace of whose imagination we may be sure that no foreign ore would pass without being re-fused. And this is the more regrettable inasmuch as nearly all the authentic work of Leonardo that has come down to us, deals with subjects of a more placid kind, so that here above all one would have liked to see through no other eyes, not even those of the great Fleming, what of power and fierce energy there was in him. He sang this wild war-song but once; pity it is that the echo only has come down to us.

Some bitterness of rivalry, if we are to believe a tradition which we would fain disbelieve, ensued from the joint commission of the two great masters to paint the one hall. And perhaps it could scarcely be that the principals should remain in a region of high serenity, while the partisans on either side were stormily discussing their respective merits. And some unseemly haggling over moneys paid, for which the citizens did not consider they had received a fair equivalent, seems also to have disturbed Leonardo's peace. And he was further troubled by a lawsuit with his brothers, in which, according to the fashion of the time, he received help from the influence of his great patrons, and notably from the French king (Louis XII.).

Whether or not these annoyances influenced his movements, it is now impossible to say; but in about 1507 he again left Florence for Milan, remaining there at the special request, which was equivalent to an order, of Louis, addressed to the Signoria of Florence. The four years that followed were among the most prosperous of his life. He was appointed painter to the King, who appears really

exhibited. This we cannot but regard as a misfortune, even if it be not a fault.

to have valued and appreciated his work for its own sake, and he found in Georges d'Amboise, Marshal of Chaumont, the French governor, an enlightened patron and a friend. But in 1511, those storms from which, according to one of his manuscript notes, he would so fain have fled, began again to disturb the calm tenor of his life. De Chaumont died. War raged through North Italy. The sack of Brescia was a wild revel of blood and ravage appalling even in that age of horrors—the prediction of Savonarola to her citizens, that they "should see this city sweltering in her blood," being terribly realised. The French, under the brilliant and able Gaston de Foix, who was struck down in the moment of victory, gained the battle of Ravenna. They were nevertheless compelled to evacuate Italy. Maximilian Sforza, the son of Lodovico, regained the paternal dukedom. He was in a few months forced to flee before the French, who in turn were again driven beyond the Alps, and then by the Treaty of London (7th Aug. 1514) resigned their claims on Milan. Whether or not it was, as M. Rio surmises, in consequence of this latter event, that Leonardo determined on leaving that city—and doubtless he was too much implicated with the French rulers to be altogether favourably regarded by the dominant party—certain it is that we find a note on one of his manuscripts to the effect that he "started from Milan for Rome on the 24th September, with Giovanni, Francisco Melzi, Salai, Lorenzo, and Fanfoja," his beloved pupils and disciples.

But neither at Rome was there found rest for the sole of his foot. Leo X., the magnificent pontiff, did indeed at first receive him well, bidding him "work for the glory of God, Italy, Leo X., and Leonardo da Vinci," but seems to have given him no important work to do, and to have angered him by contemptuous remarks over his delay in executing such commissions as he received. The fact we take to have been that the chill hand of age had already touched him, and that he no longer felt any yearning "to drink delight of battle with his peers," and cope in splendid rivalry with the young Raphael, who then indeed—

> "Was flaming out his thoughts
> Upon a palace wall for Rome to see,"

or with the sombre and disdainful Michael Angelo,

stronger than himself by the unspent energies of twenty-three years of life. So on hearing that the new French king, Francis I., had entered Italy, and by the desperate and decisive success of Marignan made good his entrance there, Leonardo immediately left Rome, and joined the brilliant, popular young monarch. He was well received, as he certainly deserved to be, even apart from his great gifts, for his loyalty to the French cause, and reinstated in the appointment he formerly held as painter to the king; and a pension of 700 gold crowns was awarded to him. Nor was this all. Francis, the youthful graces of whose character had not yet turned to a cankered fruitage, desired to do honour to the grand old artist, to have him always near him, to receive a reflected glory from his work. So when he recrossed the Alps, in the beginning of 1516, he induced Leonardo to cross the Alps also, and installed him at the small castle of Cloux, just outside the walls of his own castle of Amboise, overlooking the broad reaches and fertile plains of the Loire.

But the night was coming when no man can work. This sojourn in France, this last halt in the pilgrimage of the painter's life, was to be no more than a season of rest before the peaceful end. Honoured of all men, unassailed by harsh rivalries, urged flatteringly to resume the labour of his brush, surrounded by the love and veneration of the pupil and servant friends who had followed him from Italy—of Melzi, beloved for his nobleness and beauty, his gaiety and youth, of Salai, the "son" and "disciple," with a certain grace of clustering and waving hair most pleasing in the master's sight, of Villanis, the faithful attendant—in this genial atmosphere of affection and encouragement, he yet did nothing. A languor as of evening fell upon him, and the night was at hand. With what feelings, what hope of another dawn beyond, did he look forward into its darkness? "As a day well spent gives a joyful sleep, so does life well employed give a joyful death"—thus had he written in earlier years. Did the end come thus joyfully to himself one wonders? Was it "Death, the friend," as in Rethel's wood-cut—the rest after labour, the calm of twilight, the bell tolling out the past, and the bird singing of hope? So it would seem to have been. The serenity of his spirit continued unclouded. On the 23rd of April, 1518, nine days before the end, "considering the certainty of death and the

uncertainty of his time," he made his last will, "firstly recommending his soul to our Sovereign Lord and Master, God, to the glorious Virgin Mary, to our Lord St. Michael, and to all the beatified Angels and Saints of Paradise," and then giving his goods for the most part to Melzi, his friend and executor, and appointing the manner of his funeral. He had already, if indeed he ever held them, abandoned these "heretical ideas" which, according to the statement in Vasari's first edition, he had formed during the course of his philosophical investigations, when "he did not belong to any religion, but believed it better to be a philosopher than a Christian," and had for some time "wrought diligently to make himself acquainted with the Catholic ritual, and with the good and holy path of the Christian religion." And now "he confessed with many tears, and although he could not support himself on his feet, yet being sustained in the arms of his servants and friends, he devoutly received the holy sacrament while thus out of his bed." And then, on the 2nd of May, 1519,* he breathed his last—falling back for his last long rest into the arms of the French king, according to an old and picturesque tradition which, if not fully proven, would yet show the legendary honour that had gathered round his name; and his body is laid in that strange land which was yet the land of his adoption.

It was one of M. Sainte-Beuve's ingenious remarks, that literary skill is shown, not so much in working the main threads of any subject, as in gathering up the minor threads and weaving them into a strong and beautiful tissue. And as we look back at what we have written, we see, alas! many jagged ends and raw edges that might perchance have been worked into the tapestry—many thoughts that have suggested themselves in the course of our studies, and have found no place, or an inadequate one, in our narrative. Let us gather up a few of them, however. The mere mention of them will at any rate show that we are not without a sense of our own shortcomings. And first we should have liked to find a place for an examination in detail of Leonardo's maxims and criticism on art—maxims practical for the most part rather than philosophically æsthetic, but breathing here

* The year, of course, began at Ladyday, so that there was only nine days from the date of the will.

and again a fine disinterestedness in art matters, and a spirit of noble aspiration, and not without an occasional touch of humour, as when he says "one painter ought never to imitate the manner of any other, because in that case he cannot be called the child of nature, but the grandchild," or again when he compares the exaggerated muscular studies of some of his contemporaries to "bags of nuts" and "bunches of radishes." We should have liked, too, to consider the influence of classic art upon him, and his voluntary subordination of that influence to the influence of nature, which he declared to be his mistress in all things; and also to discuss the problem why one who was so consummate an anatomist yet seems to have studied the nude figure comparatively so little. Nor, among minor matters, would it be uninteresting to guess at the reasons which induced him to discard the nimbus in painting the heads of sacred persons—whether because he felt that this gave a touch of unreality, or because he felt that he had the power of so painting them that their sanctity should be sufficiently apparent without such adjuncts. Nor again would it be lost time to stand before his many backgrounds of mountain and rock, wondering why he selected those weird and desolate places for which his own age entertained no great love. We would, too, trace his influence in his disciples, and notably in that one who, whether he ever came personally under the tuition of the master or not, yet received the largest measure of his spirit, and executed in its sweetness if not its full strength Leonardesque works that are second only to those of Leonardo himself—we refer of course to the painter of the "Crucifixion" at Lugano, the "Virgin with the Lily-flower," the "Christ and the Doctors" in our own National Gallery—the exquisite Luini. And finally, for we will not unnecessarily swell the catalogue of our omissions, we would have liked, a little tardily perhaps, to discuss the merits, literary or otherwise, of Mrs. Heaton's book and Mr. Black's important additions thereto, and in any case to thank them for their labours.

There is, however, one subject to which we feel constrained to return for a moment—one voice that calls us back in tones that are irresistible. The spells of the Joconde are upon us, as on our predecessors. We have no charm to escape them. Sphinx-like she offers her riddle; and though, like "Childe Roland" in Mr. Browning's

verse, we come to the dark tower with no hope of success, yet we too must try the adventure, we too must offer our solution like the rest. What does she mean, that lady with the weird smile—what is her message to us? In her face how much is there of the Mona Lisa who walked in Florence streets three hundred and fifty years ago, and listened to Leonardo's musicians, or to his own scarcely less musical speech, as she sat before his easel—how much is there that is Leonardo's alone? Something of the former no doubt; more of the latter, we think. Could we read that face, following the thoughts that were wrought into it during the painter's four years' labour, our knowledge of him would not be dim and vague as it now is, but clear and full. Here, if our belief be not too fanciful, he consciously or unconsciously portrayed his own soul. This, we take it, was the look which his *mind* habitually wore. And whence came the look—how was the soul fashioned? Let us strive for a moment to penetrate the mystery, gropingly, doubtfully, and yet, it may be, perchance not all in vain. Let us try to reproduce to our own thought the world in which this great man's lot was cast, and his own character, and to imagine the probable influence of such a world upon such a character.

As regards the world: it was one of fascinating horror, like his own Medusa. Crimes the most fearful, turpidy the most base, a bestial licentiousness seeking refuge from satiety in strange and abnormal ways of sin—these were in the atmosphere, things of daily occurrence. Christianity had sunk to being little but a name, and a name with an ill-savour, such was the unworthiness of her ministers.* Patriotism was dead or dying. The number of free citizens was daily decreasing. Among the princes, personal

* Dr. Newman, an unexceptionable witness, after comparing the Church, at this time, to our Lord being carried in the arms of Satan during the temptation, says that she was "so environed, so implicated with sin and lawlessness, as to appear in the eyes of the world to be what she was not. Never, as then, were her rulers, some in higher, some in lower degree, so near compromising what can never be compromised; never so near denying in private what they taught in public, and undoing by their lives what they professed with their mouths; never wore they so mixed up with vanity, so tempted by pride, so haunted by concupiscence; never breathed they so tainted an atmosphere, or were kissed by so traitorous friends, or were subjected to such sights of shame, or were clad in such blood-stained garments, as in the centuries upon and in which St. Philip came into the world. Alas for us, my brethren! the scandal of deeds done in Italy then is borne by us in England now."—*Sermon on the Mission of St. Philip Neri.*

aggrandisement, by intrigue, perfidy, or force, was the one master passion. The splitting of the country into a number of small rival states, each with conflicting interests, under the suzerainty of a foreign emperor, had prevented the due development of any feeling of a large common nationality. Such is the dark side of the picture, and it is very black. But on the other, what a magnificent outburst of intellectual activity, what a pure joyance in the recovery of the long-hidden treasures of the past, what a rich foison of art works that are imperishable! How from the dunghill should have sprung these beautiful and delicate blossoms, how by some mysterious alchemy so much of fine gold should have been extracted from that filth, is one of the most interesting problems of history. So it was, however, and such was the time.

Now, to the moralist in such a state of society the obvious wrong, the spiritual wickedness in high places, would be most apparent. This woke in Savonarola a great and indignant cry, premature indeed and silenced all too soon, but caught up again and re-echoed by Luther in mightier tones, that still go resounding through the ages. Leonardo, however, was not specially a moralist. He had no natural mission, if one may venture so to speak, as a reformer—and, moreover, it should be remembered that his death occurred within only a few months of the posting of Luther's theses on the church doors at Wittenberg (31st October, 1517), the first public declaration of war against the old order. He was simply a man of splendid intellectual gifts, and of a mind singularly large, serene, and equitable. We know the danger of arbitrarily selecting—it has been done in the case of St. Paul—some one utterance from among the many that have fallen from a great man's lips, and saying, here is his nature in a microcosm,—the rest is mere surplusage and ornament. But in Leonardo's fragmentary writings, the passages denoting a high serenity, a spirit superior to passion and excitement in all forms, are too numerous to be the mere expressions of some chance feeling. "Flee from storms" is the heading of one of his manuscript books. "Hold me not vile, for lo! I am not poor; the poor is he who over much desires," so he speaks in one of his sonnets; and again in another, "He who cannot do what he will, must do what he can.... Our joy and grief consist alike in this, in knowing what to will and what to do; but only he whose

judgment never strays beyond the threshold of the right learns this. Nor is it always good to have one's wish. Full oft doth what seem sweet turn to bitter, and I have wept at having had my will." Even his exclamation, "When I thought I was learning to live I was but learning to die!" is scarcely one of trouble; and that which we have already quoted, "as a day well spent gives joyful rest, so does a life well spent give joyful death," is pre-eminently one of peace. And the same spirit breathes in his tolerance of hostile criticism, and readiness to give due weight to unprofessional opinion in art matters. It breathes, too, in his art itself, as we read the signs, in its strong and yet delicate perfectness, in the absence, among minor matters, of that haunting figure of death which appeared so constantly to the imagination of his sadder contemporary, Dürer. It breathes, too, in his own face as he has drawn it for us, with its purely cut outline, and steady eye, and delicate mouth, and perfect forehead, and white flowing hair and beard.

Now, in the eyes of such a man how would that world in which he lived appear? Immeasurably in advance of his contemporaries in scientific knowledge, equal to the mightiest of them in his art, consciously in all things holding Nature's hand with a loving grasp, and knowing, as well as Wordsworth, that that is a love which is never betrayed—it can scarcely have been but that most of what his fellow men around him fought and wrangled over seemed to him lighter than vanity itself. He stood upon a height from which he looked down upon his age, its thoughts, opinions, achievements, aspirations, nay, even its vices and crimes, with a smile that knew itself to be inscrutable—and this we take, or rather half take, and that doubtfully, to be the reading of the Joconde.

And now, finally, for one bold question more. Does the woman whom we thus take to be the projection of Leonardo's self on to canvas—does she look down upon infinitely higher things? In her almost disdainful serenity does she, as some would have it, look down on Christianity itself? A hard question, truly. Those "Pharisees," as Leonardo with his nearest approach to sarcasm called the ministers in whom religion was then personified, had much to answer for in alienating men from God. Scientific studies, even from the days of Chaucer, have been recognised as having a tendency to suggest materialism. It may

perchance have been true, as Vasari in his first edition asserted, and then, by his silence at least, denied, that utter scepticism had once dwelt habitually in the master's mind. But one would fain think not. One would fain believe that it was not only in the weakness of approaching death that he who gave to man the noblest representation of the face of our Lord, in its sorrow and sweetness, and twofold ineffable beauty, and who, in an age of grossness and licentious deed and thought, wrought with a pencil uniformly pure—one may trust it was not then only that the greatness of the God-man dawned into his soul. She looks down, does that strange woman, upon the hopes and aspirations of men. We trust there was another look in her face when she turned it upward towards God.

ART. IV.—*A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists.* By the Rev. JOHN WESLEY, M.A., sometime Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. With a New Supplement. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1875.

To the west of Temple Bar, amid the labyrinth of brick lying between the Strand and High Holborn, is a street of mean appearance, which evidently once saw better days, upon which the passer-by may see the name inscribed, "Little Wild Street." This short thoroughfare has a Methodist interest of its own, with which even few Methodist antiquarians appear to be acquainted. In Little Wild Street was formed the first Methodist Society, and there too was published the first hymn-book that ever bore upon its title-page the names of John and Charles Wesley. These memorable events took place at a bookseller's shop known by the sign of "The Bible and Sun," which was kept by James Hutton, the son of a clergyman, and one of the most attached friends which the Wesleys then had. It was on the 1st of May, 1738, that the Society referred to was instituted at "The Bible and Sun" by Wesley and a few others. The place of meeting was shortly afterwards removed to a room in Fetter Lane, and subsequently to a chapel in the same street. This Society is celebrated in the annals of early Methodism as the Fetter Lane Society. It drifted towards Moravianism in spite of the efforts of the Wesleys, who eventually seceded with a considerable number of the members who adhered to them. The residuum at Fetter Lane organized themselves into a Moravian Church about two years after the Wesleys left.

Little Britain, a street in "the City" of London, leading from Aldersgate Street to Smithfield, shares with Little Wild Street, "without Temple Bar," in whatever glory attaches to the publication of the first Methodist hymn-book. The two places are associated upon the original title-page, which we give: "*Hymns and Sacred Poems. By John Wesley, M.A., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford; and Charles Wesley, M.A., Student of Christ's Church, Oxford. London: Printed by William Strahan;*

and sold by James Hutton, Bookseller, at the Bible and Sun, without Temple Bar; and at Mr. Bray's, a Brazier in Little Britain. MDCCXXXIX."

The incongruity of selling hymn-books in a brazier's shop is accounted for partly by the fact that that shop was in Little Britain, which at one time contained a considerable number of booksellers' shops, and partly by the fact that Charles Wesley was a lodger at John Bray's. He was staying at James Hutton's, ill of pleurisy, on the memorable 1st of May, 1738, when the little Society was first formed "which afterwards met in Fetter Lane." A few days subsequently he was carried in a chair to the brazier's in Little Britain, where, on the 20th of May, he "found rest unto his soul." At Bray's it is certain he composed some of his hymns, one of which, on his own conversion, he sang three days afterwards when his brother John came with a troop of friends from a little meeting in Aldersgate Street, declaring, "I believe!" That 24th of May, 1738, was an important day for England. The bells of the Metropolis rang out merry peals for the birth of a prince, whose reign as George III. was long and eventful; whilst holier music, to which the angels sang responsive, was heard at John Bray's, the brazier, "over one sinner that repented." The hymn then sung, which Charles Wesley speaks of in his Journal as *the* hymn, but which he does not specify, his late venerable biographer conjectures to have been either "Where shall my wondering soul begin?" or "And can it be that I should gain?"

We have spoken of the *Hymns and Sacred Poems* of 1739 as "the first hymn-book that bore upon its title-page the names of John and Charles Wesley." There was, however, a volume issued the preceding year bearing the title *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns*, which is clearly traceable to the Wesleys, although it bears the name neither of compiler, printer, nor publisher. But, as the friendship of the brothers with the bookseller of Little Wild Street was of the closest kind in 1738, no doubt the anonymous volume was issued also from "The Bible and Sun, without Temple Bar." The contents of *Psalms and Hymns* are nearly all selections from other authors; but the *Hymns and Sacred Poems* of 1739, and a second volume, bearing the same title, published in 1740, contain a large number from the pens of John and Charles Wesley, and amongst them the very best hymns that the brothers have

written. The selections are mainly from Dr. Watts and George Herbert; but in the case of many of Herbert's pieces, the alterations made, apparently for metrical and musical reasons, amount to a reconstruction of the hymns. Dr. Johnson says of Prior: "He has altered the stanza of Spenser as a house is altered by building another in its place of a different form." The same remark applies to the alterations of Herbert which are found in the early Methodist hymn-books.

The three volumes which we have named were followed by other poetical publications of the Wesleys, selected and original, which are thus classified by Dr. Osborn in his edition of the *Wesley Poetry:* "Four are entirely extracted from other authors; six are partly original and partly selected; nine are mostly selections from previous publications of their own, with a few from other authors intermixed; while thirty-eight are strictly and exclusively original." With so large and bewildering a variety of books, it is no wonder that John Wesley should have been "importuned for many years" to publish such a book as might be generally used in the congregations, and that at last, yielding his consent, he should have issued in 1780, "*A Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists.*" This book, with its characteristic preface, tersely written, and unmarked by the usual apologetic and self-depreciatory tone of prefaces generally, comprises the first five hundred and thirty-nine hymns of the present Methodist Hymn-Book. The exceptions are certain hymns marked with an asterisk, which were inserted in substitution of other hymns after Wesley's death. Before 1831 twenty "*Additional Hymns*" were subjoined, and during 1831 "*A Supplement*" containing two hundred and nine hymns was added. In this form the book has been circulated by (it is not too much to say) millions of copies the wide world over during the last forty-four years. It must now yield its place to the new Hymn-Book which has just been issued by the Conference Office.

As in the new book John Wesley's compilation of 1780 is retained,—the few hymns deleted having been replaced by better ones from the Wesley pen; and as the new Supplement contains a considerable number from the Wesley poetry,—those who use the book have whatever guarantee this name secures, that upon the whole it contains good poetry and sound theology.

The Scriptural purity of the Methodist Hymn-Book few evangelical Christians will question, and those who use it habitually of course regard its doctrinal teachings as in thorough harmony with the Word of God. As, however, there is not as certain a standard to test its poetical and literary merits by, as on these judgments will differ according to varying tastes,—the present may not be an inopportune occasion to make some remarks upon the poetry and composition of many of its hymns.

When we say that the name of Wesley is a guarantee for good poetry, we mean good for hymnic purposes. Every kind of poetry is not adapted in conception and treatment to Christian psalmody. Sir Roundell Palmer, now Lord Selborne, in his well-selected *Book of Praise* says: "A good hymn should have simplicity, freshness, and reality of feeling, a consistent elevation of tone, and a rhythm easy and harmonious, but not jingling or trivial. Its language may be homely, but should not be slovenly or mean." He further remarks: "From the operation of causes connected with the nature of such compositions, it happens that writers who do not in general rise above mediocrity sometimes produce beautiful hymns." To this judgment of the clear and calm-minded ex-Lord Chancellor we will venture to add, that, on the other hand, many of our most gifted poets were incapable of writing a thoroughly good hymn, and that their principal disqualification lay in the very exuberance of their poetical genius. Milton undertook to "celebrate in glorious and lofty hymns the throne and equipage of God's Almightiness," but his celebrations took the form of magnificent epics. When he acted the lyricist and sang "The Nativity of Christ," he produced an Ode so prodigal in imagery, so full of conceptions foreign to devotion, and so rich in classical and other allusions, as to render it altogether unsuitable for Christian worship. Charles Wesley had an imagination greatly inferior to Milton's (how few poets are not his inferiors!), and yet he produced a more popular and appropriate hymn on our Lord's nativity than did the author of *Paradise Lost*. Charles Wesley's "Hark! the herald angels sing" has been appropriated by the universal Church, and is the carol by which Christian congregations of all denominations express their loyalty in jubilant strains every Christmas Day to the New-born King. It is sung by surpliced choirs in solemn

minsters, and by rustic worshippers in village chapels and humble meeting-houses.

While agreeing, upon the whole, with Lord Selborne's sensible criticism, we object to a Procrustes' bed for the measurement of devotional lyrics. Hymns may differ widely from one another, and yet each be good in its kind; so that each one should be judged of upon its merits, and not by some hard and fast canon of criticism. Still we are disposed to say that, as a general rule, an excess of the imaginative quality in a hymn is likely to spoil it. Imagination may exert its highest powers in epical, dramatical, and even in lyrical poetry on certain subjects, but in devotional lyrics it ought to be kept within proper bounds. In this department feeling is required more than fancy. And herein was Charles Wesley's strength as a hymnist. He was not one of those writers, referred to by Lord Selborne, who do not in general rise above mediocrity, and yet produce beautiful hymns. He had an imagination above the average of writers in verse, but he was still more remarkably endowed by nature with poetic sensibility and feeling,—feeling which, in his case, was baptised by the Spirit of God. He had in combination the very elements which are necessary for the production of the best kind of hymn. His imagination was sufficiently powerful and vivid for this species of literature; but had it been more powerful and creative than it was, more active and able in disjoining and recombining his conceptions, and in bodying forth the forms of things unknown; in a word, had he been a greater poet than he actually was, he would have been a less successful writer of hymns. In such a case, general poetical literature would have been a gainer, but English hymnology would have suffered a great loss.

Of the eminent poets who have tried their hands at Christian hymns, Cowper has, perhaps, succeeded best in keeping both his imagination and his poetical rhetoric under control. Indeed he laid them aside too completely, for so tame and bald are some of his *Olney Hymns* that they might pass for the genuine productions of his excellent but rather prosaic friend John Newton. Like some brilliant preacher who in prayer is as simple as a child, the gifted author of *The Task* speaks to his fellow-men with an exquisite play of fancy, in picturesque word-painting, and with the "divine, enchanting ravishment" of the

charming poet that he is, but approaches his Maker with a simple and unadorned song. Still fancy, like murder, "will out." In spite of Cowper's evident efforts to be simple in hymnic composition, he cannot always keep back the imagery which seeks to be employed. In his fine hymn, "God moves in a mysterious way," he has several sublime images, some of them borrowed from the poetry of Divine Inspiration. But amongst the glorious thoughts gathered from seas, and clouds, and storms, from the unfathomable and the vast, there is one pretty figure, culled doubtless from Mrs. Unwin's flower-garden, in incongruous association with these sublimities. However, this is but a minor blemish upon the hymn, and we forget the bud with its "bitter taste," as we think so frequently of the Divine Father's smiling face hid behind the black cloud of a frowning Providence.

The Wesleys evidently felt that excessive or incongruous imagery is injurious to devotional poetry. This is plain from the alterations which they made in many of George Herbert's pieces. For the author of *The Temple* they showed an early predilection, and were quick to discover the pure gold of his poetry amidst odd and fantastic surroundings. Herbert belonged to the class of poets to whom Dryden, and after him Johnson, gave, with something of inappropriateness, the name of "Metaphysical Poets;" of which school Donne was the founder, and Cowley the most renowned disciple. Of the whole brotherhood of quaint singers, Herbert's song is likely to last longest; for its theme is the noblest, and of undying interest. In the Wesleys the saintly poet had admirers not only of his verse, but of the sanctity of character which gained for him the title "Holy George Herbert," by which the Rector of Bemerton was known. His very ecclesiasticism, no doubt, was an additional attraction for the Methodist clergymen, who, notwithstanding their canonical irregularities, never ceased to love the Church of which they regarded themselves as ministers to the last. Indeed Charles, while unbeneficed, while holding pastoral relations to Methodist congregations, and to them only, in buildings which no bishop had consecrated, delighted to advertise himself upon the title-pages of his poetical publications, with something of an ostentatious inconsistency, as a "Presbyter of the Church of England." But the admiration in which the Wesleys held Herbert and his poetry did not blind them to

his faults of style. Accordingly, in their alterations they pruned his redundancies, and lessened the number of his grotesque metaphors. And yet in one piece in which George Herbert calls a bird a bird, his improvers call the creature "a feathered minstrel!" But this, be it remembered, was fully forty years before the terms "meek-eyed" and "pale-eyed" were pilloried as "pretty compound epithets," together with "menders of hymns," in a noted *Preface*, which has made some readers stare.

In having regard to the external influences that contributed to make the poetry of the Wesleys what it is, no critic who examines the subject should overlook the state of English versification in their day. Its condition, as exhibited in the pages of Dryden and Pope, may be pronounced almost perfection. Of the highest kind of poetry, that which is independent of composition, which consists in imaginative thought, and deep feeling in profound sympathy with nature, we can find but little in the pages of these eminent writers. But if the things which constitute elegant versification—flowing numbers, faultless rhythm, polished diction, and these expressing fine sentiments garnished with wit and epigram and antithesis,—if all this be the purest poetry, then the school of Dryden and Pope was at the head of English poetical literature. No doubt it was so regarded in the age of Anne, and by many after that, until the poetry of nature, as sung by Cowper and Wordsworth, brought back the taste of the nation from its vicious bondage to the poetry of art. The artificial poets, however, had great merits of their own, the principal one being the excellence of their versification. As smooth and harmonious numbers, and even the artifice of rhyme, by which the epic would be degraded, are, for obvious reasons, suited to compositions which have to be sung, it is plain that the influence of the Dryden and Pope school upon the psalmody of Dr. Watts and the Wesleys was, upon the whole, beneficial. Herbert, who followed Donne in his rough and irregular measures, is in consequence unsingable. The Wesleys and Dr. Watts consciously or unconsciously imitated in their hymns the flowing versification of their day, and the result is that their poetry is almost articulate music.

Of Matthew Prior, a writer after the style of Dryden, distinguished in his day, but now almost forgotten, John

Wesley was a great admirer. Cowper credits his friend Robert Lloyd with being—

> "—— Sole heir and single
> Of dear Matt Prior's easy jingle;"

but it is plain that the author of *Henry and Emma* had the more distinguished honour of securing John Wesley's admiration and advocacy. In 1782 the veteran Methodist clergyman published a defence of Prior's personal and poetical reputation against "a very ingenious writer," who was none other than Dr. Samuel Johnson himself. Wesley was influenced, very probably, by the fact that his brother Samuel had been on terms of familiar friendship with Prior, and had complimented him in his (Samuel Wesley's) poem, *The Battle of the Sexes*. A not unworthy version of Psalm lxxxviii. by Prior, we observe, finds a place amongst the "Select Psalms" in the new hymn-book. (No. 596.)

The literary influences which helped to shape the verse of the Wesleys affected no less contemporary hymn-writers, notably Addison, Doddridge, and Watts. The contributions of the latter to the Methodist hymn-books, first and last, have been more numerous than those of any other writer, Charles Wesley alone excepted; so that whatever influenced the poetry of Watts operates to this day upon Methodist hymnology. That his versification is not formed upon the pattern of Spenser, or of Cowley, or of Milton, but of Dryden and Pope, is plain to every judge of style who is acquainted with his *Horæ Lyricæ*. It is impossible, for instance, to read his ode on "The Law given at Sinai" without perceiving that he took Dryden's "Alexander's Feast" for his model. Indeed, so apt a disciple did Dr. Watts become in this particular school of poetry, that Dr. Johnson, who belonged to the same school as a poet, and favoured it as a critic, had Watts included, by particular request, in Tonson's edition of the "Poets," to which his own *Sketches, Biographical and Critical*, were prefixed. Johnson admired the *Horæ Lyricæ* as the product of a poet whose "imagination was vigorous and active," whose "ear was well-tuned, and his diction elegant and copious;" but he thought his devotional poetry to be "unsatisfactory," or, at most, that Watts did "better than others what no one has done well." And yet these "unsatisfactory" lyrics are sung by increasing

multitudes wherever the English tongue makes music throughout the whole world. Johnson plainly thought it an act of condescension on his part to admit the writer of hymns to his series of the poets; and yet many of the names in Johnson's *Lives* have slipped from the memories of men, while the name of Isaac Watts has become a household word, and is likely to survive most of those with which it is associated on Johnson's list.

While imitating the poets of his day in his miscellaneous poetry, Watts purposely discarded what has been called "poetic diction" in the composition of his hymns and psalms. The peculiar phrases which were thought essential to the dignity of poetic literature in the days of Queen Anne were left to do duty in Pindaric odes, heroic couplets, and "needless Alexandrines," while he tells us in the preface to his Hymns that "some of the beauties of poesy are neglected, and some wilfully defaced." "I have thrown out," he says, "the lines that were too sonorous, and have given an allay to my verse, lest a more exalted tone of thought or language should darken or disturb the devotion." In like manner, in his preface to *The Psalms of David Imitated*, he confesses that he "always avoided the language of the poets where it did not suit the language of the Gospel;" that he would not "indulge in any bold metaphors, nor admit of hard words, nor tempt an ignorant worshipper to sing without understanding." In rejecting the "elegant" inanities of "poetical diction," while he adopted the versification of his day in its general features, Watts contributed thereby not a little to the permanent value of his hymns.

Other influences, affecting not so much the composition as the matter and spirit of their poetry, came upon the Wesleys from German sources. Germany has a hymnic literature vastly more voluminous than that of England. Even before the Protestant Reformation the people were not altogether without vernacular hymns. In the middle ages St. Francis spoke to his monks of the pious pilgrims who came from "a certain country called Germany" to visit "the holy shrines," with their "long staves and great boots," and how they "sing praise to God and all His saints." At the Reformation the national taste for sacred song was allowed to gratify itself to the full, and Luther himself was amongst the singers. The great Reformer was a poet as well as a preacher, and could compose a psalm

as well as write a thesis. As the Wesleys were greatly aided in the work of practical reformation, in turning men "from the power of Satan unto God," by their own hymns; so Luther, in the work of doctrinal reformation, in turning them "from darkness to light," was mightily assisted by his own stirring psalms. His well-known hymns, *The Stronghold* and the *Thanksgiving for Benefits in Christ*, became exceedingly popular, and were blessed to many. Of the latter, one who lived at the time of the Reformation said: "Who doubts not that many hundred Christians have been brought to the true faith by that one hymn alone."

The intercourse of the Wesleys with David Nitschmann, the Moravian minister, and the other Germans under his care, on board the ship *Simmonds*, during their voyage to Georgia, was improved by John in learning the German language. The apt scholar, armed with a new power, soon explored the treasures of Scriptural truth and fervent piety contained in the Herrnhut Collection of Hymns, from which those Christian emigrants sang the praises of God. The translations which he made were not made at random. In referring to his intercourse with these Brethren, more than half a century afterwards, he says: "I translated many of their hymns for the use of our own congregations. Indeed, as I durst not implicitly follow any man, I did not take all that lay before me, but selected those which I judged to be most Scriptural, and most suitable to sound experience." Although not exactly the first Englishman who worked in the mine of German hymnology —for Dr. Jacobi preceded him—John Wesley was, we believe, the first who, by the excellence of his translations, made German hymns extensively known to English readers. Miss Winkworth—to whom all praise is due—and others have since then worked well in this department of Christian literature.

Although Wesley's translations were made from the Herrnhut Collection, yet only a few of the hymns are of Moravian authorship. From Count Zinzendorf, the patron, if not the founder, of the remarkable community at Herrnhut, which claimed, rightly or wrongly, to be a continuation of the ancient Church of the Bohemian Brethren, John Wesley took the hymn, "Jesu, Thy blood and righteousness"; and from Spangenberg, a Bishop of the Moravian Brethren's "Revived Church," he got, "What

shall we offer our good Lord?" Rothe, the Lutheran pastor of Berthelsdorf, within which Herrnhut is situated, was author of the German original of "Now I have found the ground wherein." But most of the writers whose hymns Wesley has made familiar to English congregations had no connection with the Moravian Church. Paul Gerhardt—three or four of whose hymns are amongst the favourites in the Wesleyan hymn-book—died many years before Count Zinzendorf was born. Freylinghausen, the author of "O Jesu, Source of calm repose," belonged to the school of the Pietists, and was both the son-in-law and successor at Halle of Francke. Indeed nearly all the other German hymn-writers from whose compositions Wesley has made translations, if not Pietists in every instance, were more or less influenced in their spirit and writings by the Pietistic movement. This is true to some extent of Deszler, Winkler, Lange, and Tersteegen. From the latter Wesley took the two grand hymns, "Lo! God is here, let us adore," and "Thou hidden love of God whose height." Scheffler was a Lutheran, then a Mystic, and at last took refuge in the Romish Church. It must have been while yet a Protestant that he wrote two of the noblest hymns that Wesley has put into English dress. These are: "O God, of good the unfathomed sea," and "Thee will I love, my Strength, my Tower."

In estimating Wesley's obligations to Germany his intercourse with the Moravians is thought of too exclusively. But was he not indebted to others as well? Not to dwell upon the fact that it was while listening to a reading from Luther that he found the Gospel salvation, did he not, indirectly at least, receive light and blessing from the Pietism of Germany? The fact was that much of the spiritual life and power of Moravianism was derived from the religious movement within the Lutheran Church, which the cold-hearted nick-named Pietism, and which was remarkably similar to the movement which subsequently took place within the English Church, and which wits and worldlings labelled Methodism. The refugees from Moravia formed but a small proportion of the motley community which settled at Herrnhut, and which for some years was without any proper church organisation, depending mainly for pastoral oversight upon Lutheran ministrations. When Zinzendorf assumed the leadership

of the community which he had befriended, he was already in the possession of spiritual religion. He had been trained from his earliest childhood in Pietistic principles and practices. Spener was his godfather, and August Hermann Francke was his tutor. Spangenberg, whose influence in the Church of the United Brethren was second only to that of Zinzendorf, and who was an abler and less erratic man than his chief, was connected with a blessed spiritual work at the University of Jena, where he was a professor, and at the University of Halle, the head-quarters of the Pietistic movement in the Lutheran Church, before he connected himself with the Brethren at Herrnhut. Even Böhler himself, who gave to Wesley correct views of justifying faith, received spiritual blessings at Jena before he came under Moravian influences. It is plain, then, that any light which Wesley might receive from the Moravian emigrants in the ship *Simmonds*, and in Georgia, and from Peter Böhler in England, came in whole or in part through a Moravian medium from a Pietistic source. This is certainly true of the hymns which he found in the Herrnhut Collection. Nor should it be forgotten that the great Bengel, whom Wesley so much admired, and upon whose *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* are based those *Notes on the New Testament* which form part of the authorised standards of Methodist theology, was one of the Lutheran clergy whose doctrinal views were substantially those held by the leading Pietists, while in experimental and practical godliness he was one with August Hermann Francke, whom he sometimes visited at Halle. Indeed Bengel may be considered one of the leaders of the Pietistic movement in Southern Germany.

The effect of the hymnology of Germany upon the poetry of the Wesleys was not so much upon its form as upon its contents. Wesley found the German hymns full of Divine truth, and glowing with the fervours of experimental religion. It requires only a glance at his translations to see that most of them are not merely descriptions of religion, but the expressions of a religious heart; that they are not only hymns concerning God and Christ, but are direct appeals to, and communings with, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Even the very tropes, which may be regarded as the embellishments of composition, are subordinated to this end, as, for instance, in the stanza from Gerhard Tersteegen:—

"As flowers their opening leaves display,
And glad drink in the solar fire,
So may we catch Thy every ray,
So may Thy influence us inspire;
Thou Beam of the Eternal Beam,
Thou Purging Fire, Thou Quickening Flame!"

Taken as a class, they bring the soul of the worshipper nearer to God than most compositions of their kind. There is much of sublimity in their reverent recognition of the Divine greatness, of holy wonder in their contemplation of the exceeding richness of His grace, and of sanctified passion in their longing after God. How far the Wesley hymns have been influenced for good, and indebted for their spirituality to these lyrics from the land of Luther, who can tell!

We have said already that Feeling is more appropriate to hymnic compositions than Fancy. Indeed this is true of lyrical poetry in general. If thoroughly good, there may be imagination, but there *must* be emotion. A love song which does not breathe the "tender passion," and a patriotic ballad which is uninspired by a love of Fatherland, would be left unsung, however exquisitely worded or beautifully illumined by the light of a many-coloured fancy. Songs of devotion, to meet the requirements of sanctified human nature, or of hearts yearning after God, ought to express emotions, deep, strong, and tender. Who cares for hymns dryly doctrinal, or coldly didactic? And why is it that amongst inspired Scripture the Book of Psalms is so great a favourite with holy minds? Is it not that it is the Scripture of religious feeling and experience? And how is it that amongst the readers of the Psalter, almost everyone, like Luther, has a favourite psalm? Is it not that in that particular one our feelings—whether of penitence or trust, whether of sorrow or joy—are most fully and faithfully expressed? If, in this respect, "everyone hath a psalm," it is because everyone hath a heart.

The pre-eminent excellence of the Wesley hymns consists in deep and holy feeling. In this respect Charles Wesley is superior to Dr. Watts. As to the comparative merits of these two great hymnists opinions differ. James Montgomery places Charles Wesley as a poet second to Watts; and in the completeness of his versification, the melody of his numbers, and in what might be called the individuality of his hymns, it may be conceded that Watts was before

his brother bard. On the other hand, he was certainly inferior to the Methodist poet in spirituality of thought, intensity of emotion, and in the clearness and distinctness of the utterances of faith and hope. It is questionable whether Watts could have written a hymn so deeply penitential as "Depth of mercy! can there be"; one so full of passionate desire as "O love divine, how sweet thou art!" or one so strong in its unquestioning confidence as "My God I am Thine." There might have been a difference constitutionally in the temperaments of the two men, and we know that grace does not change man's emotional nature, but only sanctifies and regulates it. Dr. Watts wrote when the "Dissenting Interest" was at a low ebb, spiritually as well as politically. Considering the religious stagnancy which had settled upon many of the Nonconformist churches early in last century, it is remarkable (and it speaks much for the spiritual-mindedness of the men themselves) that Watts could have sung "Come ye that love the Lord," and that Doddridge could have written "O happy day that fixed my choice." Charles Wesley mixed in more stirring scenes than those which marked the quieter lives of the two Nonconformists. He was a prominent actor amid the wonders of an extraordinary revival, that looked like the return of Pentecost. After his own conversion his regenerated heart overflowed with love and zeal; and it was while he retained the seraphic ardours of his first baptism of fire that he poured forth the best and sweetest of his sacred songs.

It has been the habit in certain circles to speak disparagingly of Watts; and his own opinion, that Charles Wesley's *Wrestling Jacob* was worth all the verses that he himself had ever written, has been quoted to his detriment. It ought, however, to be mentioned to his honour. An author's estimate of his own performances is not always the most correct, whether for or against. George Herbert, with the like humility, characteristic of true genius as well as of true godliness, called himself merely a "*Verser*," and did not venture to publish in his own lifetime that exquisite poetry which is read by increasing numbers with increasing admiration after the lapse of more than two hundred and fifty years. Still it is not surprising that after Charles Wesley's death his brother John should quote Dr. Watts's opinion of *Wrestling Jacob;* which, no doubt, was originally offered, not in a

spirit of self-depreciation, but with a generous desire to exalt a brother poet by a candid recognition of his great merits. Dr. Watts could afford to do this. His own claims as a poet were admitted by the leading critical authority of the day—the *Monthly Review*. Not so with Charles Wesley's claims. They were ridiculed by the same organ; his hymns were classed with the doggerel of the English Moravian Hymn-Book, and the authors of both dismissed as "rhyming enthusiasts." In a review of his *Short Hymns on Select Passages of Holy Scripture*, the exquisite verses, sparkling with poetic beauty, "Thou Shepherd of Israel and mine," are especially singled out for contemptuous comment. Dr. Watts could therefore gracefully make the admission which he did, and undue advantage should not be taken of it.

It is remarkable that, notwithstanding Dr. Watts's high opinion of *Wrestling Jacob*, and the commendation and exposition of its lyra-dramatical structure by so competent a critic as James Montgomery, it is not one of Charles Wesley's most popular hymns. So far as our own observation goes, it is not very frequently sung in public worship. The very circumstances that constitute its excellence as a "poem" interfere to some extent with its adaptation and suitability as a hymn. "The consummate art" of which Montgomery speaks, by which the author "carries on the action of a lyrical drama," the subtle play of feeling, and the poetical felicities by which its composition is characterised, are merits too recondite for general appreciation. But is it not something else, or something more, than a lyrical drama? We have just read it again, and have laid down the book with this thought: "Which things are an allegory." Certainly, Charles Wesley's *Wrestling Jacob* is an allegory, for in it one subject is employed for the illustration of another which resembles it in certain processes and circumstances. The general meaning of this poetical allegory is obvious enough, but here and there in the poem are points of analogy suggested where the meaning is not quite so clear. If the principal subject be not kept entirely distinct from its type, if there be a confounding of the literal meaning with the spiritual, then the completeness of the allegory is marred. In *Wrestling Jacob* there are expressions that are appropriate only to the Patriarch at Peniel, or if capable of a meaning applicable to the spiritual wrestler in

England, we fear that all who use the hymn cannot see it. This defect belongs only to a few expressions, and if the poet's allegory be not perfection, neither is *The Pilgrim's Progress* by the prince of allegorists. With critics we doubt not that this most lauded of Charles Wesley's hymns will continue to be admired for its poetical beauties, but that it is not likely to be more generally sung in the future than it has been in the past. A far more popular hymn of Charles Wesley's, upon which we have remarked already, is, "Hark! the herald angels sing." How unaccountable that when John Wesley compiled the large Hymn-Book in 1780, he should have omitted this, now the best known of his brother's compositions!

It is well that those who admire *Wrestling Jacob* have it, and may have "all that Dr. Watts has ever written" in addition, if they so choose. As in the case of all voluminous hymn-writers, some of the Doctor's pieces are feeble. His very best are those embodied in the Methodist Hymn-Book, some of them considerably improved by the omissions and alterations made by Wesley. And it is no unimportant testimony to the merits of Watts, that none of his productions contained in the book are amongst the unsung and neglected hymns. We have heard his well-known "There is a land of pure delight" condemned as an unbelieving hymn. Indeed, Mr. Jackson, in his *Life of Charles Wesley*, says: "The Doctor teaches Christians to sing with mixed emotions of desire, hope, and doubt, '*Could* I but climb where Moses stood,' &c.; whereas Charles Wesley has attained the desired eminence, and thence triumphantly exclaims—

> 'The promised land from Pisgah's top
> I *now* exult to see!'" &c.

On this comment we have only to repeat our own judgment, already expressed, that the Methodist poet was more spiritual and jubilant as a hymnist than Watts. At the same time we hold that the varying experiences of God's people may be expressed in uninspired hymns, as they are in the inspired Psalms. All Christians have not reached the top of Pisgah, and those who have not may surely be permitted to sing, "Could we but climb where Moses stood." Let us be fair to Watts. He sometimes taught the saints to sing, not with "mixed emotions of desire, hope, and doubt," but in the full assurance of faith,

such hymns as "Come, let us join our cheerful songs," and "Come, ye that love the Lord." And even Charles Wesley sometimes sang "Could":—

> "O that I *could* repent!
> O that I *could* believe!"

This we know was written "For one fallen from grace;" for why should there not be penitential hymns as well as "Penitential Psalms." In his hymn "Jesu, shall I never be," which is really a yearning after the mind which was in Christ Jesus, the hypercritical might object that Charles Wesley teaches Christians to sing, "Oh, how wavering is my mind!" &c. The answer to this objection we have already suggested. Upon the whole, we are not sorry to find Watts's Hymn, so full of pictorial beauty, in the new Hymn-Book. It has carried forward the thoughts of many a Christian from earth to "a better country, that is an heavenly." We doubt not that it was written with a clearer faith than the terms "could" and "doubts" and "gloomy thoughts" suggest; for the author's original title for it was: "A Prospect of Heaven makes death easy."

In many of Charles Wesley's hymns the feelings expressed were really felt under circumstances which actually produced them, and this is one secret of the power of such hymns. When poetry is written "to order," at so much per sheet; when the author has first to find a theme, and then to find the feelings appropriate to the theme, the emotions expressed are not likely to be deep and strong. Like Cowper's Katerfelto, "at his own wonders wondering for his bread," the amazement must be somewhat simulated. Anything can be got for money but genuine feeling. Even strength of will cannot move the emotions, unless objects and causes calculated to excite them co-operate with the volition. In our calm moments to-day we may resolve to be angry to-morrow; but when to-morrow comes, if there be nothing to disturb our equanimity or to arouse our wrath, we shall feel that we have set ourselves a very difficult task. Many of the Psalms of David were evidently composed on occasions in the Psalmist's personal history which called them forth. Hence their naturalness, reality, and force. It required one whose life had been eventful and varied; who was favoured and persecuted; who wandered as a hunted fugitive, and reigned as a powerful king; who sorrowed with the bitterness of a genuine

repentance, and felt the blessedness of the man unto whom the Lord will not impute sin; who had enemies that hated him with cruel hatred, and friends that loved him with a love surpassing the love of woman; who knew something of the quiet of pastoral life, and of the bustle of the camp, and of the splendours of the court; something of Jonathan's friendship, and of Absolom's rebellion, and of Ahithophel's treason, and of Shimei's curses: it required all this, and more, to qualify him for writing those matchless lyrics which have been said, and sung, and chanted, and felt, by succeeding generations ever since. In a word, living David's history was necessary to the writing of David's Psalms. Of course they were inspired by the Holy Ghost; but Divine inspiration does not give us truth as we find it in a catechism, without emotion or imagination. It gives us truth more naturally, in the epistles of a letter-writer, with their personal allusions and friendly salutations, and in the psalms of a lyricist, warmly glowing with the poet's personal feelings, and illustrated by the light of his own imagination. Like the Psalms, many of Charles Wesley's hymns are autobiographical in their allusions, and personal in the expression of feeling. "*The* hymn," referred to in his *Journal*, which was sung when his brother John said "I believe," was composed a few days before, not on some imaginary case of conversion, but on his own. The very feeling hymn, "God of my life, what just return," was written upon his recovery from sickness. The grand hymn, "Worship, and thanks, and blessing," was composed "after a deliverance from a tumult," and no doubt is all the truer in feeling because the poet himself was the subject of the danger and the deliverance. "Head of the Church triumphant" is one of the hymns "For times of trouble," which has the same ring about it, for the trouble was real and felt. These hymns remind us somewhat of Luther's *Stronghold*, which, breathing the fearlessness and the faith of the intrepid reformer, finds, we are glad to see, an appropriate place in the new Hymn-Book. Even Charles Wesley's *Earthquake Hymns* are connected with his personal history, for he was preaching in the Foundry when it was shaken by an earthquake. His *Hymns on Select Passages of Holy Scripture* have generally less feeling than his earlier poetry, partly, no doubt, because they were composed as a sort of task-work, and not under the provocation or inspiration of circumstances.

Like Milton's "new Presbyter" and "old Priest," the new Methodist Hymn-Book is the old one "large writ." Although the new Collection is considerably larger than its predecessor, not a few hymns have been omitted, especially from the Supplement. Amongst the few which have been removed from John Wesley's part of the compilation is the remarkable hymn, "Ah! lovely appearance of death," in which are expressed sentiments on the subject of mortality in which but few will agree, and still more questionable wishes for immediate dissolution. However well prepared for dying a Christian may be, it should not be forgotten that long life is spoken of in the Bible as a blessing, and that the "promise" of the "first commandment with promise" is a promise of longevity. No doubt both sinners and saints, when gazing at a corpse, have, in many instances, "wished to lie down in its stead;" but it has been when life had, from various causes, become irksome or intolerable. St. Paul's desire "to depart and to be with Christ" was expressed by him, not in the buoyancy of his youth, nor in the vigour of his manhood, but when he was "Paul the aged;" not in the full career of his usefulness, but in his imprisonment, harassingly protracted, and when (as we learn from Phil. ii. 17) he expected a fatal issue to his appeal to Nero. And yet, aged and persecuted as he was, his desire to be with Christ in glory was counterpoised by the desire to labour for Christ on earth: "Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." In contrasting "the earthly house of this tabernacle" with the "house not made with hands eternal in the heavens," he apparently desired to obtain the heavenly house, that is, as some understand it, the "spiritual body," not by first dying, but by being changed and caught up to meet the Lord: "Not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Indeed the longing of the early Christians for the second advent of Christ was not a longing for death, but, on the contrary, included a desire and expectation of escaping death.

The omissions and alterations in the section "For Believers Interceding" are considerable, and they were much needed. It contained, in proportion to its extent, a larger number of hymns, prosaic in style and questionable in taste, than any other section. The hymn "For the Mahometans" embodied a faithful description of the Mahometan system, but an intercessory hymn is scarcely

the proper place for it, and consequently few will regret the omission of this denunciatory hymn. From the hymn "For the Heathens" the "dark Americans" disappear, as an "American" now means a citizen of the United States, and not one of the aboriginal Indians. Many of the negro race are now free Americans, but "the servile progeny of Ham" continues in the improved version. Hymn 448 is replaced by a better hymn; and the first eight lines of Hymn 449 by eight preferable lines. The second stanza of Hymn 451, in which the Jews are spoken of as "abhorr'd of men and cursed of God," is omitted from the new book. From this Section Hymns 453 ("For England") and 460 are taken out; and the last eight lines of Hymn 459, including one with the "two sticks" metaphor, give place to sixteen better lines from the original poem.

The "New Supplement" differs very substantially from the old, and contains the noblest hymns of the Church Catholic, not before included in the book. Of the new authors admitted, James Montgomery contributes the largest number of hymns. This was to be expected, not only because of his great reputation in general poetical literature; not because he was a voluminous writer of hymns; but on account of his Methodist associations and spirit. His "The Heathen perish day by day" is rather prosaic; but "Hail to the Lord's anointed" is a spirited version of the Seventy-second Psalm. The two best known of his hymns, which are inscribed upon his monument at Sheffield, are admitted of course. "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire" is a felicitous description of what prayer is, but, with the exception of the last stanza, the verses themselves are neither prayer nor praise. Still the piece is not without its use. "For ever with the Lord" is a charming hymn, and will be sung by many a pilgrim, until the "moving tent," forsaken of its tenant, is taken down, and the spirit enters in at the "golden gates."

Bishop Heber's picturesque hymns will be welcomed by many. It is only fitting that "From Greenland's icy mountains," the missionary hymn of a missionary bishop, should be sung by a people who are not the least zealous or successful of the Churches in missionary enterprise and toil. Although the Methodist Hymn Book was already rich in hymns to the Holy Trinity, Heber's glorious composition on this subject, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," may be regarded as a valuable acquisition.

In hearing its pealing strains, we feel as if listening to the song of the Seraphim.

Several of Keble's hymns are introduced, notwithstanding his prominent connection with the Tractarian movement. Happily his *Christian Year* was published before that movement began at Oxford, and was thus saved from being spoiled by his developed opinions. Still before the conspiracy against the Protestantism of the Church of England was organised, Keble was a High Churchman who disliked "irreverent Dissenters," and in whose estimation even the genius of Milton suffered, apparently through his connection with the Puritan party. Keble's ambition was to be a second George Herbert, in which he has succeeded to a considerable extent. Like the author of *The Temple*, his verse shows an admixture of the subjective and the objective, and contains not a little of the pure gold of poetic thought. His mood is reflective, and at the same time is in sympathy with external nature in her gentler forms. Like Herbert, he was the laureate of the Anglican Church. The religion of his poetry might be called the religion of the Prayer Book, but as the Bible, happily, intermixes so largely with the Book of Common Prayer, Keble's verse received in this way a leaven of Scripture. He tells us that his chief purpose in the *Christian Year* is to exhibit "the *soothing* tendency of the Prayer Book." And certainly those who drink deeply into his poetic spirit, who can banquet on its very obscurities, who have a relish for its occasional over-refinements, will find its effects upon their minds to be tranquillising, and almost soporific, until, like Tennyson's "Lotus Eaters," they feel, "There is no joy but calm!" In the Forty-sixth Psalm, in which Luther found both an armoury and a battle-cry, the gentler spirit of Keble sought for an anodyne for his fears. Nothing can illustrate better the differences between the fearless leader of the Reformation and the timid would-be leader of the counter-reformation of Tractarianism, than the opening lines of their respective paraphrases of this grand Psalm. Thus shouted Luther:—

> "A safe stronghold our God is still,
> *A trusty shield and weapon.*"

And thus whispered Keble:—

> "God our hope and strength abiding,
> *Soothes our dread*, exceeding high."

These two hymns are, we are glad to see, in the new hymn-book; so is Keble's well-known and justly-admired "Sun of my soul," but the first verse is so altered as to have almost destroyed its identity. In the first line "My Saviour dear" is changed to "Thou Heavenly Light," and a transposition is made in the third line to meet the requirements of the rhyme. It is very likely that those who have been long familiar with this beautiful hymn (and who does not know it?) will not be pleased with the change. We suppose it has been made to get rid of the word *dear*, a term to which Wesley objected as too familiar when applied to Christ. His fine taste was disgusted with the amatory character of many of the Moravian hymns, which addressed the Saviour of the world in the language of human love, and used terms of endearment *ad nauseam*. But because some have abused the word dear by an excessive and indiscriminate use of it, not only speaking to "dear Jesus," but to "dear Lamb," "dear wounds," dear everything, it does not follow that the innocent monosyllable should be separated altogether from the Saviour's name and utterly proscribed. Moderation will be thought by many to be preferable to total abstinence in the application of this epithet to our Lord. Each case should be judged of by the context and tone of the hymn where it is employed. In Keble's lines the glorious metaphor "Sun of my soul" saves the word dear from the charge of being used in a fondling or sentimental style. We wish that the sometime Professor of Poetry in Oxford, whose *Christian Year* finds its most ardent admirers amongst readers of culture and refinement, could be depended upon as safely for his theology as for his taste.

The new Hymn-book is greatly enriched by the compositions of Lyte, Bonar, Neale, Grant, Twells, Kennedy and many others. The Church of England contributes largely from the productions of her dignitaries, most of whom are distinguished by their scholarship. Some are archdeacons; amongst the deans are Milman, Alford, and Stanley. The fine hymn by the latter on the Transfiguration of Christ will be read with pleasure. The bishops, who deserve to be crowned with the laurel as well as with the mitre, are not few. The hymns by Bishop Wordsworth are noble compositions, and show that he is not unworthy of the name he bears. The number of lady minstrels whose harps are heard in the new Hymn-

book, is worthy of notice. In John Wesley's part of the compilation, as published by himself in 1780, there were no women-singers, and in the old Supplement there are only two lady poets, Mrs. Bulmer and Miss Steele. In the new Supplement the fair sisterhood of sweet singers is increased to ten, while into the old Collection a translation by John Wesley from the French of Madame Bourignon is introduced in lieu of an omitted hymn. Many of their compositions are marked by the extra gracefulness and tenderness of the poetry of women. Two of the pieces will be recognized by those familiar with the Sankey *Sacred Songs and Solos*. Mrs. Codner's "Lord, I hear of showers of blessing" is a good hymn, and not unworthy of its place in the Methodist Hymn-book. Miss Campbell's "What means this eager, anxious throng" is inferior to it in poetic merit, but is still superior in vigour and good sense to the mass of sentimental, luscious, mawkish hymns which have a transient popularity. Of all the hymns from poetesses in the book, Miss Elliott's are perhaps the best adapted to man's spiritual feelings and yearnings after God. Her well-known "Just as I am, without one plea" is the sighing of a broken and a contrite heart become articulate.

Amongst the new authors are some Methodist preachers. Thomas Oliver's sublime composition, "The God of Abraham praise," and William M. Bunting's *Covenant Hymn* were admitted to the Supplement of 1831, and also "Hail, Thou once despised Jesus," a fine hymn by John Bakewell, a local preacher. In the new Supplement several of Mr. Bunting's appear, characterised by much tenderness of feeling and beauty of expression; also "All hail the power of Jesu's name," a spirited hymn by Edward Perronet, once one of Wesley's "Helpers." Of the living "Brotherhood of Methodist Preachers" two only find a place in the Hymn-book,—Dr. Punshon and Mr. Jenkins. Perhaps while we write the latter may be singing his own sweet verses, "While lone upon the furious waves," on his missionary voyage to the East? Dr. Punshon's two hymns are both on the subject of the Sabbath,—a subject full of poetry in itself, and yet one on which there are very few thoroughly good hymns. George Herbert's pieces on this theme sparkle with poetic thought, but the irregularity of the measures and the oddness of the similes and illustrations render them unsuitable for

congregational use. A prosaic Sabbath hymn of Stennett's, in the old Supplement, is very properly excluded from the new. Dr. Punshon's hymns are from his *Sabbath Chimes*. They are beautiful in thought, well-selected in phrase, and will ring out sweet music for many a year.

For a variety of subjects on which we intended to dwell we have reserved no space. Of the large Collection of Hymns on which we have remarked, we have a high opinion, and shrink not from affirming of it, what Wesley said of the book when it was little more than half its present size: "No such hymn-book as this has yet been published in the English language." Its publication is not without considerable importance to the Church Catholic, but to "the people called Methodists" it is of paramount value. To them the book is both a liturgy and a creed, and is a powerful auxiliary to the pulpit in propagating the doctrines of God's written Word. The scriptural character of these hymns, and especially the thorough permeation of the Wesley poetry with the doctrines, ideas, imagery, and even the very phraseology of Holy Scripture, are, after all, their highest praise. No one can study Charles Wesley's hymns without feeling amazement at his intimate acquaintance with God's word written, both in its letter and its spirit, and without acknowledging that "he was an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures." While these hymns, and hymns such as these, are generally used by the English people, it is impossible that England can retrograde to superstition or advance into unbelief. The well-known saying of Fletcher of Saltoun about caring not who made the laws, if he could make the ballads, is still more applicable to devotional poetry. We need not greatly fear the makers of false theology, if evangelical poetry supply the people with evangelical songs. Essays are unread when psalmody is sung, and sermons are forgotten when hymns are remembered. When passages of Scripture in the prose of the authorised version cannot be retained in the memory, a metrical version by the aid of rhyme and numbers may. When Sir Patrick Hume was unable to read in his dark confinement, he beguiled the weary hours by repeating Buchanan's Version of the Psalms, which he had learned in his youth. What Montgomery says of prayer, may be said of hymns, that passages from them are the Christian's "watchword at the gates of death," and with the prayer

and praise, of which they are the vehicle, "he enters heaven."

The improvements in, and additions to, the Methodist Hymn-book, as seen in this new and enlarged Collection, are the work of a Committee, which included, we believe, a goodly number of scholars, theologians, critics, and poets. It is questionable whether so many competent minds were ever before associated in the compilation of a hymn-book. The secretaries, to whom most of the labour fell, were eminently qualified for the work. Of Dr. Moulton it is needless to say more than that his indefatigable industry in the work of choosing, revising, and editing, was exceeded only by the high culture and classic taste which he brought to bear upon this labour of love. His co-secretary was the editor of the *Poetical Works of John and Charles Wesley*. We know of no one whose knowledge of English hymnology is more extensive than his, or whose judgment is sounder as to the requirements of a good hymn. His keen eye soon detects a blemish, poetical, literary, or theological; and as speedily discovers the beauties and excellences of hymnic composition. His studies, his tastes, his sensibilities, and his spirituality have fitted him for the work which he and Dr. Moulton have done so well. Although his name does not appear from one end of the volume to the other; we believe that the Methodist Connexion owes much for the completeness of this noble hymnal to Dr. George Osborn. To Dr. Jobson, to whom the Conference has worthily committed the publication of the Connexional literature, thanks and congratulations are due. Surely the additional anxieties which, in bearing his responsibilities, he might have felt through the meddlings of honest ignorance or sinister misrepresentation, will be forgotten in the real joy which he must experience in issuing from the Conference Office this incomparable Collection of Psalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs.

ART. V.— *Concordantiæ Omnium Vocum Novi Testamenti Græci.* Cura C. H. BRUDER: Lipsiæ. 1853.

WE propose in these pages to trace the term Elders, with its shades and varieties of meaning, through the Scriptures of the New Testament: not so much, however, for the interest of the study itself, but for the sake of establishing on the only sure foundation the actual and relative importance of the office indicated. The design is limited to the field of the Word of God, which is the final and the only appeal on all the questions which the discussion involves. Those questions will not be directly touched, though they cannot be altogether excluded. The principles and objects of church government, the distinctions between legislation and administration in ecclesiastical questions, the relation in this matter between the universal church and its particular societies, the developments of controversy as to the ministerial function, will be considered only so far as they are suggested by the exposition of the plain language of Scripture. In other words, we shall pursue the term through the Bible as far as possible without any reference to any other authority. For this we want nothing but the Greek text, and that invaluable guide and commentary which is furnished by the Concordance.

The first glance at the family of words belonging to our subject shows how rich are the materials. No other term connected with the ministry of the Church takes up so long a column. For instance there are some seventy passages in the New Testament which claim attention to the Elderships; while the Episcopate has only four or five. The Diaconal list is, indeed, equally long; but its number is greatly reduced when the deaconship, as such, is referred to as an office. Apart from any argument founded on the fact, the fact is observable that the Presbytery is the only body that has a corporate name. Three times the term, τὸ πρεσβυτέριον occurs: once at the close of the Gospels when "the Presbytery of the people" led Jesus into their council; once at the close of the Acts when St. Paul appealed to "the Presbytery" or "the whole estate of the

Elders"; and once at the close of the New Testament, when St. Paul for the first and only time speaks of "the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." No other body has this corporate and official distinction, and that is reserved for the close. Twice "the Presbyters of the church" are mentioned: once in the well-known allusion of St. James; once in the great Miletus-passage when St. Paul summoned to him that body, and that body alone. Once they are alluded to in the same distinctive manner as "ordained in every church." Thus we have again three remarkable passages: each of which in a very emphatic manner presents the Elders in a specific and, as it were, unshared relation to the church, and the church in a specific relation to the Elders as its representatives.

Upon these leading texts hang a large number of others, which may be classed under three heads.

First, those which conjoin the Apostles and Elders in a very significant manner. These amount to seven. Four times we have the collocation in the council-chapter, Acts xv.: Paul and Barnabas were sent "to the Apostles and Elders about this question," and were received of "the Church and of the Apostles and Elders;" "the Apostles and Elders came together to consider of this matter;" "the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church," sent chosen men with their decision; the letters began with "the Apostles and Elders brethren send greeting;" and the decrees were received as "of the Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem." To these must be added the seventh indirect connection, when, in Acts xi. 30, the Judæan contributions were sent "to the Elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." This class of passages will bear further analysis. The last makes the Elders simply as such the representatives of the Church as touching its charities: they receive the contributions which, of course, their subordinate deacons would distribute. One of them, ch. x. 23, if we adopt the best reading, joins the elders with the apostles as "apostles and elders brethren": the very peculiarity of which authenticates the reading, and marks a certain distinction at a critical point between the apostles and the elders as representatives of the congregation. In another passage, ch. xv. 4, "the church" precedes: the delegates were received of the church, but it is added significantly "and of the apostles and elders," to whom, as we previously read, they were primarily sent.

In another, ch. xv. 22, the church follows: "it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church," where the emphasis lies on the "with," indicating, not so much that the matter was formally submitted to the votes of the entire body of the people—who could not have been present in one assembly at the stage of the advancement which the church in Jerusalem had then reached—as that nothing was done by the apostles and elders without the knowledge and concurrence of the people, however collected and known.

The second class consists of those in which the apostles give their directions as to the choice, qualifications, ordination, discipline, and functions of the eldership. These bring us to a period when the office was established for permanence: passing over a large body of scriptures which refer to the extraordinary dispensations of gifts, among which those which were connected with the pastoral eldership invariably appear, but with peculiar names, hinting, but only hinting, their future pre-eminence. The bulk of the official references to the defined function of the elder is in the pastoral epistles, where we find the other title of bishop freely used, confirming previous indications, and the combination of teaching and ruling laid down as characteristic of the office, with its relation to other offices transitional and permanent, the apostolic with its delegacy on the one hand as above, and the diaconate as below. A careful study of this class of passages ought to leave no obscurity on the subject. Nothing in the whole economy of the New Testament is more clear and explicit than the constitution of the presbyteral body as it finally left the hands of the apostles.

Preceding, surrounding, and following these two classes of presbyteral passages there is a third and large class which do not immediately belong to the New-Testament office, but nevertheless throw much light upon it. Among these passages a considerable number bring the office up out of the Old Testament, whence directly or indirectly all things come into the New: directly, in this case, as an official body appearing with remarkable distinctness in the ancient writings as distinct from priests and Levites, but not without its own Divine consecration and endowment; indirectly, as passing through the times of the interval between the prophets and the New Testament, and there prepared as it were for Christian service. The link between

that old office and the eldership of the church is nowhere exhibited by St. Luke; unless indeed we find it in the words of St. Peter's Joel-quotation on the Day of Pentecost, where the "old men" upon whom the Spirit of illumination and revelation was to descend, are literally "the ancients" or "presbyters" well known throughout the Old Testament. But no stress can be laid upon the terms of that symbolical prophecy.

Besides these there are some passages, suggested by the last to which reference has been made, which show that the word has not altogether lost its original and natural signification; that the idea of older was not altogether merged in that of elder; and that the congregation was addressed as composed of older and younger men and women. These passages, however, are very few; and it is remarkable that St. John, who calls himself an elder, uses the terms fathers and young men and children for the same distinction: though in his case the distinction may be supposed to include gradations in the spiritual life. Once more, there are a few applications of the term which seem to waver between the eldership of age, of dignity, of ministerial office: as when St. Peter and St. John call themselves presbyters; a fact which on any theory of interpretation, stamps great dignity on the word. And, lastly, there are those mystical references to the eldership in the Apocalypse which, as will be seen, blend Old-Testament prediction and New-Testament fulfilment in visions which carry our word out of revelation with surpassing glory.

A few observations will now be made upon the development of the idea of the eldership as it runs through this mass of Scripture. It is obvious that this will be most effectually done by reducing the whole to a still more definite systematisation, the most simple outline of which seems to be the origination of the office in the New Testament as derived from the Old, its transitional combination and co-operation with other offices, and its final or permanent form.

The eldership of the Old Testament runs up to an extreme antiquity, and from the beginning had more or less of an official character; a fact which the preponderant and more imposing authority of prophets and priests and judges and kings in the theocracy has tended to keep too much out of view. From the earliest records

downwards there is perpetual reference to a body of men distinguished by the same uniform Hebrew name, uniformly translated by the Greek term *πρεσβυτέροι*, which represented the people in a different sense from the priests, acted on their behalf in things both civil and religious, were appointed by God to exercise a settled authority, and endued to that end with the Holy Spirit, under whose influence, they, like the first deacons of the New Testament, prophesied and taught. To establish this, generally, we need only appeal to two passages. In Numb. xi. 16 the Lord bids Moses: "Gather unto Me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be elders of the people, and officers over them, and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation that they may stand there with Me." This may be regarded as the more formal ratification of an ancient office, and it is signalised by a special outpouring of the Holy Ghost (ver. 25): "And the Lord came down in a cloud, and spake unto Moses, and took of the Spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders: and it came to pass, that, when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease." These men were not prophets in the strict sense, though they exercised a spiritual office occasionally; they were not priests in any sense whatever, being representatives of the congregation simply. But they were set apart from among the people, representing their tribes and families, and were a distinct order; as is implied in the rebuke of Moses to Joshua: "Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them." Moreover they had executive and judicial authority, concurrently with Moses, suggesting the "apostles and elders" of the New Testament. Taking this passage as a starting-point, we may trace the office backwards and forwards through the Old Testament and find nothing to contradict the general proposition that they were a body of men between whom and the elders of Christianity a certain resemblance may be traced, after making allowance for the wide difference between the two economies. These elders were representatives of the people accompanying Moses almost everywhere as a standing council: to the king of Egypt; on all festal occasions; and in the solemn exercises of his judicial functions. "They shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone" (Numb. xi.

17): where it is very plain that they were not merely representatives of the people, qualifying the authority of the lawgiver, but officers with him over the congregation. In the time of the Judges, after the land was in possession, their functions are still more emphatically marked. There are elders of every town, and elders of every tribe, and elders of the whole land and people, both in Judah and in Israel: judges and administrators of the law. They in the name of the people demanded a king, and afterwards their voice was heard and their suffrages were very important in the choice and recognition of the individual kings. Under the regal government they did not lose their importance: they formed a special college, or presbytery, for counsel and advice. How pervasive their influence was can be estimated only by such an examination of the history as space here forbids. They were acknowledged by prophets, as well as by the lawgiver and the kings, as the representatives of the people and their stated rulers and judges. "But Elisha sat in his house, and the elders sate with him" (2 Kings vi. 32). Nor was it different with the later prophets. The "elders of every city and the judges thereof" are mentioned by Ezra, ch. x. 14, and so down to the times of the Maccabees; when first we meet with the synonym ἡ γερουσία, which reappears in the Acts of the Apostles.

Thus it appears that there was a presbytery in the old covenant as there is in the new: as definitely named, as regularly organised, and as permanent in its place and function. We read of lawgiver, judges, prophets, and kings surrounded by the presbyters—if we may use this name for our present purpose—just as we read of apostles and presbyters in the New Testament. "Moses, with the elders of Israel, commanded the people, saying: Keep all the commandments which I command you this day" (Deut. xxvii. 1). Of course the differences were great. Though the elders were sometimes endued with the Spirit of prophecy, and could teach the people in an extraordinary manner, they were not generally a school of the prophets, nor were they resorted to for instruction. They were precisely the Ruling Elders of a later ecclesiastical theory. They administered justice to the people; brought it to every man's door; and were thus the intermediaries between the higher tribunals and the congregation. But it must be remembered that it was a congregation which

they served, and not merely a people; if all the Lord's people were not prophets, at least they were all saints or members of the Jewish church; and the office of the elders was exercised in what never failed down to the last to be a theocracy. It was therefore a spiritual eldership. But, as such, it was overshadowed by other offices, peculiar to the Old Testament, of which not a trace remains in the New. The all-pervading priesthood, and the diaconal ministry of the Levites, left but little place for the elders in the conduct of worship. The voice of the prophet, never silent in special emergencies and scarcely ever in ordinary times when God was honoured, absolved them from the duty of formal instruction. But, unless we misinterpret the stream of all Old-Testament history, they were as much as any others, and perhaps more than any others, the pastors and rulers and superintendents or bishops of the tribes and townships of Israel. And, finally, the analogy goes further. They were the only officers who may be said to have represented the people while they watched over them and ruled them. They were, in the modern sense, the laity—in days when there was a laity, marked off from the priesthood by a fence which it was death to violate, which in fact may be said never to have been violated without the signal intervention of heaven. They were laymen, distinct and apart from the clergy, in days when the distinction between clergy and laity was legitimate and divine, legitimate because divine. But there are not wanting hints that even in the sacrificial ritual they occupied a place which mediated between priesthood and people: for instance, in Lev. iv. 15 it is said, "And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock:" as representatives of the people, yet in a directly spiritual function. They were not chosen by the people as their representatives; they filled up their number themselves from among those whom the popular voice proposed for election: just as Moses chose those whom he "knew to be elders in Israel." The lawgiver ordained and the Spirit descended on those whom the lawgiver chose as known by himself through the report and voice of the people. They were not, in the modern sense, delegates to any convention nor representatives in any assembly; for the plain reason that in the theocratic church there was no such assembly: the rulers and the ruled were too clearly distinguished for that.

But there can be no doubt that it is to the times of reconstruction after the Captivity that we are to look for the type on which the New-Testament eldership was organised. However much exaggeration there may be in the tendency to find in the Judaism of the Interval the origins of Christian doctrine and discipline, we are on a safe track, so far as the present institution is concerned. The ancient elders of Israel reappear with a more defined status and ampler authority in the ecclesiastical constitution into which our Saviour was born. They occupy a prominent place in the Sanhedrim, or the council which presided over the affairs of the whole nation; and a still more prominent place in the synagogue, which regulated the religious affairs of every individual congregation. We need not dwell upon the former; as, although it took cognizance of matters of doctrine and morals and ecclesiastical regulations generally, it is not pretended that the New Testament sanctions any court which, combines, as that did, judicial, legislative, and administrative functions. It is to the synagogue we must look. Undoubtedly the first Christian congregations were simply new synagogues; and their constitution and worship were to some extent conformed to the model of the synagogue: indeed St. James uses the very word to define the Christian assembly; partly as a tribute to the old institution which our Saviour had so greatly honoured, partly in deference to a manner of speech that still lingered among the Jewish Christians.

In these synagogues—which existed in every considerable town throughout the whole estate of Judaism—everything belonging to Divine service was conducted save only its sacrifices: common prayer, the reading of the Scriptures by (according to Philo) one of the priests or elders, its exposition by the reador or by one of the same order chosen by the chief or president; the benediction of the priest if present, followed by the Amen of the people. It appears that, besides these religious functions, the synagogue was the scene sometimes of punishment for religious offences: excommunication, with its terrors, and scourging, mainly for heresy and apostasy. Now in the synagogues it may be said that the rulers were the main element. The ruler was one of this body; the priest was only occasionally and accidentally present; the angel or Legatus, who read the prayers, was one of them; so was the administrator of alms; the only exception being the

minister, who superintended the books and chests, if indeed he was an exception. The names and titles given to the elders of the synagogue are important in relation to the New-Testament office. That name itself was the most common: not indeed "elders of the synagogue," but, as in the embassage of the centurion, "elders of the Jews" (Luke vii. 1), or "rulers of the synagogue" (Mark v. 22; Acts xiii. 15), "pastors" or ποιμένες, and "rulers" or προεστῶτες; these last names occur abundantly elsewhere than in the New Testament, which gives them solely to their Christian representatives.

The enthusiasm of some expositors is disposed to find the complete ministerial system of the New-Testament church in the Jewish synagogue as it existed in the time of Jesus: of course, "save these stripes" to which reference has been made. We have no such enthusiasm, for reasons already stated. But it may be interesting to note how this is done. The theory sees in the "ruler of the synagogue" the presbyter, *primus inter pares*, of later times. Now it is undeniable that among all *pares* there must in the decent order of Christian service be a *primus*. But here there is some confusion. The New Testament sometimes speaks of a ruler, sometimes of rulers, in the same synagogue. St. Luke calls Jairus a "ruler of the synagogue" (Luke viii. 41, 49), while St. Mark speaks of him as "one of the rulers of the synagogue;" and these are not the only passages, as we have seen, which refer to several "rulers" in one synagogue. The whole points to a presbytery, elders by dignity, rulers by office; but also suggests the question whether there existed a settled head, or a small number of heads from whom the president for the time being was chosen, or a select presbytery within the presbytery presiding over the whole. Moreover, "the angel of the synagogue" complicates the matter. Was he the mere spiritual head, reading the prayers, while the other was the head of the assembly as such? Where is this angel in the Christian constitution? Is he the apocalyptic "angel of the church"? If so he has either changed places with the ruler, or merely lent him his name. But leaving all this, let it be impressed on our minds that the body of the synagogue functionaries is known by three names: presbyters, pastors, rulers, and by no others whether within or without the New Testament.

When we pass from the "elders of the Jews" to "the

elders of the Church" we look in vain for any link between the two save the coincidence of the names. It is to the Acts of the Apostles that we turn of course; but we find there no trace of a designed imitation of the ruling body in the synagogue. The first mention of the presbyters is in Acts xi. 30: the relief for the brethren in Judæa was sent "to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." Here is the germ and origin of the whole presbyterian system. This passage throws much light on the subject, both by what it says and by what it does not say. It tells us that in the church at Jerusalem there was a Christian body of elders: representing in the new Christian synagogues, in the whole community of disciples in Jerusalem, "the rulers" of the older economy. It keeps silence as to the origin of this body; but from the analogy of the apostolic appointment of deacons we may gather that the apostles had, under Divine direction, constituted a college of presbyters even as they had constituted a college of deacons. Had we this passage alone before us we might suppose that these elders were no other than those deacons themselves, especially as the deacons are never again mentioned throughout the Acts. It has been elaborately argued that the Seven constituted the first college of elders, having no special connection with the deacons mentioned in the epistles. On that supposition everything is supposed to be plain: the seven elders naturally received the contributions for the poor. But this hardly needs refutation. Throughout the New Testament the elders' office is distinct from that of administering as poor-stewards. Nor is there any hint that the relief was brought to them that they might dispense it. It was brought to them simply because they were by this time the acknowledged "rulers of the synagogue," and took charge of everything. Just as the money was aforetime laid at the apostles' feet, so it is now laid at the feet of the elders: these elders, or the presbyteral college, be it understood, including the apostle who took the lead in Jerusalem; precisely as in the gospels "the rulers of the synagogue" meant the whole body, including the president, angel, minister, and all others. The reason why they are mentioned is twofold: first, contributions from abroad could not reach the deacons, save through the administrative body under which the deacons were subordinate; and, secondly, the contributions had not directly to do with the Seven, inasmuch as they were

for the poor in Judæa, for the poor, in fact, of a wider province than that for which the Seven were responsible.

There is a sense in which the origin of the eldership may be assigned to the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, the same "apostles" who laid the contributions at the feet of the elders. That they were called elders in Jerusalem would not of itself prove that the office was formally established; because inveterate habit might attach the name to such a body as the Seven, and, indeed, to any administrative heads of the new community. But now the case is different. The Apostle Paul—for we need not refer to Barnabas—saw the will of God written before his eyes in the constitution of Jerusalem, and, as the organiser of the Gentile churches—that is, in reality, of the Christian church—at once established the same system. Exhorting the new converts to pass through much tribulation into the kingdom of God, and commending them to the Lord, the only Bishop of their souls, they also "ordained elders in every church." Here then we have the text for the institution of elders. After this we never meet with them save as a permanent body, whose functions are prescribed, and relations internal and external defined. But in this passage we have the Jewish office transferred to the Gentiles; transferred as the divine and authoritative rule for "every church," and the office itself invested with a special sanctity, dignity, and importance.

It could hardly be expected that this solitary account in the Acts—so brief and, as it were, incidental—would furnish us with the full statement of the rules which guided the choice of these elders. Those who dispute with so much keenness over each word of this text lose their pains. The passage itself determines nothing: its meaning must be settled by subsequent references in the pastoral epistles. It may, with almost equal propriety, be made to bear three several meanings: either the apostles simply "appointed" by their plenary authority elders of their own selection; or they set apart elders "chosen by suffrage or show of hands" on the part of the people; or they ordained "by imposition of hands" elders chosen whether by themselves or by the congregation. A word may be said as to each.

The first dismisses from the word χειροτονέω the notion of the hands stretched out, either in laying them or holding them up. There can be no doubt that the word has this extended meaning in classical Greek, and in Acts x.

41, the word, with *πρό*, or before, added, is used of a Divine appointment: "witnesses chosen before of God." When we remember the high authority of the apostles; the recent conversion of these churches, and the impossibility that any candidates for the office could yet have established a character with the requisite qualifications; and, finally, the specific discernment given to the inspired founder of these communities; we shall hardly be able to reject as impossible the assumption that certain men were chosen and set over the infant churches whose ability was perceived and sanctified by express graces for their function. But these principles at the same time remove the appointment from the ordinary course of things. It establishes no precedent. In this interpretation the first Gentile elders were as it were extraordinarily chosen and appointed office-bearers.

As to the second, it is supported by the analogy of the suffrages of the church in the election of deacons. Not, however, by that of the election of Matthias, whose place in the apostolate was not of man, nor by man, but the Lord Himself: His choice being declared by lot, and in an extraordinary way, as suiting the interval between the Lord's departure and the descent of the Spirit. It was by the direct election of the Spirit that Barnabas and Saul were separated to their work. There can be no difficulty in allowing, generally and abstractly, that the people sought out their best men and presented them for the eldership. Presented them, that is, for some kind of ordination; for the "ordaining" is after all grammatically the act of the apostles, and the act of the church is included only in an indirect manner: "when they," the apostles, "had ordained them elders." At any rate, the principle is a sound one, that the church has a decisive voice in the selection of all its officers. In the case before us it would be the whole church, small in numbers and as yet without any representatives to act in its name. In every true Christian church the people's voice must be heard declaring and attesting worthiness in those who are candidates for the ministry generally, as also in the acceptance of its own pastors in particular. This touches the very life of the church. Since the apostles have gone, there is no man, nor is there any body of men empowered by absolute authority to set apart ministers and impose them on the congregations. But it must be confessed that there are difficulties in the par-

ticular instance before us. The democratic theory of ecclesiastical constitution must be arrested by the anomaly of perfectly new congregations choosing for themselves and presenting to the apostles men to rule over them. In the case of the deacons there was a marked difference. Their office was one which required such qualifications as the people could test better than any others. And the church in Jerusalem was thoroughly established; familiar therefore with the characters of those whom it selected. Moreover, the men "of honest report" were men whom the apostles were to "appoint," and accordingly they, the twelve, "laid their hands on them."

This brings us to the last interpretation. The apostles "appointed" the deacons; but the word is not the same as that here used, and the change is a significant one. To "appoint over this matter" and to "ordain elders in every church" are different things, as expressed both in the English and in the Greek. There is nothing in the appointment of the deacons which indicates that it was an ordinance for every church. There is no further reference to them whether in the church of Jerusalem or in the Acts generally. We are taught in due time that it became a permanent office: an expedient adopted in all churches. As to the final ordination of deacons it is not once mentioned; though this is no argument, as in this case also we cannot prove a negative. But the very express reference to the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery" and the injunction to Timothy, "lay hands suddenly on no man," assert expressly that the ordination was universal in the case of the elders. And we are justified in assuming that the "ordaining" in the first missionary journey of St. Paul was by imposition of hands. It is true that the word does not say so. Some of the early Fathers assert that it does. The canons of the council of Nicæa and Chalcedon use χειροτονία and χειροθεσία interchangeably; but there are other and equal authorities which distinguish them. Certainly the only other use of the former word in the New Testament says nothing of imposition of hands. St. Paul remarks (2 Cor. viii.) of the brother whose praise was in all the churches, that he was "also chosen, χειροτονηθείς, of the churches to travel with us with this grace." But a candid consideration of the whole matter will leave little doubt that the term as used in the passage in the Acts includes that apostolical imposition of hands and

designation to office which the pastoral epistles make so familiar.

Summing up, we suggest that there must be such a compromise here as shall include all the interpretations, however impossible it may be to reconcile all the theories based upon them. The apostles in their supreme authority, and as the organs of the Holy Ghost, appointed men to take the ministerial charge of these churches of the Gentiles: men whose immature religion was confirmed and strengthened by special gifts, whose office, as we learn from the first reference made to it by St. Paul, and that very soon afterwards, was thus to "labour among them, to be over them in the Lord, and admonish them." It was one work, however, for the sake of which they were to be honoured: "esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake" (1 Thess. v. 12, 13). These men were ordained and set apart to that one work—τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν—by the imposition of hands: their office was sealed to them permanently and finally, so far as the design of the Spirit went. But all this in concurrence with the judgment of the church, however expressed. The congregation either presented names out of which the apostles might choose those whom examination found most competent, or they were asked to accept the names given them by the apostles and did accept them, or they signified their entire concurrence with a designation in which they had no other part. Of such men as these the apostle afterwards spoke as "elders of the church," and spoke to them as representatives of their several communities; he also reminded them that their churches were flocks "over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God," and he urged them to "take heed" to the flock in the presence or prospect of error: to take heed to their own body, out of which false teachers would arise, and of the church, that it might receive no harm from them. (Acts xx.) The high authority and solemn responsibility attached to the office of the elders in the later Acts must be reflected back upon all the intervening references to the office, until it rests upon the simple narrative of its first institution in the same neighbourhood.

But this is anticipating the second branch of the subject—the transitional references to the combination of the presbytership with other offices under the apostolic regimen of the church. Here there are several collocations of the

term as one of office. We have "apostles and elders"; "bishops and deacons"; "elders of the church"; "the apostles and elders with the church." All these are used during a period when as yet the final definition of the office and its functions had not been laid down. Each of these situations of the word will afford opportunity for a few remarks. But we will invert the order in which they are given above.

The full and formal description of the only general synod held in the apostolic times designates it as a meeting of "the apostles and elders with the whole church." This is the strongest formula. But there are two variations in it: "Paul and Barnabas were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders"; and the letters were sent with the greeting of "the apostles and elders and brethren." There is some reason for thinking that in the last passage "and the" must be struck out: in which case we should have the superscription of the decree as from "the apostles and elders, brethren," who "send greeting to the brethren," the first canons of a general synod being from brethren to brethren: or "the apostles and elders-brethren send greeting to the brethren," the apostles having their pre-eminence, and all the rest brethren. But if we leave the reading as it is now accepted we can combine the three passages into a deeply interesting harmony. The matters in dispute were referred to the "apostles and elders" (Acts xv. 2) as representatives, the former of the church generally and the latter of the individual church of Jerusalem. And the decrees which resulted from the conference were "ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem." These two important texts begin and end the history: they are its frame and setting. But, intermediately, the unity and unanimity of the whole body of the church is maintained by the three other texts: not, however, in such a way as is sometimes supposed. The apostolic deputies are "received of the church, and of the apostles and elders." But, if this is examined, it will be found that they were not received of the whole church in their character of deputies charged with the details of a particular question of the future regulation of the kingdom of God. To the church as such they simply "declared all things that God had done with them." In other words, they met the whole multitude and narrated, as St. Peter had done before, the wonderful history of the "conversion

of the Gentiles" which had "caused great joy to the brethren" everywhere on their road (Acts xv. 3, 4). It was the first great missionary meeting, in which the glorious tidings of the free course of the gospel among the nations were narrated to the mother church, now ready to receive without bigotry and without reluctance the great fact to the acceptance of which they had been so slowly brought: that the salvation which, by the highest authority, was "of the Jews" was, by the same authority, "for the world." It was this intelligence which the whole church met to hear and rejoice in. There is no hint that they met to receive deputies appointed to lay before them a vital question for discussion in their presence and decision by their votes. On the contrary, it is expressly said that "there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees, which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses" (Acts xv. 5, 6). After that it is added that "the apostles and elders came together, for to consider of this matter": to them the question had been referred, and they met to consider it. But not without the people: certainly the Pharisaic party were present and "all the multitude"; but all that is said of the multitude is that they "kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." Then the apostles spoke, in the hearing of the people, and the Lord confirmed their words; and "it pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men"—that is, Barnabas and Silas. The faction opposing had sprung up from the people; and the case is placed before the people: not, however, for their decision, but that they might have full satisfaction as to the propriety of the course pursued. Hence the significant "with": it is not intimated that it pleased "the whole church," but that it pleased "the apostles and elders, with the whole church." The sympathy and good feeling and full consent of the entire community were with the decrees which went forth therefore as from "the apostles and elders and brethren." It may be added that the "chosen men" who were sent with Paul and Barnabas are described as ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους, "chief men among the brethren"; and it is significant that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which reflects the constitution of the church in Jerusalem, this term, translated here "chief," is the only

one used to mark the pre-eminence of those "who have the rule," that is, of the elders and pastors of the church. But this circumstance, and the inference from it, must be weighed by its own merits: it has some importance in the consideration of the whole subject.

The question here arises, What bearing has this on the original constitution of the Christian church with regard to its eldership in relation to the Christian congregation?

Generally, it establishes this, at least: that in the Divine idea and intention nothing is done without the privity, consent, and perfect acquiescence of the whole body of believers. There is no hierarchy in the Christian system distinguished from the laity. The universal priesthood of the saints forbids this: indeed allows no room for it, and is utterly repugnant to it at all points. It was not the will of the Head of the church that His church should be ruled by an authority made external to it, which, while responsible to Him alone, should be absolutely without responsibility to the church from which it springs. So far as that principle goes, the congregational theory of the church is the true one, and the only true one. Not an ordinance, not a decree, not a regulation, is valid in the sight of the Lord which has not the concurrence of His people. On the other hand, we entirely misread the history if we do not mark that there is a distinction between the people and their representatives, marked off from them as their representatives and guides, who represent them in questions pertaining to the outer world of Christ's kingdom and the general administration of that kingdom. We miss the emphasis of the salient points of the narrative if we do not perceive that it is the apostles and elders of the whole church represented in Jerusalem, who send forth decrees binding on other churches elsewhere. The apostles and elders are the link between one church and another, between the local and the universal church. And, so far as this principle goes, the presbyterian theory of the government of the church is the true one, and the only true one.

With regard to the former, such an exaggeration of the congregational theory as would commit the decision of every question of doctrine and discipline to the suffrages of the church makes the relation of the apostles and elders an unaccountable unreality. This will be felt the moment we try to arrange in our minds the precise position of these office-bearers to the congregation. The apostles propound

and argue the question elaborately before the people, who give their decision. What, then, is the part of the elders? Do they collect the suffrages and give them to the apostles? Again, is it conceivable that in matters so vital to the essence and to the spread and to the prosperity of the Christian church "the multitude"—for such is the term used—were asked to decide? And, supposing the Jerusalem church educated enough for this, is i pretended that in all churches, and in all places, and to the end of time, questions of supreme importance are to be left to the suffrages of "the multitude," young and old, fathers and young men and babes in Christ? It might be said—though the argument is not made prominent on that side—that the Apostle Paul argues out the identical question of the Jerusalem council before the churches of Galatia in his epistle. It is true that he does so argue it. But it is not true that he argues it for the church's suffrage. Nothing could be more opposite to his intention than that. He simply and authoritatively lays down the truth; but he shows the reasonableness of the truth which he lays down, its consonance with Scripture, its vital importance to the whole fabric of Christianity, and the fearful consequences which follow its rejection. He speaks to the people, because the people as a whole had sinned, being "bewitched." He peremptorily demands their recantation, though he pleads for it with tears and shows its reasonableness by many arguments. But he does not always discuss the question with the people. In his last epistles he carries the same question—a question, however, which had then become enlarged, and was complicated with many others connected with Gnostic heresy—from the people to their guides, the representatives of the eldership, in the persons of Timothy and Titus, and holds them responsible for themselves and the presbyters they ordained. He acts similarly at the close of the Acts, where he does not send messages to the churches of Ephesus and the neighbourhood, but lays upon the elders the blessedness and the burden of watching over the truth.

We are therefore compelled to give the eldership the distinct and prominent place, both in the local congregation and with reference to other churches, which what is called Presbyterianism concedes to it. It is not so much matter of choice as matter of necessity. There is something in the other theory which, considered as an ideal, is extremely attractive. It would be a perfect tribute to the

high doctrine of our Lord, "All ye are brethren." It would be a noble rebuke to the hierarchical assumptions which have, beyond almost anything else, perverted the simplicity of the Gospel. There is something very grateful in the thought of the little community of the Lord's people ready with its sound decisions on every question pertaining to the doctrine and discipline of the Gospel, leaving all the rest of Christendom to the care of the common Lord and His uniting Spirit, and minding peacefully and unanimously its own affairs; having "the unction from the Holy One and knowing all things," and therefore able to decide every question of doctrine; being "kings and priests," and therefore able to exercise common government over every member of the flock, and decide every disciplinary case; being "priests unto God," and therefore competent to every priestly service, spontaneously assumed, or in order regulated by themselves. But this ideal cannot as yet be realised. It is not in harmony with the general strain of the New Testament, and it has not commended itself to the catholic sentiments of the church from the beginning.

The other theory, that of the representative character of the elders, leads to the next formula that occurs, "the elders of the church," varied as before, by "the elders which were in Jerusalem," or "elders in every church" or "in every city." From which we are taught, directly, that every distinct community has its college of presbyters; and, indirectly, that, with regard to the universal church, every distinct community is represented by its elders. These are the fundamental principles of the system of church government which has been known in history as the Presbyterian: that the presbytery is the representative body which presides over all questions of doctrine and worship and discipline within the congregation, and that various churches are united in one general connection—whether territorial or national or free—by the bonds of a common elective system of synods or assemblies or conferences. But we are not now travelling out of the New Testament itself.

A dispassionate consideration of all the texts which introduce the Presbytery as such must lead to the conclusion that it is in the early economy of the church the college which has the entire oversight and regulation of the internal affairs of every congregation. What that oversight signifies and includes is not specifically stated

until the final ordinances of the apostles are before us. Meanwhile, it is enough to say that the elders are made by the Holy Ghost its overseers or bishops. This general proposition cannot be contradicted: there lurks in it no fallacy, whether in what it states or what it omits. The term elders is undeniably the word used for an office held by a certain number in every church, and the term overseers or bishops is undeniably the word used for an administration which is commonly called that of rule or government. The elders are distinct from the church, for they are set over it. They govern, whether by the word of their doctrine, the administration of the statute and common law of Christianity, or the exercise of discipline. As to the subordinate propositions which may be introduced, as to the division and inclusion of each term, there may be much difference. We may safely say, without fear of contradiction, that the term does not mean an elder for every city, as some have supposed: Baur, for instance, who pleads that "in every city" means distributively an elder appointed by Titus for every church. The office is an eldership in every congregation: larger or smaller, in number according to its demands. In this eldership there would necessarily, especially in the transitional times of which we now speak, be a wide variety of gifts: some would be more apt to teach, some more competent to defend the faith, some more able in the economical administration, some more wise in government. Such a college would necessarily have a president, a first among equals. Of this our Lord had given a precedent in placing Simon Peter at the head of the company, all of whom were brethren and equal. And of this the synagogue had furnished the type: for in it, while all the elders were "rulers of the synagogue," as we have seen, there was always one ruler. In some churches, as that of Corinth, which were liberally endowed with extraordinary gifts almost denied to some others, the charisms of government and of teaching would be variously bestowed. And the college or presbytery would, under the presidency of its superintendent or chief bishop, assign to its individual members their individual functions. While all would teach, some would "labour" in the word and doctrine, teaching more abundantly than others, and watching over what we may call, for hypothesis' sake, the lay or local teaching and preaching of gifted

men not belonging to the ordained order. While all would exercise their common supervision over the benevolent institutions and charities of the community, some would make this province more particularly their own, and direct the work of the deacons and deaconesses and other "helps," whether expressly set apart or not. There would of course be a limit to their distribution. In matters affecting sound doctrine, and the admission and exclusion of members, especially their exclusion, all would combine. There could be no detachment of the presbytery assigned off to this most solemn responsibility. Nor in this last case can we suppose that the final decisive sentence could be passed without the testimony, consent, concurrence, and ratification of the whole brotherhood: the "punishment" or censure, which the apostle himself inflicted was also "inflicted of many" (2 Cor. ii. 6). Not, indeed, that the congregation either judged or inflicted the punishment; for the apostle had already said: "I verily as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already (ἤδη κέκρικα), as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such an one unto Satan." They were gathered together—whether in full assembly or by their representatives is not said—to hear and approve the sentence sent them by the apostle in the matter of the delinquency which they had sent to him for adjudication.

But the undeniable omission here of any reference to the presbytery leads to the consideration of the remaining formula, "the apostles and elders," which also involves the second point previously alluded to—the representative character of the elders in the union and communion of various churches.

Now it may be said generally that while the apostles remained in the Church their supreme authority under Christ placed all other offices of rule and jurisdiction more or less in abeyance when they were present. What the Lord was to His own little congregation and Church His twelve were to the Church at large: all "continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship." There is nothing more clearly and deeply stamped upon the epistles of the three great apostles than the sacred dictatorship they exercise. The passage lately quoted,

having reference to St. Paul's judgment from a distance, gives a very striking illustration. But all their epistles declare the same fact. Their writings and their words bring into every church and into every question the very authority of Christ Himself. This principle may be applied both to the internal or local and the external or catholic representativeship of the elders.

As to the former: the college of presbyters is never ignored, superseded, or disparaged by the apostles. But they do not write to them as a rule, because their letters are for the teaching of the whole church, and belong to a sphere quite distinct from that of ecclesiastical relations. Through every church they write to the whole of present and future Christendom. They do not teach the church through the ministry, but teach the congregation and its ministers together. St. Peter's first epistle is an instance in point. It is addressed to the Christians generally in the Dispersion: found in churches, but not addressed as such. It gives instruction to all: special exhortations to the presbyters as touching their rulership over the flock, and special exhortations to the flock as to their duty to their superiors. So it is in St. Paul's epistles. One of them is addressed to the church with its bishops and deacons. Generally he writes as it were from a point whence he beholds only an undistinguished company of Christians: taking care, however, in almost all his epistles distinctly to lay down the duty of good and faithful ruling, and meek submission to rule.

But the apostles knew that they must cease to exercise that supreme jurisdiction. They did not provide for an extension of their apostolate by any appointment of an order succeeding in permanence to their prerogatives. They give no hint of an apostolical succession in any sense. On the contrary, St. Paul, in particular, refers again and again to the fact of his coming removal, and with specific reference to the removal of his apostolical and authoritative guidance. Towards the end of his career his mind was much troubled about the future: troubled, that is, as much as one could be troubled who exercised supreme trust in the providence of his Master. On two occasions he expressed his solicitudes or apprehensions or foreboding prophecies concerning the times to come. The shadow of future antichrists fell on his soul. And what was his refuge? or, rather—since he had no care for himself—to

what defence did he commit the Church? To what form of guardianship did he declare that the Lord would commit it? He summoned the elders of Ephesus—the same whose successors in their angel-representative received the Lord's epistle—and charged them with the care of the doctrine and morals of the Church of God, and with the care of their own personal and corporate purity. Thus he makes compensation—not indeed to them, for they needed it not, but, as it were, to us—for seeming neglect of the presbyteral dignity in his authoritative teaching. If in his visits and in his letters he had seemed to supersede them, it was the obligation of his office. But now, in the prospect of his removal—"after my departure"—he commits the most important congregation of churches in the world to the presbytery, without any reference to the combination of any episcopal apostleship. What things he says and what things he does not say are equally instructive to us. They seem to intimate, as plainly as words could express it, that the body of elders was to exercise the same watchful care over "themselves and the flock," being pastors "whom the Holy Ghost had made overseers," as he himself had exercised over both. Again, when writing the pastoral epistles to Timothy and Titus, his delegates and representatives in the apostleship, he never for a moment speaks of his reliance on their fidelity as continuing his apostolical prerogative after he was gone, but always on their fidelity as preachers and teachers, and on the fidelity of those whom they might appoint to guide and guard the flock. These two apostle evangelists, who simply were the delegates of St. Paul, doing exactly what he would have done, and by his authority and under his direction, are never addressed as the future apostles, but as the future presbyters. Whenever they are addressed as representatives of the apostle, their duty is clearly prescribed to them. But whenever they are addressed as representatives of the churches, their functions and obligations are described as those belonging to the elders. In fact, they were literally an extension of the apostolate, under the qualification that they did not receive the name: "Do thou the work of an evangelist." They were appointed to sit in the apostle's seat in every city and church; and it requires only a slight glance to see that they were subordinate and responsible to him who sent them in everything.

The question is widened but not much complicated when

we look at the relation of apostles and elders to the union of churches. It might be said that the expression "union of churches" is a begging of the question; and that the New Testament gives no hint of any bond of common government. Now those who are Congregationalists in the principle that all authoritative acts must have the express concurrence of the people individually, must needs maintain that there can be no union of suffrages, since congregations could never meet congregations. Hence they must be what in modern language is called Independents also. But those who maintain that every official act within the church is the act of the body of elders, and are therefore Presbyterian in that principle, have no preliminary difficulty to encounter when the principle is carried farther and extended to the authoritative representation of many churches in one synod or presbytery or conference. If all the presbyters of all the churches in a city or province or country were to meet, that would be a court common to all, and authoritative over all. It would be like the meeting of all the churches in one vast assembly: the difference being that these churches meet in the persons of their representatives, men ultimately chosen by themselves, and as such placed over them by the ordination of the Holy Ghost.

It seems, on examination of the passages in which the apostles and elders are referred to, without the addition of the third party, the church, that we have the elements of the Presbyterian government of connexional churches. Perhaps it may be well to be bold, in the face of much unreasonable opposition, and say that every instance in which the apostles and elders are linked together has reference to something more than the interests of an individual congregation. The apostles represented, so to speak, the Head of the Church, who thus gradually prepared His people for His invisible headship through the Spirit, and left, His chosen twelve, and the One added to their number, to lay the firm foundation of an economy that would in due time work peacefully without their supervision. Hence in the very last accents of apostolical authority in the Apocalypse it would seem as if the Lord ended the apostolate by identifying Himself with it. It ends as it began—in Him. "I John, your brother and companion," is spoken by one who seems to render back his function to the Lord who gave it, and He then speaks as

the only bond of union among His various churches. But those churches are represented by their elders. When the apostles met the elders of Jerusalem with their gifts, they met a body of men who had representative relations to all the churches throughout Judæa which had been stricken by the visitation of famine. Therefore it was not to the well-known deacons of Jerusalem that they brought their contributions. When a question of catholic interest arose, again the apostles are united with the elders, the bond between them being more close than between both and the "whole church." The elders are in the history of the council, in Acts xv., undoubtedly the representatives of a number of churches in and around Jerusalem, and the multitude referred to as present when the admission of the Gentiles was recorded could not have been a gathering of the church as such. Many explanations may be given of the concurrence of the church: more or less free according to the tone of the pleader. Our own would be very free. The more openly all is done the better; the larger the number of questions that can be laid upon the people's hearts the better; the more entirely the rulers and the ruled can blend in one common attitude of submission to the common Master the better. But no explanation of Acts xv. can be said to deal fairly with the collective passages which makes the assembly of the people in Jerusalem a gathering of the church as such, and in its judicial capacity. The question was sent up to the apostles and elders, or presbyteries of the entire mother country of the church; and those same apostles and elders meet as a conference discussing and deciding questions of importance to the whole Gentile world; in other words, they and they only are said to send forth the decrees. The single passage in the middle—we can hardly concede the second—declares that a worshipping multitude approved. But it was as a worshipping multitude. It was not in any sense the representation of the church: certainly not of the churches legislated for; certainly not of the church legislating, as that was far too large to meet in one assembly.

The same conclusion is yielded by the careful examination of the Miletus synod: for such in its essence we may regard it. The apostle did not summon to him a very small number of men who administered the affairs of a single church, but the entire presbytery of one of the most prosperous districts of early Christendom. Their coming

to him was instead of his going to the churches which they represented. He speaks to them, first, in their corporate capacity as being the representatives of the several churches; and then, secondly, as being representatives of their own presbyterial body, some of whom may be safely supposed to have been absent. As to the former, every word reveals that the speaker has before him the churches and the flocks to which he had ministered: "Ye know from the first day that I came into Asia after what manner I have been with you at all seasons." Surely St. Paul is addressing many congregations in these words, but many congregations as represented by these elders. So entirely are the elders, as it were, identified with their flocks that he makes no distinction: "I have been with you." Of course the Presbyterian argument is strengthened if we assume that the apostle is referring to his former intercourse with the college of elders as such. Certainly he is speaking to them in their corporate capacity; for he announces his departure as the guardian of the faith, predicts the coming of false teachers, and bids these elders take heed to themselves and to their flocks in the presence of these dangers.

The only other instance, following hard on the former, carries us back from the Asian centre to the mother church again. We would ask the reader to look carefully at the narrative in Acts xxi., and note its remarkable similarity in many respects to that of the earlier Jerusalem council. In the present case there is no question sent up for decision from the other churches; but the church or churches of Jerusalem, its cluster of societies, meeting in the persons of its elders and in no other way—"Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present"—gave their advice and more than their advice, their injunction, for the general good and the special benefit of the Jewish converts; and the apostle of the Gentiles submitted. Many things might be observed here. As in the former instance, "the brethren received us gladly"; as before, the synod was held amidst the people, and its meeting was blended with religious exercises: so, in modern times, assemblies and conferences for the regulation of church affairs are most effectually representative when bound up with devotional meetings. Thus the eldership has its best setting and surroundings in the church. The presbytery seems here, in the last historical reference to it, to be as it were clothed with more authority than before. In fact, each reference

seems to make it more prominent. Whereas before the apostles alone spoke, now it is the elders who speak, though James is present. They even say: "We have written and concluded that they observe no such thing," where the words ἐπεστείλαμεν, κρίναντες have a tone in them which the English version faintly echoes.

Hence, finally, we must regard the meaning of "elders of the church" as bearing more than the common signification assigned to it. The body of men so termed were a corporate body occupying the same place and standing in the same relation as the elders of the Synagogue and of the Sanhedrim. Not that any direct and close analogy may be traced between these two institutions of Judaism and the congregation and church of Christianity. There is, however, enough to base an illustration upon, enough to suggest reconsideration of their case to those who insist on limiting the idea of the visible church to the isolated community meeting in one place. The Sanhedrim or Great Council was the highest religious, ecclesiastical, and, so far as such a term was applicable to modern Judaism, political court. In it sate the elders: no longer "elders or rulers of the Synagogue," but "elders of the people," that is "of the people," not of the popular will. With this corresponds the eldership of the Christian ecclesiastical system as such: the "elders of the church." They are never called "elders of the people" in the New Testament, because the term "People" belonged only to the Jews: had it been a current designation of Christendom, they would have been called, as of old, "the elders of the people." Those who belong to this class are in an order the authority and functions of which are not limited to any one place. They carry their eldership wherever they go, and may exercise its ministrations and duties for other churches than their own, and in assemblies where they settle the affairs of many communities. The eldership of the synagogue was a different matter. It was strictly limited to the place in which the synagogue assembled: indeed to the synagogue itself. Out of the elders of the various synagogues the elders of the Sanhedrim were chosen: but in what way and under what conditions authorities are not unanimous in deciding. These elders or rulers of the synagogue suggest, as we have said, the presbyters of the individual Christian church or congregation, or, as the New Testament says, "the elders in Jerusalem,"

or Ephesus, or Philippi, or elsewhere. The distinction broadly rendered into modern ideas is that between the body of elders or pastors or ministers presiding over a collection of societies in every town, and the meeting of the same pastors, or a selection from them, to represent and administer the affairs of all the churches of a district. But the reader must not suppose that we press the analogy beyond its limits. It has the average argumentative value of analogy and no more. And, finally, the question is here limited to the New Testament: the principles which may regulate the association and fellowship of churches by their presbyteries is a matter beyond our present aim.

Then it comes finally to this, that the bond of unity among the churches having been the apostles, or their delegates, as Titus and Timothy, meeting everywhere the presbyteries, and the apostles being one by one withdrawn, the union must continue on New-Testament principles by the union of these presbyteries where possible, or, what is the same thing, their combination by representatives for the regulation of the affairs of a city or province or kingdom as the case might be. If the question is asked: What is the last hint of the New Testament as to the future unity of the churches? there are four answers.

The first theory, represented especially in modern times, is that the individual congregation is the only New Testament embodiment of the unity of the church so far as that church is visible. Each little community is in itself and as perfectly independent charged with the regulation of its own affairs, maintaining its concord rather than its connection with other communities in the fellowship and common possession of the Word of God and the means of grace. Every congregation stands or falls by its own merits. For its doctrine, discipline, worship, purity it is responsible only to itself and the common Lord. It may entertain brotherly sentiments towards other churches, and maintain friendly relations with them. But it will brook no interference, and submit to no external authority. This is the theory which is supposed to be found in the New Testament. But it is a theory that has never been practically exemplified. The most independent of modern churches have found it expedient to enter into some kind of voluntary association with others, and have found it necessary to establish some court of common appeal. Disavowing the presbyterian theory they have shown a dispo-

sition to approximate to its practice. And they have found it their wisdom to do so. We have only, however, to do with the New Testament. There is no such independency there. We have seen that the apostles who were, while yet with us, the bond of unity and the living centres of a common court of appeal, laid down the principles of a future continuance of that common jurisdiction in another form for the future.

The second theory is one which has also been devised in modern times, and is held by many with certain modifications devised by individual caprice. It is that the early constitution of the church was simply and solely that of the individual congregation, constructed on the principle of democracy. The apostles were indeed absolute dictators, but only with a supernatural and brief authority; used only to establish a government based upon popular rights, and administered by the people themselves, choosing their officers and acting through them — whether elders or deacons—rather than committing to them the conduct of their affairs. This theory then assumes—as represented by Rothe in particular in his valuable work on the foundation of the Christian polity—that with the destruction of Jerusalem and the sole survivorship of St. John there was introduced an entire revolution. The congregational idea gave place to that of the church, which was thenceforward as aristocratic or hierarchical as it had before been democratic. There came a change over the Divine order of things. The congregation gave place to the church. Episcopacy was introduced, mainly under the influence of St. John, and tacitly the Holy Spirit permitted the chief presbyters to glide out of the presbytery into a distinct order. The vice of this theory is twofold. It concedes everything that the advocates of an episcopacy by Divine right can desire; since the great change was wrought under apostolical sanction. But it makes that great change matter of accident rather than of appointment. It regards congregational democracy as ordained for a season; and autocratic episcopacy as having been yielded by the tolerant spirit of the Christian organization when heresies and schisms required it.

The third theory is more uncompromising. It asserts that the three orders were ordained from the beginning: the episcopal lying hid in the apostolate, and descending to the bishops through the apostolical delegates such as

Timothy and Titus; the presbyteral being appointed and ordained by the bishops; and the deacons or lower class of ministers in the church whose purely economical functions in the New Testament were merely transitional. The refutation of this is bound up with the maintenance of the fourth, which is that one which we have endeavoured to establish.

This leads us to the permanent constitution of the presbyteral body; and to a few remarks on it which have not been anticipated. The idea of its unity is presented to us in the final term which St. Paul gives in τὸ πρεσβυτέριον the Presbytery. And that unity may be considered as twofold: its unity as an order, distinct and alone; the unity of its functions in teaching and ruling.

We return to the observation made at the outset, that there is only one body of men in the New Testament which has assigned to it an organic and distinctive appellation, and it is the eldership. This order is distinct in the congregation, distinct from it, and distinct over it.

It is in the church: it has the same membership, enjoys the same privileges, is governed by the same laws, derives its highest dignity from its possession of the common blessings, and its only prerogative is that it has the honour of a more entire and unhindered devotion to the service of the people of Christ. Its dignity is more abundantly to minister. It springs from the people, and is never separated from it by any such divine demarcation as separated the priests in the old economy and the apostles in the new. The priests were from their "first father" a distinct tribe and order. They were not of the people. They were "taken from among men" not by men but by God. There was for them a special place in the economy, a special code of laws, and special privileges. They were God's lot or "clergy." Still more distinctly marked off were the apostles. The inspiration of the Holy Ghost was their apostolical anointing; and, though their highest glory and their deepest experience were bound up with the fellowship of all who were "in Christ," they were apostles "not of man nor by man, but by Jesus Christ." They "magnified their office," and could ask, "are all apostles?" But the presbytery are "elders of the church."

Still, it is distinct from the people. It constitutes in

the New Testament a definite body or college, into which members are admitted on certain terms, which holds an office that Christian men, experienced and prompted by the Holy Ghost, might "covet," the qualifications of which were not common to all, and the endowments of which were "gifts" of the Holy Ghost. In fact it was "the presbytery." Not, indeed, the only body distinct from the rest of the community. Deacons and deaconesses were such also. But this was the distinction of the body of the elders that they alone had a specific relation to the whole community in its highest interests as represented by their instruction and guidance and government. The diaconate represented a relation to a certain part of the general community, to their temporal interests as such, and did not affect the whole church nor the whole church in its widest interests.

Hence, lastly, it cannot be denied that it is an order placed over the congregation. The plain language of the New Testament admits of no contradiction. In a variety of terms the idea of responsible oversight is expressed: with the most solemn sanction of accountability to the Chief Shepherd, but with no variation of meaning in the midst of great variations in phrase. "Feed the flock of God over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." Those who are called to this office, with its solemn charge, and special difficulties, and dread responsibilities, must "magnify their office." Obligation is laid on them. However much they may naturally incline to the free tendencies of the day, and wish to accommodate themselves to the instincts which cry for equality, they dare not in the face of their charter. They are obliged to scrutinise narrowly the assumptions of "brethren" who pervert the doctrine of human brotherhood, just as in their theology they have to guard against perversions of the doctrine of the divine fatherhood. But when they use the term "over the flock" they mean what the Holy Ghost means: not that phantom of irresponsible, despotic, hierarchical supremacy over the churches committed to them which terrifies so many. Something very different from that: as St. Peter teaches.

As a separated body it has none over it: there is no episcopal order in the New Testament. It has none under it, in the guidance and government of the Church: the order of deacons does indeed exist, but for specific purposes

of an honourable but lower and limited character. But we have now to do only with the former.

The relation of the term Presbyter to the term Bishop demands at this point a more formal statement. The misconception of the relation between these words has had the deepest and most far-reaching consequences in the polity of the Christian Church. Hence anxious consideration has been devoted to the hints of the New Testament on this subject; and every word bearing on the question has been subjected to the keenest scrutiny. The result may be thus stated: all must agree that the origin of the distinction between the names is not marked by the faintest indication of Scripture; nor can there be any difference of opinion as to the nature of the current distinction between them in the earlier New Testament; but the latest references to the matter are supposed to contain the germs and more than the germs of a permanent distinction between the offices of the Elder and the Bishop as in the mind of the Holy Ghost.

Generally, as to the first point, there is not a solitary hint of any economical design in the variation of the phrase. The term Bishop is applied to the pastoral office only about four times, and each time in such a connection as to leave no room to doubt that the office of the presbyter and that of the bishop are precisely the same. The same persons who in Acts xx. 17 are called elders, are in ver. 28 bishops. In Phil. i. 1, the "bishops and deacons" are greeted; and certainly had there been an intermediate order of presbyters, they would not have been passed over. In Titus i. 5, 7, the two terms are used interchangeably. The identity of the two functions is most obvious everywhere; it was admitted by the writers of the first centuries; and, although the body of the elders would necessarily have one *primus inter pares* at their head there is no indication that such a president was ever called the bishop or even the chief presbyter. It is true that the distinction between the two offices soon becomes apparent in the history of the church. And much may be said as to the necessity that the chief of the presbyters should gradually become in a sense the representative of his class, even as that class was the representative of the church. But there is no shadow of an indication in the New Testament that a new order in the ministry was to arise, having jurisdiction over the rest.

There is, or there ought to be, a general consent as to the original grounds of the distinction between these two designations.

First, there can be no doubt that the term elder came from Judaism into Christianity, while bishop was an importation from the Gentile world. As to the former, enough has been said: long before the other term was employed that of elders was in common use in Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem proceeded to all other churches formed after the Jewish type. Hence by the apostles who laboured among the Jewish Christians no other term was used. St. Peter knows no other; though his reference to the "Shepherd and Bishop of souls," which has its own supreme justification, and his reference to the office of the elder, "feed the flock of God, *taking the oversight*" (1 Pet. v. 2), both plainly enough form a kind of transition to the Pauline term. St. James speaks only of "the elders of the church;" and St. John in his smaller epistles and in the Apocalypse mentions only the eldership. The term bishop sprang from the Gentile apostle, St. Paul, and is used only by him and his colleague in the New-Testament Scripture, St. Luke. The very dawn of the idea, which has exerted so vast an influence in the ecclesiastical world, is found in St. Luke's quotation, "his bishopric let [another take" (Acts i. 20). But St. Paul first used it as a title, and, some think, as a concession to the Gentile habits of thought, perhaps Gentile prejudices. Another term than that of elders would seem to be more appropriate in the case of presidency which was not associated with riper age; and we know by the instances of Timothy and Titus that age as such was not a necessary condition in higher administration. Now there was a classical term in classical use which united both office and function. The Greek term ἐπίσκοπος was employed to define the duties of many classes of office-bearers in the state, and in more private clubs and confraternities. Many illustrations of this, some valid and some fanciful, are found in the books which are devoted to the subject. For ourselves we do not attach much importance to the quotations generally paraded. We are jealous of the attempt to derive the episcopal idea from heathenism. St. Paul knew the Old-Testament use of the term full well; and was taught by the Septuagint to appropriate a word which was in frequent use in the translation of Hebrew terms signifying official charge, visitation, and

care: as, for instance, in Numb. i. 16; Judges ix. 28; Neh. xi. 9, 14; Isa. lx. 17. Meanwhile, the fact remains that the Gentile churches of Philippi, Asia Minor, and Crete are made familar with the name bishop. Both terms, bishops and elders, are of Greek derivation; but the former carries with it an idea to which the Gentiles were more habituated. And it must not be forgotten that even in the churches of Greek origin the term presbyters held its place with that of bishops as a synonyme of the office; of which the passage, Acts xx. 17, is a striking and sufficient example.

Secondly, it is equally obvious that the eldership referred rather to the dignity of the office and the episcopate to its practical function. In the cardinal passage just referred to, the apostle summons the "elders of the church" over which the Holy Ghost had made them "bishops." The distinction thus seems faintly to reflect the original and latent meaning of the two terms. The apostles sent for them as the "elders" of the church; the warning injunction as to their care of the doctrine and discipline of the flock were given to them as "bishops." It is remarkable that this is the only instance of the direct collocation of the terms: the suggestion of the reason must be weighed on its own merits. Thirdly, there is a distinction which may be thought fanciful, but will nevertheless bear examination. The term "elders" connotes always the idea of the connection between the office-bearer and the people, while that of "bishops" connotes the idea of the Divine appointment. The former must needs suggest that they are functionaries who have grown up in the congregation, and by the congregational suffrages have been brought before the Lord for His approval: that approval is expressed by their being made "overseers" over the flock.

The last thing to be considered is the question whether or not the latest indications of Scripture point to a distinction between the elders and the bishops. Here we must dwell upon the term and the office.

As to the term, it is impossible to find any trace that the supervision of the bishop was to be transferred from the flock, its one sphere, to the college of elders and the flock united, and still less to the elders as such. Every single reference to the name bishop indicates an oversight of the flock as such. This is so plain, that the advocates of a third order are obliged to fall back on the right of the

Church to change the application of a name. This is an unfortunate necessity to those who are so tenacious of the apostolical and primitive model. To us, of course, who are obliged to relax our tenacity on that subject, this special argument has not much weight. We, in modern times, inherit a system which has come to us laden with many such anomalies. The primitive deacons are changed almost past recognition. Bishops are in Germany, and in Methodism, superintendents. Presbyters are pastors and ministers. But we revert to the Scripture itself: there the bishop is an overseer of the flock, and not of the eldership.

As to the office it is enough to say that the only argument that can be used is the plain fact that the deputies of the apostle Paul exercised a general jurisdiction over the presbyters and people. Timothy and Titus were undeniably, young as they were, sent into certain regions for a season with the authority of the apostle. They were his deputies or vicars. They ordained elders; presided in the presbyteries; and acted precisely as the apostle himself would have acted. But they were "appointed" only for a season: with a transitory authority, adapted to the infancy of the church, which like the apostle's own was to pass away. Timothy was "besought to abide still in Ephesus" when the apostle "went into Macedonia": though ordained by the presbytery and the apostle as a presbyter, he was requested to undertake this special mission. But in both epistles he is bidden, and not merely besought, to come back to the apostle again, without any the least reference to a permanent vocation in Ephesus. The same injunction—and this is very remarkable—was laid upon Titus: he also was to do his diligence "to come to me at Nicopolis." And it should not be forgotten that the general strain of the pastoral exhortations given to these apostolic vicars bore upon their faithful discharge of the common ministerial office: varied in one instance by the injunction to do the work, not of a bishop in the modern sense, but of an Evangelist.

We have now to consider the unity of the eldership in relation to the offices belonging to it. It is the unity of government through the Word; and all that belongs to that government is united in one person.

The word of God is the rule and standard and instrument also of all ministerial offices, whether of teaching or

of government. This is the "power of the keys," when that mysterious term is carried back from ecclesiastical theology to the holy gospels. The term itself is one which is entitled to deep reverence, for His sake who alone used it. But, as it is never once even alluded to by the apostles, and never applied to the authority of the presbytery, we are not required to discuss it here at any length. The Lutheran church, which rescued the expression from hierarchical misuse and largely incorporated it into its doctrine of church government, understands the symbol to signify the general authority given to the church as a whole to declare through the preached word and the sacramental word—that is the word spoken and the word in act—the terms of salvation. It is the preaching and teaching of the Gospel on the one hand: the keys of salvation. On the other, it is the reception and continuation of members by the sacraments: the keys of discipline. These keys the Lord committed to the apostles for the church, and the church recommits them to men who have no divine prerogative save as made by the church its own representatives. Dismissing these sacred symbols we fall back upon the word of God which is put into the hands of the presbyters that they may preach its gospel and thus bring souls to Christ, that they may teach its doctrine to those who have become His, that they may administer its sacraments—the sacraments of Christ and not of the church—to those who are received and counted worthy, administer its discipline upon offenders, and according to its standard order all things for the spiritual interests of the community at large. On them the final responsibility of administering the religion of that book finally rests. But the volume which gives them their authority itself directs them how to exercise it; and leaves them large latitude as to the methods by which they may seek the co-operation of the people, secure their concurrence and consent in all acts of administration, and employ all their diversified gifts for the advantage of the common kingdom of God which is above and beyond all mere society organisations.

All this is conceded by those who are one in these convictions as to the Presbyterian government of the church. But here there arises a division in the Presbyterian camp. Some maintain that the office of elder is in Scripture twofold: that is, that the "estate of the elders" is composed

of elders who teach or dispense the word, whether the word preached or the symbolical word of sacraments, and elders who without the higher offices are set apart simply to rule, that is, in union with the former class to exercise both legislative and administrative functions. We have only to do with the Scripture in this discussion; but we may introduce the ecclesiastical terms which have been provided to express the distinction. The two classes of elders are teaching elders and ruling elders in the modern terminology. To call them ministerial elders and lay elders would better express the distinction as it really appears in practice, since to all intents and purposes the one class is ordained to the sacred function pre-eminently, and the other to represent the people as not entirely set apart from worldly callings. We shall very briefly indicate how the question bears on the interpretation of Scripture, and then make a few general observations.

The distinction is supposed to be implied in two or three texts alone. The classical passage is that of 1 Tim. v. 17, "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine." Now this says no more than that some elders laboured more than others in teaching as well as ruling, while all alike ruled. If the word "labour" is traced through the New Testament it will be found that it invariably signifies an exhausting and most arduous exercise of the soul, and it is upon that the emphasis here lies. Only this interpretation brings it into harmony with other sayings in Timothy which lay it down as an indispensable requisite that the elder be "apt to teach," without any hint of an exemption from that service. A greater difficulty in the passage is the "double honour," which is afterwards connected very evidently with remuneration as well as higher esteem. But that difficulty deals more severely with the advocates of a ruling eldership than with us; for the ruling elders who owe their origin to a misinterpretation of this passage have no remuneration from the people. When the apostle, in Rom. xii. 7, 8, distinguishes between him that teacheth and him that receiveth, he is not referring to formal offices at all, but to the discreet exercise of religious gifts generally. So also when in 1 Cor. xii. 28, he co-ordinates "apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, helps, governments, tongues," he is again speaking of only special charisms bestowed on the

Church. "Teachers" and "governments" are not distinct offices; for, if so, then the apostles must be bereft of the functions of government. If God gave "pastors and teachers" (Eph. vi. 12), He gave these in one, even as their Lord is "the Shepherd and Bishop of souls." Everywhere throughout the Scriptures the ruling and the teaching are united: from 1 Thess. v. 12, where "labouring," and being "over you," and "admonish you," are all of one, down to Heb. xiii. 7, 17, where those who "have the rule over you" are those who "spake the word of God" and "watch for your souls."

Though this distinction does not exist in Scripture, it has in it an element of importance, so far as it recognises the different functions which the body of presbyters may discharge according to the measure of the several gifts of its members. Where the congregation is given over into the hands of one minister, of course there can be no room for this diversity. But the New Testament does not countenance what has been sometimes termed "the one-man ministry." Where a pastoral body of two or three or more is intrusted with the common oversight of societies and churches there is much room for the exercise of various gifts: some being able to rule well, others to labour in the word more efficiently, some to minister to the young, and so on through the whole range of talents.

There is, however, an inconsistency in the modern theory as it avowedly seeks to give the people their rights in administration of the affairs of the Church, while at the same time it calls out the lay-elders—we must give them that name, however much it is disliked—from the body of the people, and separates them by the most solemn services and rites. The theory that the clerical elders represent the proper pastorate and the ruling elders the people has been laid down with great precision and much plausibility by some Presbyterian divines. But the fact remains that the ruling body thus chosen from the congregation is to all intents and purposes ordained and set apart from the people, and ceases to represent them in any practicable sense beyond the representationship of all elders as such.

It follows that the ruling elders of this system—we must not call them lay elders now—cannot be pressed into the service of those theorists who would introduce laymen as such into the direct administration of the pastoral govern-

ment and oversight of the Christian Church. No body of men chosen for their gifts, their influence, their services, their popularity—supposing them elected annually, and to retire when their term of delegacy ceases—can with any propriety be placed on a level with either the ruling eldership of modern Presbyterianism, or the New-Testament eldership as described in the New Testament.

But the expedient which began with the Reformation with a good design, which the genius of Calvin stamped upon the Reformed constitution of the Church, and which has been perfected in modern Presbyterianism, points to the propriety and necessity of other and better expedients for introducing the full force of the strength of the people into the affairs of the Christian society. This is a subject beyond our present province. Suffice to say that most Christian churches are making these experiments. Some of the branches of the Methodist Society have for many years done more than experiment: in our judgment with very partial success. Methodism is now called to solve the problem in her own way, and will doubtless be able to exhibit, perhaps, the best example of a successful solution: one that will maintain all pastoral rights as secured in the New Testament, and, at the same time, show in how large a sphere of practical administration the representative laity may take their place by the side of their pastors.

But we must close by returning to the New Testament which yields us a few passages as yet unconsidered. We must not forget that the last title the apostles assume is that of presbyter: St. Peter is "also an elder," and St. John gives himself formally no other name than "the Presbyter."

But these last allusions to the office and dignity of the presbyter in the Church of this world suggests that we preserve the term into the other world. St. John is here our guide. Though, while his apocalypse lingers on earth, and lays the scene there, he does not use this word, but that given him by His Master, the symbolical angel; no sooner does the door open in heaven than among the first objects of the higher scenery we see the four and twenty elders. They sit on seats round about the throne, "clothed in white raiment, and they had on their heads crowns of gold." In this first vision they take precedence even of the four living creatures, their faithful companions afterwards throughout the visions of the book down to the time of the

consummation when both living creatures and elders vanish together. Until then they are a necessary part of the visions: never absent and always consistent with themselves, with the living creatures the only permanent appendages of the sacred drama. They appear at each great crisis; and in such a manner as to suggest a presbytery in heaven. As the Lord was in the midst of the candlesticks in the earlier vision, so He is afterwards in the midst of His elders, as it were nearer to Him than the four living creatures, or the cherubim-symbols of universal creation; nearer to Him than the angels; nearer to Him than all else, because in these visions the church of the redeemed is foremost, and everything in the universe regarded in relation to it. We cannot but be reminded of that ancient prophecy, whether it is here fulfilled or not: "when the Lord of Hosts shall reign on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His elders gloriously" (Isa. xxiv. 23: Sept. *ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτερῶν*; Vulg. in conspectu Senum suorum). No one can fail to perceive that the general aspect of the heavenly world is as the pattern on the mount of things seen below: the throne, the elders, the countless hosts of the redeemed, including the disembodied spirits of the martyrs; all the powers of creation and the multitude of the heavenly host witnessing and sympathising with and assisting at the holy service.

This would require little stretch of the imagination; nor would it involve anything bordering on irreverence. But it is not what we mean to suggest. We do not interpret the four-and-twenty elders as symbolically signifying the literal eldership of the lower Church. But we do regard them as signifying the universal Church represented by its ministerial headship generally. This has been in some form or other the prevalent interpretation: common to those whose hierarchical views have given it a false turn, and those who have held purer views of various shades as to the representative ministry of the Church, and those who have rejected a representative ministry, and think only of the flower of redeemed mankind. The first have found in them the cardinals or the priests; the last the leading spirits of the human race; while the middle and sound opinion is held by some of the best expositors, who differ only as to the partition of the number twenty-four. Whether the two twelves are the patriarchs and apostles, or the one twenty-four is the number of the priestly orders,

or the number signifies the blended heads of the old and new covenants, is matter of comparatively slight importance. It is slight, at least, in regard to our present subject. The Church is represented in its eldership: the four-and-twenty being the Church itself in its ministers presenting constant homage to the Triune. Sometimes without, sometimes with, the heavenly laity, they are always engaged in acts of worship: clothed in the white garments of consecration, and sitting upon thrones; yet always presenting praises with their harps, and the prayers of saints with which their vials are full. When the Lamb took the book which He alone could open, the elders, representatives of the permanent ministry of the Word, bowed down and led off the new song. And to us at least there is a reminiscence of unspeakable interest in the fact that St. John himself receives from one of these elders, and more than one, pastoral instruction. We have the heavenly catechising: "What are these?" "Sir, thou knowest!" "These are they that have come out of great tribulation!" And it is not without significance that their last ministry is to extol the final victory of the Lamb over the apostasy of the church: "and the four-and-twenty elders and the four beasts fell down and worshipped God that sate upon the throne, saying, Amen, Alleluiah." (Rev. xix. 4.)

But, after all, the presbytery was made for the church, and not the church for the presbytery. It is the congregation of the redeemed, and not its ancients, that the eye of faith beholds in these four-and-twenty elders. There is no distinction of orders in the upper world. The elders in Paradise are the church of the redeemed, which is represented at the close by the bride, at the beginning by the innumerable multitude, and, consistently with both, in the middle by the four-and-twenty elders. In the presence of Christ beyond the veil there is only the congregation of the redeemed; and this side the veil also economical distinctions are lost in the supreme blessedness of being in Him, "brethren and companions in the kingdom and tribulation and patience of Jesus."

ART. VI.—1. *India and its Native Princes. Travels in Central India and in the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal.* By LOUIS ROUSSELET. Carefully revised and edited by Lieut.-Col. C. Buckle. Chapman and Hall. 1875.

2. *L'Inde des Rajas.* Par LOUIS ROUSSELET. Paris: Hachette. 1874.

3. *Correspondance de Victor Jacquemont pendant son Voyage dans l'Inde* (1828—1832). Paris: Fournier. 1834.

4. *The Peasantry of Bengal.* By Romesh Chunder Dutt, B.C.S., Barrister-at-Law. Trübner and Co. 1875.

5. *Govinda Samanti.* A Novel of Bengali Peasant Life. By the Rev. Lal Behari Day, Chinsurah, Bengal. Macmillan, 1874.

NEXT to the buying of the Khedive's share in the Suez Canal, the visit of the Prince of Wales to India will always rank amongst the remarkable achievements of the present ministry. Probably no one except the Bishop of Lincoln —as great an enthusiast about the influence of royal personages as he is a monopolist for his own communion of ordinary titles of courtesy—ever imagined that the Prince would have any direct influence on Missions. Yet every thoughtful person must have felt that vast results could scarcely fail to follow such an unprecedented step. Of these the greatest will, perhaps, be wrought at home. England is now thoroughly roused to consider what her Indian Empire means, and how she may best fulfil the trust which God has so clearly placed in her hands. It is not likely, for some time at least, that the opening of an Indian debate will be, as it so often has been, the signal for a "count out" in the House of Commons. Everybody here is seeking to learn something about India, just as everybody there is seeking to learn something about England. There illustrated Lives of the Queen and Royal Family, etc., published in three or four tongues, are selling largely; here works of all prices and pretensions, from the Indian number of the *Graphic*, perhaps the most wonderful shilling's worth ever seen, to that grand and

costly specimen of bookmaking which stands first on our list, are being eagerly read. The value of all this can scarcely be overrated. Ignorance at both ends has wrought incalculable evils. Ignorance in India caused the Mutiny,—ignorance alike of our power and of our aims and intentions. Azimoolah Khan, who had only seen us in the Crimea, amid disaster and mismanagement, went back and told his master, the Nana Sahib, that, if the white men then in India were "eaten up," there were no others to replace them. Jung Bahadoor, on the other hand, the ruler of Nepaul, was our stedfast ally, because he had learnt the truth about us. His prime minister had put up at the London Coffee House, and had watched hour by hour for the stream of people to pass by. *It never passed by*, and he never forgot the lesson which that vast tide of human life taught him. To set a score of native chiefs on London Bridge would be perhaps the most effectual way of "tranquillising India." They would not only see our population, busy and energetic, and apparently numberless, but they would see in the "Pool" and along the river bank a sample of that commerce and industry to which we mainly owe our position in the world. Ignorance at home, or amongst those sent out as rulers, has been almost as harmful as native ignorance of England's resources. If it did not bring about a mutiny, it has been the cause of much mischief and of untold misery. To it are due a series of bad laws, from Lord Cornwallis' well-intentioned but most oppressive Permanent Settlement down to the rashly-imposed and hastily-repealed Indian income-tax. "Most of our administrators and officers (said one who knew India well) know no more of the history of India than they do of the history of the moon." We may well hope that the Prince's visit, as it will surely make India "fashionable," will also give a permanent impetus to investigation, so that this reproach may be less deserved than heretofore; and that some knowledge of the people amongst whom they are going—of their literature, their peculiarities, their aspirations—may be deemed as essential in Civil Service examinations as ability to solve problems in higher mathematics. Much has been done in this direction: it is impossible to read books like that of Mr. Talboys Wheeler, or papers like those of Mr. Grant Duff in the *Contemporary Review*, Mr. Lyall in the *Fortnightly*, and Mr. James Routledge in

Macmillan, without feeling what a change has been wrought in our feelings towards India. But men like these, and like Sir H. S. Maine and Mr. Hunter, naturally have most influence on the noblest natures: "the residuum" (not Mr. Bright's lowest class, but the blind, impracticable, and selfish of every rank) is more likely to be moved by such an event as a royal visit. It will make them more easily led along the line which others have marked out; and thus, without expecting too much from the Prince's tour, even while smiling at the enthusiasm of one native poet who says, "He comes to us the latest Avatár—the brightest," we may reasonably hope that this will be one instance of what Mr. Gladstone calls "progress by leaps," or of the other who exclaims:

"We will see the king that is to be.
Prepare cannon!
The moon-faced, fish-eyed deity;
Fire, bang! The guns go off from one to twenty-one!"

Of the Prince's personal influence for good we will not say much. Mr. Bright hoped that his well-known courteousness would be a permanent lesson to European officials. It is doubtful whether such a lesson is needed. Those who call the natives "niggers," and treat them accordingly are the same insignificant majority who cry out against missionaries and mission-work. The lower class of Europeans, engineers, railway-men, and above all common soldiers, are naturally often guilty of oppression and insolence; but they are an improving class and can be kept in order. "The white loafer" is the despair of magistrates, the disgrace of our race and religion; we have plenty of loafers at home, but here they are tolerably harmless; in India they will cease to be a special nuisance when the natives rise more to the average English level. "Temper is everything," should be the grand rule for the English in India. The climate tends to make people irritable, and then offence is taken where none is meant, dependants are treated with want of consideration, and on the part of high-class natives argument is too often looked on as an insult, and difference of opinion as disloyalty. On the other hand the natives are often very "trying," and the bugbear of caste is sometimes made a mere excuse. Lord Dalhousie thought so when, in reply to his bearer's refusal to empty some dirty water, he

pulled out his watch and said: "If that is not emptied in five minutes, I'll discharge not only you but every one of your caste who is employed in Government House." The man gave in; discharged alone he would have been supported by his fellows, but he dared not bring wholesale ruin on the "bearer" caste. It was a dangerous experiment, though; a smaller matter has before now led to the decimation of a native regiment; and it savours too much of the spirit which, by annexing Oude, led directly to the Mutiny. But it shows how "caste" works. Far more harmless was the conduct of the railway porter who, when a high caste, yet poor or stingy Brahmin, determined to travel third-class, was crying out for a compartment to himself and keeping the train waiting, bundled him in unceremoniously among a crowd of "all sorts," shouting, "I can't 'elp your caste; get in, do." Railway travelling, more than anything else, has forced the natives to feel that they must give and take. If your superior sanctity makes it impossible for you to rub shoulders with other men, you had best not travel third-class; and if you yourself are poor there are thousands of rich Brahmins who might well pay the difference, and so ensure you the necessary isolation. However, when a conquering is dealing with a conquered race, there will always be room for the former to learn more abundant exercise of "the unbought courtesies of life." If the Prince's example makes any more careful of these, his journey will not have been in vain. That his presence at elephant fights and such like will have increased his influence for good, we cannot believe. "Such things are the rule at Baroda, and if he had not gone to see them he would have been thought backward in cordiality." It is impossible to read such an apology without disgust. Englishmen abroad too generally forget home manners in the absence of home restraints; but for a tourist to go to a bull-fight, or for a skipper or palm-oil trader to be present (sometimes because not to go would bring destruction on his own head besides ruining trade) at the murderous "customs" of some West African king, is a very different thing from the future Emperor of India sanctioning with his presence barbarities of which all but the very worst of the native princes have grown ashamed. How can we be angry with the young Guikwar if he treads in the steps of his predecessor, when our own Prince has looked on approvingly at cruelties too much resembling those

in which that predecessor revelled? At Bombay the Prince was all that could be desired; no wonder Parsees prayed and Mahometans held special services, and the press, guided by men like Mr. Robert Knight, of the *Times of India*, and Mr. James Maclean, of the *Bombay Gazette*, was jubilant. Nothing was forgotten; while the Ellora Caves were illuminated with lime-light, and Sir Bartle Frere was humoured in his love of native music, the investment of Dr. Birdwood with the order of the Star of India showed that good hard work for higher education was duly recognised. Would that things had gone on in this way; would that Baroda had been left out of the programme if its atmosphere was so debasing as to make cruel and shameful sports the order of the day. Vivisection is not likely to find many advocates amongst us; but gratuitous barbarity is more inexcusable still. It was a mistake to carry Hurlingham over to India—the one mistake in an otherwise unexceptionable programme.

Closely connected with this is the fact that the book which stands first on our list was selected for presentation to Indian princes. Fifty copies of it, gorgeously bound, formed the most striking part of the Prince's literary baggage. Now there is very much to praise in M. Rousselet's book; as one of Messrs. Hachette's series, *Le Tour du Monde*, it was what it professed to be, a lively description, *for Europeans*, of Indian life and scenery. The illustrations, 317 in number, many of them full page (*i.e.* royal 4to.) size, and artistically coloured, are unusually good. The author is as indefatigable as an enthusiastic Frenchman could be. He was out in all sorts of weather (in a whirlwind of warm rain and stones, for instance); he went everywhere; at one time living *en prince*, welcomed with a salute of eleven guns, dressed by the court tailor, and made a Sirdar at the Court of Bhopal, or presented with a robe of honour by Khundar Rao, Mulhar Rao's predecessor at Baroda, at another time glad to take shelter in a tomb in the midst of ruins. He was, moreover, as keen a sportsman as he was a clever photographer, and if some of his experiences seem apocryphal, we must remember that he was on the look-out for adventures. All this gives a freshness to the book, very unlike the weary dulness of many recent writers on India. We were reminded of a very different book, Bishop Heber's Journal. The work deserves much higher praise than this. It is not only far away the first of the costly books of the sea-

son; it gives a better idea of Indian architecture, for instance, than it was possible to obtain heretofore. The exquisite detail of much of the work, both Hindu and Mahometan, comes vividly out; if ever the phrase "stone lace-work" was deserved, it is by some carved screen-work at Agra and Delhi. We would call special attention to the illustrations of buildings at Oodeypore; they are so rich and so beautiful that the town might well be called, from an architectural point of view, the Venice of India. The colossal rock-sculptures at Gwalior are also most impressive; while the Palace of King Pâl at the same place looks like a baronial castle, of which able hands have covered every turret and all the blank wall-spaces with elaborate ornament. We do hope that these architectural illustrations will be carefully studied; they will give a high opinion of the artistic genius of the people who have reared them. About some of the landscapes there is a picturesqueness which is very fascinating. The Valley of Ambir (p. 244), the View of Bhurtpore (p. 283), and the Night Scene in Malwah (p. 330), especially deserve mention. And not only art and nature, but almost all the circumstances of life—nautch and durbar and religious ceremonial and simple every-day life in bazaar or village—are well illustrated, the accompanying descriptions being written by one who is clearly free from the want of sympathy, which is too often the besetting sin of English travellers.

His descriptions of several of the native princes are curious and suggestive. The portrait of Maharajah Sayaji Scindia shows a man of much firmness and determination, older apparently than his years (thirty-three) when M. Rousselet saw him ten years ago. His close hard lips and furrowed brow contrast with the general expression, which is melancholy. Scindia, unlike most native princes, devotes himself not to field sports and amusements, but to politics and the reorganisation of his State. His minister, Sir Dinkur Rao, is one of the ablest financiers of any age or country—as able as Sir Madhava Rao, who in a short time has raised Travancore from beggary to wealth. These are the men whom we ought to put in high places; if our *raj* is to last, a proper position must be found for native genius, combined with spotless integrity. Such men might well be invited to Court and treated as the State ministers of any European Court would be treated. Our relations with Scindia and his fellows would be greatly improved by such

treatment of their trusted ministers. Scindia, however, is, as a Mahratta should be, a splendid horseman. M. Rousselet saw him display some remarkable feats on a magnificent charger in front of the Palace at Gwalior, amid the frantic applause of a crowd of spectators. Unfortunately he stammers frightfully, so that a conversation is a troublesome and painful business.

Next to Scindia, perhaps, the most characteristic portrait is that of the Begum Secunder, of Bhopal, a lady who evidently much impressed our traveller. Her dress, tight-fitting trousers and embroidered jacket, with dagger in the belt, and her sharp, energetic eyes (so unlike those of the typical Eastern woman), make it easy to mistake her sex. Her history is curious; she was the daughter of the last Nawab, and on his death established her claim to the throne. The English, however, interfered, and gave the preference to her husband, Schamghir. At his death she became regent; and, casting aside the Mussulman rules, which condemned her to direct her affairs from behind a curtain, she presented herself to the people on horseback, with face unveiled, took the reins of government in hand, and concentrated all power in herself. She very skilfully managed to get rid of English intervention, and then set about reforming abuses. She paid off a debt of 80 lakhs, and raised the Crown revenue from 13 to 30 lakhs, made roads, reorganised her army and her police, stood forth as defender of the people against the exactions of the nobles, &c. For ten years she worked twelve hours a day, and showed an amount of administrative ability which astonished the English. No wonder M. Rousselet says: "Her gesture and manners reveal the sovereign." This very remarkable woman, who was lately succeeded by her daughter, adds one more to the list of famous Eastern queens. We understand Semiramis and Artemisia and Zenobia, not to speak of Deborah and the Arab chieftainesses of her type, when we read the history of India, and see how, occasionally, Ranee or Begum has stood forth as a heroine or an able administrator when the men about her were "naught." M. Rousselet seems studiously to avoid any remarks on the English and their government. Not having had the advantage of seeing the original work, we cannot say whether these have been cut out by the translator; but we fancy not. In this he pleasantly contrasts with such writers as Madame Ida Pfeiffer, who, in her *Voyage Round the*

World, finds fault with us at every turn, speaking of India as if we were answerable for the state of ruin into which many glorious buildings have fallen, whereas the enforced peace brought about by our rule has alone saved the remnant from a destruction which was otherwise inevitable.

Enough has been said to show that the book is one which everyone should see who can. Every free library and Athenæum ought to possess it; and working men might well combine to add it to such institutions. The price (three guineas; much dearer, we believe, than the French edition, which came out in cheap *livraisons*) may soon be saved by the self-denial of a score of subscribers; and then, if a proviso is made that it shall not be taken out of the library or reading-room, the book will be instructive to many generations. But this is a very different thing from choosing it for presentation to the native princes. Besides the pictures of which we have spoken, the work contains a rhinoceros fight (p. 103), an elephant fight (p. 42), a horrible picture (p. 114) of an elephant-executioner crushing the skull of a prostrate criminal, and a picture (with animated description) of the *nucki-ka-koosti* (fight with claws), in which two naked men, armed with a more terrible *cæstus* than that of the old Greeks, tear each other in pieces. The claws used to be of steel, but in recent times horn has been used instead; yet even now the fight is almost always fatal to one if not to both the combatants:— "Intoxicated with *bhang*, they sing as they rush upon one another; their heads and faces are soon covered with blood; their frenzy knows no bounds. The king, with wild eyes and the veins of his neck swollen, surveys the scene with such passionate excitement that he cannot remain quiet, but imitates by gestures the movements of the wrestlers. The arena is covered with blood; the defeated combatant is carried off, sometimes in a dying condition; and the conqueror, the skin of his forehead hanging down in strips, prostrates himself before the king, who places round his neck a string of fine pearls, and covers him with garments of great value. . . . In one day the king distributed among the victorious wrestlers necklaces and money to the amount of more than £4,000." One episode in this terrible day is, indeed, too much even for M. Rousselet. A wrestler, on whom the *bhang* had not taken full effect, fell in trying to escape; he cried

for quarter, and his adversary turned for orders to the king, but the cry: "*Maro, maro*" (strike), from the royal lips soon set him tearing the poor fellow's scalp. Our author hereupon at once withdrew, "without any heed of the effect my sudden departure might have on the Guikwar." Now all this, and the accounts of "elephants, bellowing and covered with flames," and the like, can produce but one effect on the mind of the most uneducated Englishman—that of unmitigated disgust. We know that cruelty is not strength, that it is almost always the accompaniment of weakness. But Indian rajahs will take a very different view of such pictures and descriptions; they will conclude that such scenes, certainly not condemned, are held to be as worthy of admiration as lovely landscapes or gorgeous architecture. Colonel Buckle has "carefully revised" the book. He was evidently working against time, for trifling errors abound; but if it was impossible to prepare a few paragraphs of stern condemnation, the proper course would have been to leave out all these episodes of cruelty. The editor has missed a golden opportunity. All these savage sports remind us forcibly of the scenes in a Roman amphitheatre—the costumes, the wreath-crowned attendants, bearing wands, adorned with flowers, the eager looks of the great man on whose signal depends the life of the vanquished; it is like a picture by Gérome. If such a scene was to be reproduced in a gift-book, presented by our Prince to native princes, surely it might have been shown how closely was bound up the decay of Rome with the horrors of the amphitheatre; how even Christianity could not save a people degraded by having been for centuries familiarised with such spectacles.

Instead of this, there is not, we believe, one word of rebuke except that cited above. Colonel Buckle inserts a few lines about the Guikwar's fancy for keeping 60,000 pigeons, attributing it to madness, and mentioning it as the cause why the Bombay papers kept urging the Government to take in hand the affairs of Baroda. We have searched in vain for anything stronger than that; while M. Rousselet's regrets at "having to tear himself away from a state of existence so fascinating as that which he had passed among his kind friends at Baroda" are allowed to stand without comment. Of course it will be said that in such a book sermonizing or "goody talk" would have been quite out of place; but, while avoiding any approach to this, the

editor had it in his power to mark what true English feeling on such matters is,—and he has not done so. A well-known print represents the Queen handing a Bible to an African prince, thereby giving him (as she says) that which has been the true cause of England's greatness. We do not like the picture; and we feel that the gift might be sadly misunderstood. In Africa it might become a grand "fetish;" even in India some rajah might be found ignorant enough to set it up beside his *linga*, and to hang wreaths of flowers about it when he went to his devotions.* And if such a book will seldom do much good without the missionary to explain it, how much harm is M. Rousselet's work sure to do unless every resident takes care to supply the strictures which Colonel Buckle should have inserted. We feel so strongly on the subject that we wish the Government would issue a letter or pamphlet to each recipient of the volume, explaining the spirit in which these scenes are to be looked at. If they are left with no other comment than the Prince's presence at beast-fights—from which the correspondents of the press are said to have been excluded—we cannot but fear lest serious mischief should be done. We should have failed in our duty if we had not spoken strongly on this matter; and we have done so the more freely because we have praised the book as a whole, and because, from the Prince's tour, even though it has been unhappily cut short, we have been able honestly to augur much good. We may remark that in that wonderful shilling's worth of which we spoke, several of M. Rousselet's best and one of his worst engravings are reproduced.

Of the other books on our list we have no space to say much. Jacquemont's style is delightful; and his shrewd remarks on the Anglo-Indian society of that day are specially interesting after the lapse of more than forty years. He saw a good deal of Runjeet Sing, by whom he was treated with such liberality when he went on his botanical and geological expedition to Cashmere, that (as he says) "the petty salary received from the Jardin des Plantes counts for nothing." It is curious to find him (vol. ii. p. 25) speaking of the Goorkhas, who afterwards did such good service in the Mutiny, as most valuable men, falling easily in

* Even the Prince's emblems have been made allegorical. "The three tufts of feathers are emblematic of the three gods. The starfish puts three fingers forward as it swims. The pomegranate has three tap-roots. There are three kinds of milk."

with European discipline. We too often hear it said that an Oriental always attributes anything like lenity to fear. Jacquemont, however, always tried the rule of kindness, and almost always found it answer. Once his head-servant embezzled certain rupees when employed to pay the rest of the suite. "Instead of getting in a rage, and having him beaten, I spoke to him very gently, and, while fining him (the fine of course to be divided among those whom he had robbed), and refusing him a holiday that he had asked for, I made him feel so ashamed that he did what I think no other Indian was ever brought to do—he confessed his fault and said he was sorry for it" (vol. ii. p. 5). Less fortunate than M. Rousselet, poor Jacquemont died in Bombay of neglected liver-complaint. His last letter to his brother even a Stoic could scarcely read with dry eyes.

Mr. Dutt's little book is a forcible plea for the ryot against the zemindar, to whom Lord Cornwallis, by his Permanent Settlement, unwittingly gave the means of unlimited oppression. Mr. Dutt proposes that the constantly increasing rents paid to the zemindars should be fixed by Government. We do hope that the Prince's visit may be the means of calling attention, to some purpose, to the condition of the Bengal ryot.

What that condition is is admirably set forth in Mr. Day's novel, written for a prize offered by a blind but most energetic and enlightened native landlord—one of those who have been stirred up to feel that property has duties as well as rights. This work we briefly noticed last July; but we feel it a duty again to call attention to its life-like descriptions of every-day scenes; for, if the Prince's visit is to do its proper work, it must make us more thoughtful about the condition of the millions whom Providence has so strangely placed under our rule. We have improved, both in knowledge of the country,—most educated men now know that "India" is only "a geographical expression," and that this fact alone makes our supremacy possible,—and far more wonderfully in the spirit in which we accept the burden laid upon us. That is the proper way of characterising it; for despite the consideration which it gives us in the writer's eyes (a consideration out of all proportion with its extent, for British India is less than the one colony of Western Australia); despite its immense value in fostering "imperial ideas," correcting insular narrowness, and drawing the nation off from those

schemes of European aggrandizement to which nations that have no colonies are tempted; despite the opening which it gives to so many of our young men, India is a weakness for us, albeit (as Mr. Grant Duff expresses it) "a glorious weakness." Few ever reflect on the amount of ability which it absorbs; we must go on with our work, but the work is (as has just been said) a burden laid upon us.

The more we learn about India, the more we shall be able to bear this burden as it ought to be borne. And the questions to be asked and answered are manifold. There is the all-important question of missions. Were the Indian bishops of the Established Church right when two years ago they deplored the non-effect of missionary effort on the educated native, except in the way of indirect influence? How is it that so many, educated in mission schools, remain heathens, or at most join the Brahmo-Somaj? Are we sufficiently alive to the fact that two kinds of missionaries are needed; that, whereas among the wild aboriginal tribes clever handicraftsmen (like those two Danes whom Mr. Routledge describes as church-building, road-making, standing between the people and their money-lenders) soon become powerful for good, it must be quite a different stamp of man to deal with the *pundits* of Benares or Poonah? It may be that we lost the opportunity of (humanly speaking) giving a great impulse to conversion when, at the close of the Mutiny, the Sikhs were said to have been ready with a very little encouragement to come over to Christianity in a body. All we can do now is to educate, and to trust in God's blessing on careful education. So long as the Christian schools keep up to the mark they will not want scholars.

Another great question is the influence and the prospects of the *Somaj*. Rammohun Roy's principle: "unity in essentials, variety in non-essentials, toleration in all" is so true if only his followers can be got to recognize what are really essentials. The high tone in so much of the Hindoo morality surely shows, as the old missionaries used to say, a basis of what the parable calls "the honest and good ground" which to fitting culture will yield forty, sixty, or a hundredfold. Those people cannot be wholly debased through whose chief fair (for such is the great yearly gathering at Juggernaut) an English lady may walk at nightfall without fear of seeing anything to offend.

Another question is the position of "Young Bengal:" does he "love brandy more than God?" was Keshub Chunder Sen justified in his sweeping charge against England of having brought drunkenness into native villages? Does the educated native care for nothing but superficiality to the total neglect of science and experiment? Is he morally untouched by what he learns, or are we (as Mr. Grant Duff says) actually making the native magistrate as unbribeable as the European? Again, as to the development of the country, are coal-mines at Raneegunge, and jute-mills on the Hooghly, things to be desired, or will they destroy the remaining handicrafts, even as our home cotton-mills long ago destroyed the chief native industry?

But there is no end to the questions which crop up, and to the variety of answers which will be given to them. The grand thing is to get information, trustworthy information; and the royal visit will surely furnish us with a larger stock than we have hitherto had of this valuable commodity. Every man or woman who, with open eyes and ears, spends some time in India, helps in after life to dispel some prejudice, to strengthen some one's hold on a fact, about our great dependency; and, though the Prince's following will have seen many things *couleur de rose*, most of them can scarcely have failed to learn much, for many of them have a keen eye, well trained not only to observe the external aspects of country and people, but to catch something of what lies below the surface. It will be for us in England to make a good use of what they teach us. We are awakening to our responsibilities; but there is still much to do, and from the nature of the work it cannot be done rapidly. The way in which this last famine was met shows that Government has made such a rapid advance in its recognition of duty as the world has surely never seen; to keep the conduct of the individual up to the same high level must be the work of home teachers. At home, at school, in the pulpit, the duty of dealing considerately with men of other races must be enforced on all who are likely to find their way to India. If "the Indian tour" becomes fashionable, we must not only pray but strive that travelling Englishmen may act worthily of their nation. "We that are strong must bear the infirmities of the weak" is not only St. Paul's lesson, it is taught by the life and conduct of every man who has been truly great in India. "Clemency Canning" is now valued as he ought to have

been. The kindliness of Lord Mayo, more even than his administrative ability, is his title to the esteem of those among whom he worked and died.

The same holds good of the old heroes. Sir Thomas Munro's first hint to a young civilian was, "never punish a lie." No reader of Munro's life can mistake this for indifference to truth. What he felt was that falsehood had become ground into the native character through having been for ages the only protection of the weak against intolerable oppression. The principle is of wide application; and to apply it discreetly, in a Christian spirit, must be the aim of everyone who would do his duty in India.

"Give the natives fair play; open to them judiciously the higher posts of Government; inquire frankly into the causes of discontent, and, as far as possible, remove them (there are such causes, or else emigration into native states would be a thing of the past); be not over eager for gain; strive to convince the natives that we do mean well, and that our rule is a blessing to them; let it no longer be said that everyone who goes to India, except a few missionaries, simply goes to make money." Such are some of the maxims which we should keep always before us. If the Prince's visit forces them more vividly on our remembrance, that visit will (despite the mistake about M. Rousselet's book) prove a blessing, not to himself only, but to the empire where he has been sojourning as well as to the nation which welcomes him back.

ART. VII.—*The Mother of Jesus Not the Papal Mary.* By EDWARD JEWITT ROBINSON. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 2, Castle-street, City-road, and sold at 66, Paternoster-row. 1875.

THE chief heresies that have in various ages infested the Christian Church are traceable to errors respecting the Person and Work of Christ. Where there has been loyalty to the central figure of Christianity, all others have retired into shadow, and, however illustrious in character and action, have served by posthumous renown as by lifelong testimony to exalt the Son of God. But where the true spirit and glory depart from Christianity or any section of it, the absoluteness of Christ's supremacy is compromised, and, although He be not actually dethroned, His sovereign rights are so parcelled out among subordinates that it is no marvel if His hands be bound by His people's unbelief, and He appear "astonied as a mighty man that cannot save." There are living men to be numbered by thousands who, while professing themselves His servants, glory in this spoliation of the dear-bought jewels of the Redeemer's crown, and in this illegal participation in His prerogatives as Head of the Church and of the race. In their arrogance they associate with themselves the most sacred of earthly names, as justifying by precept and example their assumed lordship over God's heritage and copartnership in the merits of Christ's redemption. But these sainted personages stand acquitted of all complicity in such transactions. Being dead, they yet speak from the pages of inspiration, and in tones so clear and so condemnatory of all who shall glory in any other than the Crucified, that the spread of the uncorrupted Word of God—the going forth of the sword of the Spirit—may well, like the sword of secular power, be a terror to these evil-doers.

Of all the names to be found in sacred story (we say nothing of the worshipping of angels), none have suffered worse indignity of adulation than those of the first and last Apostles, and of the mother of our Lord. Paul, in the fancy of rationalising dreamers, is exaggerated in his pro-

portions till he becomes the master-spirit of the New Testament and the real founder of Christianity. Compared with him the other members of the Apostolic band were mere obstructives, and Christ Himself but an amiable enthusiast, who would have been astonished at the meaning put by His disciple upon His own words and deeds. His differences with Peter are magnified into a serious schism, threatening the integrity of the infant Church; and in forgetfulness of Christ's oft-repeated claims to universal dominion, the prevalence of what are called Pauline views over those of the Judaising Christians is held to have determined the emergence of Christianity into a position of independence, and its entrance on a career of world-wide conquest.

The dishonour done to Peter and to Mary has arisen from the opposite quarter. Their features have been distorted by fumes from the smoking altars of superstition, not by fogs from the icy wastes of unbelief. Peter has been lifted up above his fellows and made the real ecclesiastical head of the Church. We do not speak of the contrast between the humble circumstances of the Fisherman and the wealth that has poured in a ceaseless stream into the coffers of his professed descendants, or between the simple utterance of Gospel truth which formed his only weapon and the arrogance which has not only sought to share the rights of temporal sovereigns but claimed the sole possession of them: our quarrel is with the spiritual usurpations effected in Peter's name. When Christ bestowed on him the gift of the keys, He is regarded as having thenceforth abdicated all His functions, royal, priestly, and prophetic. Christ only offered His sacrifice once: Peter, with his successors, repeats it millions of times. Christ could only speak the words the Father gave Him: Peter and his representatives both interpret these words as it pleases them and add others of equal or superior authority. Christ cannot promise the sons of Zebedee the places of honour coveted for them by their mother, because they are reserved for those to whom they shall be given by the Father: Peter and the humblest of his hierarchy open at pleasure the portals of bliss or the gates of woe, and with equal facility consign their fellow-sinners to perdition or dispense them from the penalties and even the obligations of the Law. With what holy scorn the Fisherman would have rejected

such pretensions, had they been thrust on him while yet in the flesh, may be inferred from the humility with which in his First Epistle, claiming no higher office than that of elder, he exhorts his fellow-elders to feed the flock of God, "not as lords over God's heritage, but as ensamples to the flock." Had he possessed prophetic foresight of the abominations to be perpetrated in his name, he could not have denounced them in more burning words than those employed in his Second Epistle to describe the character and doom of false teachers.

But it is Mary who has suffered most at the hands of these unfaithful guardians of the good deposit. Other saints have only been canonised: Mary has been deified. Other followers of Christ have only been supposed to exercise their traffic in the souls of men on earth, or, if in heaven, only as intercessors. Mary has carried on the profitable commerce in the heaven of heavens, and that not as a lowly suppliant but as an imperious favourite whose demands are not to be denied. She has suffered indignity in regard to her person, her history, and even her character. Other mortals, though their virtues and prerogatives may have been exaggerated, have not been raised above the ordinary conditions of our earthly life: the Virgin's conception, like her Son's, was immaculate, her life absolutely spotless, her death an assumption to a sovereignty not inferior to that of the Triune God. The main facts concerning Peter have not been disputed, and but few interpolations have been attempted: in the case of Mary the minutest details have been magnified into amazing prodigies and profound symbols, while the puerilities of apocryphal writers have been received as welcome supplements to the scanty records of the Gospels. But the deadliest blow has been dealt at her character. An official character has been ascribed to her of which not the slightest hint is afforded in the Scriptures; and in the supposed exercise of it her personal character has been degraded to the dust. We do not speak now of the unhallowed curiosity that has pried into those sacred secrets which her maiden modesty kept concealed. We speak of the kind of sympathy she is supposed to entertain for certain classes of her votaries, and the kind of help she is entreated to afford. Requests not for forgiveness of sin but for success in it, such as would never be presented to the Deity, are thought to meet with favour in her eyes be-

cause she is human and feminine; and the pander and the prostitute ply their infamous trade with more boldness because they have prayed to the Madonna. Nor is it to breaches of the Seventh Commandment only that she is supposed to extend her compassion: the lawless brigand and the hired assassin pay her tithes of their plunder or implore her guidance of the stiletto, as if she had been a Pagan Ashtoreth. Heaven itself is thus changed into the likeness of some voluptuous and venal court; and the representation of Giulia Farnese as the Madonna, and of Pope Alexander VI., the infamous Borgia, kneeling at her feet in the character of a votary, was, as a picture of Marian morals, true to the life. Surely, if sorrow can enter the realms of bliss, such profanity must be a sword in the heart of the Virgin as sharp as that which at the crucifixion pierced her through and through.

In the volume before us Mr. Robinson has undertaken the twofold task of exposing the blasphemies of Mariolatry and of presenting to us, in the place of a tawdry and hideous "image of jealousy," the fair portrait of the Virgin Mother, as she is depicted in the Gospels and as she should be enshrined in the regards of the faithful. It is obvious to remark that the former task was a much easier one than the latter. It is not very difficult to rub off the dust and grime of centuries from the *chef-d'œuvre* of some great master, but to retouch the figures that have well-nigh faded from the canvas, so as to restore the picture to its original freshness and glory, is proverbially impossible. Who now, we are ready to ask, as we contemplate the flaunting finery that bedizens some life-size idol, or listen to the blasphemous parodies of worship that are echoed from each Popish mass-house, who now will paint for us the Jewish maiden in the sweet simplicity of her Galilean home, and read to us with wise impartiality the lessons of her blest but chequered story, and teach us to join the triumph of her exultant hymn? Yet surely the theme is worthy, whether of painter or poet, of preacher or historian. Paul has not lost his hold upon us because of the undue homage of those who would hail him as the intellectual creator of Christendom; nor have the virtues and failings of Peter ceased to be a subject of alternate praise and blame on account of his undue exaltation as the head of the Roman hierarchy. Nay, we revere uninspired men, some of them not free from the very vice which we con-

demn: we have a niche in our hearts if not in our temples for Augustine and Chrysostom, for Athanasius and Cyril, for Bernard and Bonaventura, for Pascal and Fénelon, for Monica and Madame de Guyon. Why, then, should Mary be excluded from the Protestant calendar? Let us not in our rebound from fanatical adoration suffer her name to fall into oblivion, nor let us be restrained by suspicions of a leaning toward senseless error from pouring out a tribute of admiration and gratitude at the feet of the mother of our Lord.

Mr. Robinson has supplied a great want in the production of this volume. He has not been content to shatter the idol of the Romanist: he has filled the void created by its fall in the mind of the Protestant also, and given us a minute and life-like delineation of the first of New Testament saints. "In the former half of the work," the author tells us, "the mother of Jesus is portrayed as seen and heard in the New Testament. The latter part opens the romances from which Romanism picks and chooses to make and mend its goddess, traces the development of the 'heresy of the women' and the popes from the beginning, scrutinises the effigies before which the votaries of the Papal Mary bend and pray, shows how the Holy Bible is tortured to witness for her, exposes the mischievous and heathenish hypocrisy of her priestly knights in India, and calls attention to endeavours made to introduce her worship into the Church of England." Mr. Robinson has not judged from hearsay of the character and tendencies of Mariolatry. He has gone to the writings of the foremost champions of the Papacy. One end at least must be allowed to be answered by the institution of the *index expurgatorius*, viz. that we know what the Church of Rome regards as *not* heretical, as matter of permitted opinion if not of enjoined belief. Such men as Drs. Northcote, Ullathorne, Newman, Faber, and Melia are advocates not to be repudiated as upon occasion hysterical *stigmatistes* and fanatical *dévotes* of the Virgin may easily be. Their published volumes, printed in good English type and some of them written in good English style, and so far well adapted to inveigle the simple-minded into the snares from which the Reformation set us free, must be taken as legitimate exponents of Romish doctrine, and it is to them Mr. Robinson has resorted for illustrations of it. They show no tendency to recede in the

tide of superstition which, during Pius IX.'s primacy and greatly no doubt to his heart's content, has been rising higher and higher, as if it would never reach high water-mark. In dealing with their errors Mr. Robinson exhibits the temper of a fair and cautious controversialist: he neither takes nor gives advantage, but avoids the rhetorical flashes of indignation with which some Protestant writers would scathe opponents, in forgetfulness of the scriptural method of heaping coals of fire upon their heads. Let those from whom we dissent rival the arrogance of Papal fulminations by the energy with which they excommunicate heretics: they follow the example set them in high places, and the teachings of their own religious creed: let us who boast a purer faith be content to oppose the might of meekness to the fury of misguided zeal.

The workings of Romanism need to be studied, by any who would fully understand them, in the three aspects in which she presents herself to mankind. She should be seen in her own haunts, where full time and opportunity have been given her to develope her own principles: after all that has been written and is still being written about the past and present doings of Popery in such countries as Italy and Spain, our impression probably falls far short of the realities enacted behind the scenes and occasionally emerging into day. She should be seen in such countries as our own, where she comes into contact with a free people, healthy social institutions, and deep religious convictions; note should be taken of her seeming liberality, of her tone alternately submissive or confident as may best serve her turn, of her skill in holding the balance of parties, of her profuse almsgiving and attempts to gain the ear of the multitude and the heart of youth, in short of the perfect contrast between her trim garb here and her *deshabille* elsewhere, between the studied primness of her gait and features when she walks abroad and the fierce scowl that lights her visage when she keeps at home. Many have studied her in both these aspects, but there is a third not so well known, and here Mr. Robinson has the advantage. He has seen Popery in her foreign propaganda as she presents herself to the heathen world, where, unrestrained by ancient tradition or modern intelligence, she sacrifices everything to her lust of dominion, sanctioning the worst abominations of Paganism, assimilating as with a true instinct her own festivals to the vilest idolatrous cele-

brations, and replacing the poisoned cup of damnable error with the lethal draught of perverted truth,—and all in the name of Mary. Having been an eyewitness of the success with which Romish emissaries have forestalled the operations of the ambassadors of truth, and found his own efforts too frequently foiled by the indurating effect of her superstitions, Mr. Robinson has acquired convictions of the power of the Papacy deeper perhaps than ours who have not beheld her unchained might.

Skilful as is his treatment of the subject, and particularly his tracking of Romish teachers through the crooked paths of their exposition, we could have wished, for the purposes of edification, that controversy had not been permitted to encroach upon the chapters devoted to biography. Can we not study the character of a saint, we are ready to say, without being incessantly reminded of the calumnies that have been cast upon her name? Even if the controversy had been contemporary with her history,—and such controversy undoubtedly there was,—we should not think of reproducing it as a foil to set off excellences: why, then, should our memories of Bethlehem and Nazareth, and our musings on the flight into Egypt, be disturbed by the juxtaposition of idle Romish tales? Or why should such titles as "doll-goddess," "queen of heaven," &c., be employed by a Protestant writer, as if to make the Virgin responsible for the enormities practised in her name? Certainly, the titles are applied by our author to the imaginary phantom of the Romanists, but it is hard to dissociate them from the living Virgin Mary. Mindful of our own caution, we wish to follow the author to some of the scenes through which he conducts his readers, availing ourselves sometimes of his guidance, but taking our survey of the truth first, and then of the error which shrouds it.

The Annunciation is the occasion of Mary's introduction to the sacred story. Her name is first uttered for us from an angel's lips. His message, like all angelic messages, is brief but weighty. There is no unseemly adulation, no heaping up of titles: her virtues must have been many and great, or she would never have received the heavenly guest, but they are scarcely noticed in the narrative, less so even than those of Elisabeth her cousin. The salutation is given, the announcement made: the crisis of man's history has come, the purpose of Israel's separation waits to be fulfilled, the mystery of the ages is disclosed: the Christ is

to be born, and she must be His mother. His future dominion and glory are pictured in few but glowing words, and lo! the vision has departed, and Mary is left alone in her humble cottage, with her blessed secret and her deepened trust in God. But what a burden rested on her spirit from this hour! Well does our author, glancing at the meaning of her name, conjoin the bitterness with the blessedness of Mary:—

"She is well called Mary, in view of the bitterness from which her Son redeems mankind; and her personal history was in some respects a sea of bitterness. What bitterness to be unjustly suspected for a time by those who loved her, and whom she dearly loved! How bitter her humiliation when she found herself compelled to sojourn with the Divine Infant in a stable! What a bitter trial of affection and faith was nearly all the career of Jesus from the manger to the tomb! It was a bitter moment when Simeon said to her, 'This Child is set for a sign which shall be spoken against; yea, a sword shall pierce through thine own soul also!' Bitter to her was the outburst of Herod's wrath, compelling her hurried flight into Egypt. It was bitter in her own land to see the Lord 'despised and rejected' because 'the Son of Mary.' Bitterness to her spirit were all His sufferings and sorrows; and how bitterly was her heart riven when she beheld Him drooping and dying on the cross! Works of art and Romanist books represent her sorrows as seven: Simeon's prophecy, the flight to Egypt, the loss of the Child, the betrayal of Jesus, His crucifixion, His deposition from the cross, and His disappearance at Olivet.

"Her lot was not wholly bitter. Its very bitterness produced high happiness. She might in some respects have reversed for herself the speech of Elimelech's sorrowful widow, and said, 'Call me not Mara, call me Naomi.' If wanting in some manuscripts, yet the words attributed to Gabriel, 'Blessed art thou among women,' are true words, parallel with others in the Gospel narrative. They were afterwards spoken to Mary in Elizabeth's inspired address; and in subsequent passages she is called 'blessed.' The meaning is not that she is blessed in the sense in which we say, 'Blessed be God,' that is, praised and worshipped. Nor is this sentence so much a benediction as a felicitation. The feeling that invokes God's blessing may not be absent from it; but it is rather an exclamation of encouragement and congratulation,—Happiest of women thou! blessed above all others! According to Roman Catholics, her seven sorrows are balanced by seven joys: the annunciation, the visit to Elisabeth, the birth of Jesus, the adoration of the Magi, the presentation in the

temple, the finding of her lost Son, and her assumption to glory.

"In two senses she was blessed. First, as a mother. . . . Her happiness as a mother realised the ambition of the most noble women in Israel, and in this respect was the greater, because totally unexpected. If ever true of any, the words were true in her case, 'She remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world;' for she had learnt from Gabriel that her child would be the Man of men. As she should watch Him with a mother's heart, all the growth and progress before her eyes of the Promised of God and the Expected of Israel would bring her increasing blessedness. Was she not superior even to Eve, who was so named 'because she was the mother of all living'? The mother of all living had killed her offspring in their birth, becoming the parent of a race 'dead in trespasses and sins.' The Church has too fondly loved to spell the word *Ave* backwards, and call Mary the true Eva, the mother of 'Our Life,' the Life that our first parents banished. The greatness of her forefathers Abraham and David had not been their wisdom, wealth, and power, but the fact that they were chief ancestors of Christ. Such was Mary's blessedness. She was the Messiah's mother. The Divine Child was her own. . . . The majesty of the Tetrarch and the Emperor was dust on her Offspring's footstool. 'Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women.'

"The second sense in which Mary was blessed was, that she was a true believer. But for this, the honour of being the Lord's mother would have availed nothing. In her maternal blessedness she ministered as a ready instrument to the world's salvation: in the blessedness of faith, as a principal agent, she found her own. . . . God in His sovereign action, uses fit instruments and agents. . . . He regarded her, and endued her with every qualification, who gives beauty and fragrance to the flower in the forest, and whose gracious eye rests on the diamond in the mountain and the pearl in the sea. He who has ever raised up saints and heroes, women as well as men, as He has allowed the ages to require them, . . . Miriam to watch and serve her brother, and sing Jehovah's triumphs; Deborah to stir up Barak, and defeat the army of Jabin; Naomi to fetch from a sea of tears the pearl of Moab; Ruth to be a precious link in the providential chain of the world's salvation; Hannah to ask Samuel from the Lord and give him back to His service; . . . the God of sovereign grace elected Mary to her peerless distinction as the mother and guardian of the Redeemer of the world."

The visit of Mary to Elisabeth is remarkable as the occasion of the utterance of her immortal song,—shall we

not say, the first Christian hymn? The salutation of Elisabeth has corroborated the angel's testimony to herself, and the secret she has kept so close has already, by the same celestial visitant, been made known. Now, for the first time since the annunciation, her mouth is opened, and her emotions flow in song. The terse and vigorous language, the character of the symbols, and the parallelism of the sentences, carry us back at once to the strains poured forth by Israel's prophets in the heroic ages,—the songs of Moses, of Deborah, of Hannah, and, of course, of David himself. To say it was a reminiscence of them is truth, no doubt; but it is not the whole truth. The same afflatus inspired them all, and that not the vulgar poetic sensibility, which usurps the name, but the breath of the Divine Spirit who in the ages of inspiration evoked from the human heart so many matchless melodies. The hymn of the Virgin betrays, if we may so speak, the originality of inspiration. The personal element is, at the beginning, strongly marked; the words bring before us the songstress herself, and her relation to God,—"My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." A deep appreciation of the honour put upon her is then expressed, and her conviction of the eternal issues connected with the crisis that nears its consummation,—"For He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty hath done to me great things, and holy is His name." From this point the personal experience seems to be lost sight of, or to be merged in the general interests of the kingdom of God, of which her Son is to be Head. All histories and all dispensations are summed up, and the meaning of their mighty revolutions expounded, in the closing verses of this hallowed song. It is the triumph of righteousness, long delayed but now made sure for ever, that is celebrated here, not without some exultation that Israel, though brought low, should be the chosen channel of this mercy to mankind.

Strengthened and refreshed in spirit by communion with Zacharias and Elisabeth, the Virgin returns to Nazareth, to encounter a sorer trial than the sorrows of maternity, viz., the reproach of having to bear them, being a virgin. Her other kindred had not the faith of Elisabeth, nor had they had such revelations from on high. By Mary, a

student of ancient prophecy, the question of the seer might in such circumstances be repeated, with deep feeling, "Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" Even Joseph, her best friend, was ready to indulge misgivings. But, as our author beautifully says:—

"Providence and prophecy are angels in the path of Mary, and speak in turn as they guard and direct her course. God's special care of her is shown in the dispersion of the doubts of Joseph, whose continued friendship was of great importance. The saving of her character was a blessing; but for more than that her heavenly Father linked her to the carpenter. She would need an intimate human adviser, protector, and guide in many trying and painful circumstances, as on the occasion of her flight into Egypt, and during her sojourn in that idolatrous country. The reputation of her Offspring would be secured, people being enabled to speak of Him as 'the son of Joseph;' and the Holy Child would be watched over and educated in a loving and godly home. Providence had betrothed the Virgin to 'a just man,' honourable, thoughtful, and devoted,—qualified in every way to have charge of her and her Son; and now, when it seemed an impossibility, but was a necessity, their marriage was divinely brought about. By the grace of God, Joseph was kept from being precipitate, and infinite wisdom came to his help. Tempted to call Mary a dreamer or worse, at last, like Joseph of the Old Testament, he was himself taught in a dream. . . . To the Virgin it would be equivalent to God's saying again every word He had spoken by the angel to herself and Zacharias, and by the Holy Ghost to the mother of John the Baptist. Thus her faith was perfected."

Other providential circumstances concurring to mark out her Son as the promised Deliverer, are dwelt upon at length by our author, such as His birth at the time and place indicated in ancient prophecy,—the time, before the sceptre should depart from Judah, as promised by the mouth of Jacob,—and the place, at Bethlehem, as predicted by Micah. The exigencies of the Asmonean dynasty, and of the Roman empire, conspire to produce both results. But these, as pertaining rather to the history of Christ than of Mary, we may pass over: suffice it that, at great cost of suffering to herself, she became a willing and perhaps even unconscious co-operator with Providence in bringing them to pass, and that in after years, when His presumed Nazarene origin seemed to bar her Son's claim

to the Messiahship, she possessed the key to this mystery, and, instructed by her former experiences, had patience to wait till God should bid her disclose it. The season of the year, however, for which these words are written forbids us to pass over in silence all the accessories of the Nativity. The shepherds, and the angels, and the magi,—even without our Christmas carols, could we forget such witnesses as these? Rude as Mary's accommodation is, and churlish as has been the hospitality received from fellow-members of the lineage of David, there are few that, when her situation is known, will not respect her privacy. What means, then, this sudden incursion of strangers at dead of night? "A company enter with faces of excitement and expectation, go at once to the manger, and stand about it, gazing upon the Child. Breathing quick and loud, after their hasty journey, they have, at first, nothing to say, except in the meaning looks they cast at one another. The angel's voice seems to be heard again, 'Fear not, Mary!' It is evident, from the aspect of these disturbers, that they have not come for any evil purpose. They are neither robbers, nor strangers in Bethlehem, but shepherds of the place, fresh from their booths and flocks." They tell of a visit from the skies, an earthward pilgrimage of the celestial hosts. "There was no deception. More than one shepherd had beheld and heard the bright angel; and he was not long the only one seen and heard. When their glorious chief had delivered his message, 'a multitude of the heavenly host' surrounded him suddenly, singing Jehovah's praises. For a birth to be *foretold* by a celestial messenger, was not a new thing. The promise of the Baptist's birth was not the only other instance of an angel's announcing that a child should be born. The birth of Ishmael was promised by an angel, that of Isaac, and that of Samson. But when was it known that angels appeared *afterwards* to welcome a child's birth? Never till now. There had never been such an Infant. To the rejoicing angels themselves the Nativity was a new revelation." Never till now, we may add, had heaven opened its gates so wide; never till now had a vast company of spiritual intelligences made the welfare of mankind their theme, and made mankind for ever partners in their song.

The mission of the Magi stands in bold contrast with the visit of the shepherds. These came from the humbler ranks of life, those, as witnessed by their presents, from its

highest grades; these were Hebrews of the Hebrews, those, strangers from the ends of the earth. The latter were sped on their way by angel's voices, the former, led at first by gleaming meteor light were afterwards directed with no good purpose by the bloodthirsty Herod and those other enemies of the spiritual kingdom—for once confederate with him—the chief priests and scribes. But, diverse as might be their speech, and race, and garb, the spirit of both companies was one: it was that of reverent awe and simple faith and grateful praise. Their coming prefigured the blending of Jew and Gentile in the Church of Christ, and the universality and power of His kingdom. Their testimonies also cheered and strengthened the Virgin mother's heart.

The Purification in the Temple brings us again more immediately into the line of Mary's experience. Itself an act of obedience, it brought additional rewards to the faith from which it sprang, as all true obedience will do. The testimonies of Simeon and Anna are as welcome as they are unexpected. They give prominence to the spirituality and universality of the kingdom, and must have put new meaning into the twofold rite the happy parents came to perform. So far, indeed, barring some inconveniences, their progress resembles a procession through triumphal arches, each emblazoned with celestial glory and radiant with some new and wonderful device. But here a note is struck, a symbol is exhibited, strangely at variance with all that has gone before. The bitterness has, as yet, been withheld from Mary; at least, no hint has been given from above. But now the humiliation of Christ is predicted, and with it the humiliation of His mother.

"When Simeon checked himself in his exulting words, blessed the holy family, and addressed the Virgin personally, her wonder could not surpass her disappointment. She had indulged the hope that, when her son should be revealed as the Lord's Anointed, all Israel would rally to His standard. The inspired old man blots the beautiful picture, saying, 'This Child is set for a sign which shall be spoken against, an example that shall be scorned, a butt for calumny and malice, a mark for the arrow, a proof and token to be refused, an ensign to be resisted and rejected.' A reality of bitter mystery is portrayed. Wonder of wonders! The Fount of Happiness will have a career of misery; the King of Heaven will accept a crown of thorns; the God of Glory will glory in human shame; the Lord of Life will be the

prey of hunger and thirst, weariness and pain, death and the grave. . . . Echoing, and in part explaining, words of the Old Testament, Simeon's language throws a flood of light on ancient prophecy for thoughtful Mary. Night is retiring; but the morning uncovers a disastrous and tempestuous day.

"The disappointment with which, through Simeon, the Virgin was chastened in the temple of her heavenly Father respected also herself; for she had trembled in the hope of being exalted in the sunshine of Christ's royal glory. When the venerable saint spoke of the Child as doomed to encounter opposition and suffering, he touched the mother's heart. We may suppose that, as the ominous words broke from his lips, she put her hands forth to take back to the shelter of her bosom her precious Babe, and that her look of alarm and concern suddenly drew the prophetic speaker's attention to her own future of acute distress. Pausing in his sentence concerning Jesus, he said to her, in probably a lower and a nearer voice, with an abrupt communicativeness, needful, no doubt, but almost cruel as the sharp steel, 'Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also. Thou too wilt smart with pungent sorrow. Not sharing in the saving merit of thy Son at all, thou wilt have the painful blessedness of participating in His human sufferings and conflicts. The envenomed dart that falls on Him will strike thy soul. Thou mayest adopt the Psalmist's woeful cry, As with a sword in my bones, mine enemies reproach me, while they say daily unto me, Where is thy God?'"

The immediate effect of this prophecy of sorrow we do not know, but it cannot have been without a sobering and beneficial influence on Mary's mind. There is a philosophy that bids us turn our ignorance of the future to the account of present joy, but it is of the school that teaches, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Certainly, if knowledge of future sorrow means anything but preparation for victory over it, such philosophy would be very good: as it is, it is fit only for those who, unlike Mary, expect no future of glory and reward—and even for them it is full of peril. But for members of the militant Church, whose faith and hope are in God, it is well that the trumpet's summons should precede the battle. Mary is not alone in being thus gifted with foresight of the future: her Son, of course, possessed it to the full; and so necessary did He deem the realisation of the future as an equipment for great conflict, that before His departure He drew aside the veil from Peter's vision, "signifying what death he should die," and after His ascension

stooped from His throne to show Saul of Tarsus "how great things he must suffer for My name's sake." The pang that shot through Mary's heart tended to moderate her expectations, and to drive off those thoughts of worldly glory which would again and again steal in: the memory of it in after years strengthened her, when all men forsook Him, to stand by the cross of our Lord.

The first stroke of the many that should come upon her was about to fall. The visit of the Magi, which for convenience we have treated of before its time, was followed by a strange reverse of fortune. Their coming was the innocent provocative of Herod's wrath. The parents, warned by God to save the life entrusted to them, flee. Egypt, the place of Israel's ancient bondage, is their refuge, as it has often been for fugitives from Israel's coasts. The Child that is to have dominion over all the earth, though born in obscurity, is already persecuted for His pretensions, and becomes an exile from His native land. But the same Providence that bade them flee, and found them in the presents of the Magi the means of performing their journey, at the set time brought them back from their wanderings, and thus fulfilled the ancient oracle, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son." The place of abode was fixed by the same wisdom: Bethlehem would have seemed the only possible choice, if Christ was to be known as the Son of David; but the shelter of Nazareth's obscurity was preferred to the birthplace of kings. From its shades scarcely a ray emerges to show how faith developed in the maiden mother, or how the consciousness of Messianic dignity first dawned upon the Holy Child. For the latter we do well to respect the reserve of the Scriptures, and in the case of the former also we have no need to fill the void with imaginations of our own. The attempts made in both directions to be wise above that which is written are sufficiently humbling to discourage imitation.

One solitary ray does fall upon the mutual relations of mother and Child: it reveals both figures at the critical period at which infancy passes into youth, and at which, according to Jewish custom, the hitherto irresponsible child became a "son of the law." It is not in Galilee, however, but in Jerusalem, that the scene is laid. In some of its features the incident is characteristic enough: in others, till we examine them, it creates surprise that

borders on dismay. Christ a lost child suggests at first negligence in the parents: when that fear is dissipated, it gives place to the idea of disobedience in the son. The parents, journeying homeward from the feast, were in the path of duty: their supposition that He was "in the company" shows the freedom of His early life, as well as the confidence reposed in His discretion. When they miss Him from their side, the return and the search and the eagerness display the true parental instinct. The reproach also on His discovery seems a most natural feature of the story. But now let us hear the reply. Christ's words must guide us even in our estimation of the motives of His mother. "How is it," He says, "that ye sought me: wist ye not . . . ?" The rebuke—with infinite sweetness, no doubt, but yet with something of severity too—is retorted on its author. It is not the search that is reproved, but the spirit of alarm in which it was conducted. It must be allowed that Mary's question was not answered. Granting the temple was the place to find Him, why had He left her without leave? We cannot think Christ's silence was intended as an assertion of His independence: that would be inconsistent with the sequel. We regard both the deed and the word as teaching His earthly guardian a necessary lesson. The disappearance was not without a purpose; the seeming irony did not mock His mother's grief. He must have seen in Mary some sign of unbelief, some evidence of worldliness of which He could not speak, and by an action painful for the moment—made more painful, however, by this very want of faith—He, the good Physician now first exercising His art, probed her wound and healed it.

Much the same account must be given of the reply of Jesus to His mother at the wedding-feast in Cana, and of His answer to the message sent from her and His brethren during His ministry at Capernaum. In the scene at Cana we have the first of His works of mercy, as in the Sermon on the Mount we have the first of His words of grace. Not that Christ had never before performed any miracles: the suggestion of Mary seems to imply that He had been accustomed to exert His omnipotence, and that even at her instance: so much at least may be not improbably conjectured, both from her own brief sentence and the construction He puts upon it. But this was the first miracle after the selection of Peter and John, Andrew,

Philip, and Nathanael, as His more immediate followers, the first miracle therefore after His assumption of the Messiahship. It was time that His official independence of every creature, even the most nearly allied and the most tenderly endeared to Him, should be proclaimed. And with one word he sundered the last earthly tie that kept Him from full consecration to His mission. That word had not the harshness conveyed by the authorised version. The title "woman" now bestowed on Mary was not necessarily cold and distant, however it may seem to bar familiarity: and the following words were not so abrupt as they seem. But the meaning is plainly apparent, —"What is there common to thee and to me in reference to this business? That which I do, I do not in virtue of the nature I received from thee, but in virtue of my underived and everlasting Godhead: henceforth it is not for thee to know, much less to prescribe, the times and seasons of my working: my hour, the hour of my manifestation to Israel, is determined for me by my Father's will, and it is not yet come."

We may acquit the Virgin in this instance of undue familiarity or ill-timed presumption: it was natural that she should expect maternal influence would count for something upon an occasion like this, and no doubt the intimation that henceforth it must be in abeyance was received by her in a spirit of meekness, as becoming as that with which she first welcomed the honour announced by the messenger of light. But it is hard to avoid the conclusion that in the interference at a later period with her Son's ministry at Capernaum she had forgotten the lesson. After all allowance has been made on the score of fears for Christ's personal safety and of pressure put upon her by His unbelieving brethren, we cannot but feel that we trace here some falling off from that noble spirit which breathes throughout the Virgin Mary's hymn. Inspired as it was by the Holy Ghost, that jubilant strain will bear a rigidly spiritual interpretation: the means by which the victory should be achieved were not, however, then revealed. Now that these began to be unfolded, and that the dreams of temporal sovereignty which mingled with her holier aspirations faded away before the humbler characteristics of Christ's mission, her confidence was shaken: no spiritual interpretation can be put upon the line of conduct she pursued. But doubtless the words of her Son, uttered

with a heavenly dignity that could not but remind her of the feast at Cana and the finding in the temple, brought down her spirit again into the dust. When she "pondered these things," she would see that she must become her Son's disciple, by seeking to share His meekness, obedience and poverty of spirit; and she too being made willing to "hear the word of God and do it" would regain the place almost forfeited by her parley with unbelief, and enter into relations with Him deeper than any she had yet sustained, and exceeding in tenderness and durability those of "mother and sister and brother."

Hence her steadfastness at the cross. The interval was crowded with the marvellous events of Christ's ministry, but the name of Mary is not mentioned. The scene shifts from Galilee to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to Galilee again: all sorts of figures pass before our eyes, yet we catch no glimpse of the Virgin. But, whether able to accompany Jesus on His incessant journeyings or not, she was no idle and uninterested observer of His career. Taught a wise reticence, she nevertheless watched with palpitating eagerness His advancement to a position from which he riveted the gaze of all Israel, and commanded even from His enemies the acknowledgments due to His unprecedented fame: she watched also with keen solicitude the darkening of the horizon, and the gathering of the storm-clouds that were about to burst upon His head. Hope predominated over fear, and the remembrance of the "prophecies which went before" strengthened her to accompany her Son on that last ascent to Jerusalem which seemed by its very daring to augur some new manifestation that should overwhelm His foes. Such a manifestation did take place, but in how different a form from that which she expected! That He should conquer by submission and triumph through defeat was farthest from her thoughts, as it was from the thoughts of the most spiritual of His followers. One by one the opportunities for declaring Himself were allowed to pass unimproved, and one by one her hopes expired, until she beheld Him whom she had received from heaven as mankind's Deliverer suffering like an ordinary mortal the agonies of death. Yet her faith, like that of the other women and of the beloved apostle, did not sink under this awful trial. That little company of which she was the centre, standing afar off and "beholding these things," alone of all the

multitude, comprehended in some degree their vast significance. They saw in this lifting up between heaven and earth of the true Mediator between both, something more than the frustration of the last hope of their nationality: they saw what seemed to be the extinction of the last hope of salvation for the race, the failure of prophecy, the abandonment by Jehovah Himself of His rebellious creatures as no longer fit objects of compassion since they had cast out His last, best Messenger of love. Nay, there is even greater mystery still. He who had been again and again proclaimed the Well-beloved by voices sent from heaven, now confesses Himself forsaken of the Father whose will He had perfectly obeyed. Is there to be no solution of the mystery? Will her Son pass away from before her eyes without one parting token to assuage her unspeakable grief?

"His dearest apostle and the weak strong women are not content to observe Him from a distance through their tears; and the mockery of the mob having worn itself to a calm, and the crowd become more open and scattered, His cross can be approached with comparative safety and ease. Alas! He has not avoided the shameful tree. There, between heaven and earth, hangs His precious form. But nearer; for they must see His features and hear His words. The might of affection refuses the fetters of fear. John leads and is led by the Mary. Each prompts and encourages the rest. . . .

"Mary and her companions 'stood by the cross.' The word implies that, before Jesus spoke to her, she had been some minutes there. Statue-like she gazed upon Him. Accustomed to command her spirit, she did not fall to the ground beneath her unprecedented burden of grief. The air was not rent with her cries. A check upon her in this regard was the nearness of her Son's enemies. John and the women had perhaps told one another what reason there was that they should be self-controlled. Not a syllable escaped her lips. Had she once spoken, the flood would have been let loose. Her strength as well as her safety was to be still. And silence on her part was but for her crucified Son. She would not add to His torment by exciting Him to any gesture of surprise or affection; and she had learnt to defer to His wisdom. He knew when and why and how to suffer. If the shield of this faith, which she had often triumphantly worn, now trembled upon her arm, yet she heroically 'stood by the cross,' and eventually would be strong again in the Lord. He must die, it appeared; but He might first chance to bless her with a look, and enrich her with a parting word. The eyes of the sobbing widow and her expiring All did meet. Her ears did drink again

the nectar of His voice. As He turned a meaning glance on John, He said to her, 'Woman, behold thy Son!' What strong currents of thought now disturbed her deep heart? The words told her to give up hope. He verily was resigned to die. She would have Him with her no longer. His late sayings, which she had solemnly pondered, and now more clearly understood, were literally come to pass. Already delivered into the hands of the Gentiles, and lifted up on the tree, He would next, as He had foretold, be laid in the tomb. Was it for this that, fleeing by command of God into Egypt, she had saved her Son from the purple murderer? Wherefore had heaven and earth saluted her as blessed among women? Who so unhappy as she? Let her at least stay and see her Beloved die! Let her die with Him! No, 'Woman, behold thy Son,' He said to her: and to the dear disciple, 'Behold thy mother.' It was an adieu. She must not think of remaining to the end. It would but add to her grief, and increase His sufferings. Comprehending His command, and wont to obey His will, while John lent her his aid, and God supported her, she dutifully withdrew."

Sadly she joined with Nicodemus and the rest of her companions in caring for the sacred tabernacle from which the Lord of Life had departed. But a blessed surprise was preparing. All that had come to pass had been predicted, though with strange blindness she in common with His other followers had not realised the literal sense in which the words were uttered. But other words had been spoken, concerning a rising from the grave as well as a going down to it. That such a thing was not impossible with God, had been shown by what had taken place many times over at her Son's bidding, and Lazarus himself was there to prove it. Yet the idea of a resurrection seems to have been lost in the gloom that enshrouded Calvary. To the exultant enemies it afforded grounds for fear, but to the weeping friends it offered none for hope. He did not come down from the cross at the challenge of those who mocked Him: would He come back from the tomb at the petition of those who mourned for Him? It was with no such thought that Mary proceeded to the sepulchre on the morning of the third day: her purpose was to embalm the corpse, not to watch for its predicted resurrection. But the costly preparations were needless: Jesus no longer lay in the embrace of the tomb. That was the morning of Mary's deliverance, and of the deliverance of mankind. Henceforth her tears were wiped away. Cheerfully she could consent to go before Him into Galilee, and when she

saw Him on the mountain, we may well believe she was not one of those who, for a moment, doubted. Cheerfully also she followed Him, in thought if not in person, to that other mountain, and saw the spectacle or heard the report of His ascension. Her next and last appearance in the sacred story is in the upper room at Jerusalem, where with the band of holy wrestlers who first prayed in the name of Jesus, she awaited the descent of the Comforter. Surely, if Mary's heart had received the deepest wound, there must have been poured into it the richest consolations. Every word of God spoken by His prophets of old or by His angels in these latter days, had been made good. Her Son had entered into His kingdom, and had begun to triumph over His foes; rightly had the angel bidden her call Him Jesus, for He had already saved His people from their sins. Well may the sacred historians permit her name henceforth to disappear from their pages: her warfare is accomplished: she has received from heaven the Great Deliverer, and given Him back to it: henceforth let her wait in the home provided by her Son's affection, till she enters into the joy of her Lord.

From our musings on the Virgin Mary, as portrayed in Scripture, we must turn to the erroneous opinions entertained of her subsequently to the age of inspiration. Let us first follow up our sketch of the Virgin's real history by a view of the manner in which the narrative has been distorted to suit the prejudices of men. The ridiculous fables that crowd the pages of the Apocryphal gospels we may pass by. They are chiefly occupied with descriptions of those portions of the life both of the mother and the Child which are not represented in the Gospels, particularly the infancy of each. They are full of anachronisms, and display gross ignorance of the geography of the Holy Land, as well as of the manners and customs of the Jews. The discrepancies of the veritable Gospels are such as we might expect to occur in the writings of independent eyewitnesses, who do not always distinguish different but similar scenes, or the different parts of the same scene according to strict chronological order: the effect even of the most insoluble of them is not to mar the naturalness of the Gospel story. Far otherwise is it with the spurious gospels. Had their design been to bring the whole history into contempt, they could not have indulged in grosser buffoonery, or more outrageous caricature. Their obtaining credence for a

moment with the most unlettered Christians seems to pass the limits of possibility: if they did, it was only in an age in which the predicted apostasy had strongly set in. Modern critics, with their fastidious sense of historical veracity, have never, however sceptical their leanings, so far forgotten themselves as to cite these travesties of scripture-teaching as specimens of the myth-producing genius of the times. Disingenuously, however, they have kept back the evidence their existence furnishes to the other side of the question. Here, the Christian apologist may boldly say, we see what the human mind produced, even with the gospel narrative before it, when left to workings of its own unbridled imagination. The Papal Church, as Mr. Robinson says, boasts of never having given the apocryphal gospels her official sanction; but she has culled from them in her service-books, and is indebted to them for some of her most honoured saints. We cannot persuade ourselves to transcribe any of these childish, and worse than childish, inventions. Mr. Robinson has performed the ungracious task of collecting the more remarkable of them, and they will serve the purpose of placing in a strong light the baseness of those Romish impostors who, while disavowing these worthless documents, frame their dogmas in the same spirit, and found claims to canonisation for their saints on the occurrence of their names in such pages.

Coming to the Scriptures themselves, we find Marian perverters busy with the first scene in which the Virgin appears, the Annunciation. Her very name has been put upon the rack, and made to yield titles of glory, such as "The Exalted," "She who Enlightens," "Star of the Ocean," and "Lady of the Sea." The statement of her virginity is made identical with a vow to abide in that condition, and the marriage with Joseph is explained, in accordance with the spurious gospels, as the appointment of a guardian to her chastity.

"Two expressions in the narrative are tortured to support the dogma that Mary was exempt from original sin. The first is the word translated 'highly favoured,' or, in the margin, 'graciously accepted' or 'much graced' (κεχαριτωμένη). It is pretended that this is an improper translation: the translation Romanism prefers is 'full of grace.' They and we do not translate from the same page. The Protestant translation is from the original: the Romanist is a translation of a translation. That ours is correct

appears from the repetition by Gabriel, 'Thou hast found favour with God' (εὗρες χάριν). It is evident, also, from a passage in the writings of St. Paul—'He hath made us accepted in the Beloved;' not, He hath caused us to be immaculately conceived, but, He hath accepted us with grace or favour (ἐχαρίτωσεν). Our Lord Jesus is 'full of grace' (πλήρης χάριτος); but it is in other words, not in the words 'full of grace,' that the Scriptures testify that He was without any kind of sin; for those words are used also of Stephen. Was Stephen of sinless origin and heart? If, therefore, the words 'full of grace' were in the saying of Gabriel, they would not prove that Mary was a sinless creature. But the words so signifying are not in the original text: in the original text there is one word, and the translation of it in the authorised version is careful and correct. 'Full of grace' may not be a bad interpretation, but it is a free rendering, and the inference Romanists draw from it is allegorical, inconsistent, violent and untrue. . . .

"The other words perverted into a statement that Mary was without stain of original sin are these—'Blessed art thou among women.' 'That is, farther removed from the curse art thou than all women.' (Ullathorne). If the sentence has this meaning, it cannot be true; for others are also said to be blessed among women. There would be at least three further removed from the curse than all women, which is absurd. Was Jael, who hammered the nail into Sisera's temples, free from original sin? Deborah sang, 'Blessed above women shall Jael be.' Was Judith, who cut off the head of Holofernes, immaculate from birth? Romanists must so regard her if they allow the interpretation given by one of their bishops to be correct, for Ozias said to her, 'Blessed art thou, O daughter, by the Lord the most high God, above all women of the earth.' The words addressed to Mary were, 'Blessed art thou among,' not, at infinite distance from, 'women.'"

Mary's lowly submission to the good pleasure of the Most High has been blasphemously misrepresented, as if, to use the words of the same Romish bishop, "upon her will, at that moment, the coming of our salvation depended." The salutation of Gabriel has also been converted into a prayer to the Virgin, and the "Hail, Mary" takes rank with with the "Our Father" taught by Christ Himself. But the "Hail, Mary" of the Papists is not identical with the salutation of the angel. As repeated by the Romanists, it runs, "Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and in the hour of death. Amen." Concern-

ing it, a Roman Catechism confesses, "Part are the words of the Archangel Gabriel, part of St. Elisabeth, and part of the Church."

The visit to Elisabeth affords fresh matter for glorification of Mary. Her cousin's salutation is a repetition of the angel's. The humility of Elisabeth in the presence of the mother of the Lord sinks into servile worship of a fellow-creature: the leaping of the babe in her womb signifies that John was then and thenceforward sanctified to his mission. The psalm in which the Virgin speaks of being raised from her low estate and of rejoicing in God her Saviour, is a "hymn to the grace of the Immaculate Conception," and the words "all generations shall call me blessed" are a prediction of that idolatry which her whole soul would have abhorred.

At the Nativity, strange marvels are invented by the apocryphal gospels, as if the simple majesty of the inspired record could not be trusted to make its own impression on mankind. In the true Gospels, the angels send the shepherds: in the false, they come themselves. In the true, the Babe is wrapped in swaddling-clothes and laid in the manger: in the false, He stands upon His feet and receives the angels' homage. In the true, a star guides the Magi, and when they no longer need it, disappears: in the false, it shines from evening to morning over the cave, and "one so great had never been seen from the beginning of the world," while the sun, "as seen at Rome, had round it a golden circle, in which was a beautiful maiden with a child in her lap."

Whenever the veil is lifted from the relations between the mature Christ and the blessed Virgin, the difficulties of the Romanists increase. Those relations are wholly inconsistent with the idea of her having any share in Christ's sinlessness, or in the business He came to do. She works no miracle, she utters no oracle: she receives no homage, she obtains no favour because she is the mother of our Lord. There is some discussion as to who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven, but Christ points to a little child as the pattern for all who should aspire to such an honour, and makes no mention of His mother. There is some rivalry as to the possession of places at His right and left hand: Christ assigns neither of them to her whom Papists call the Queen of Heaven. There is mention made of intercession, but it is His own,

not Mary's; and prayer is to be offered in His name, not in hers. He speaks of vicarious suffering, but He does not call her to share it: the sword that pierces His soul is the sacrificial knife that slays the appointed Victim, but the sword that pierces hers brings only personal sorrow, sharpened perhaps somewhat by the sense of personal sin.

We have already seen how, at the wedding in Cana, our Lord asserted His independence. It is not strange that Romanists should strive to convert the expression of distant respect which He employed in doing so into a title of majesty, or that they should contrive to extort from the brief elliptical sentence He addressed to Mary a confession of her partnership in His prerogatives. In endeavouring to accomplish these objects, they avail themselves of the unfortunate mistranslation by the Vulgate of Gen. iii., 15. "She shall crush" (*ipsa conteret*) is the accepted rendering, and it is meant to be implied that the prophecy was not of Christ but of Mary, not of the Lord but of the woman who, as the true Eve, was to be "the mother of all living." Mr. Robinson thus exposes this strained interpretation and sophistical identification of Mary with Eve:—

"'Jesus saith unto her, Woman.' Considered apart from circumstances, there was nothing in this appellation for the noblest or meanest to resent. To the Jewish ear or the Roman, it often conveyed the impression of friendly courtesy and solicitude. Instances are on record in which maids so spoke to their mistresses; and even queens were so addressed. After our Lord's resurrection, He used the word with tenderness to Magdalene. Not satisfied with this explanation, Romanists contend that when spoken of Mary it meant immeasurably more than when applied to others in the Scriptures. 'This expression, used by Jesus Christ in speaking of His mother, is more calculated to show what she really was, the *woman* foretold from the beginning of the world, who had come to crush the serpent's head; the woman who, as a new Eve, had with the new Adam to contribute to the restoration of mankind, the woman autonomastically called *the woman*, the type of womanly perfection, the powerful *woman*, the great *woman*, who had to repair the damage caused by the fallen woman; the summary of all the estimable qualities of her sex; [so inclined to piety, so sensitive to the miseries of others, so solicitous and zealous to intercede for all the needy and afflicted.' (Melia.) With grains of truth, what a mass of assumption and misrepresentation have we here! It was not the work of the woman to

bruise the serpent's head, but of her Divine head; not her office, but exclusively and entirely that of the new Adam to redeem mankind; not she, but Christ, who was the 'Desire of all nations,' and of whom the song was raised, 'Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord'; not Mary in whom men rise, as it was not Eve in whom they fell, 'for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive'; not the wife of Joseph, but 'the man Christ Jesus,' who is the 'one Mediator between God and men,' and 'ever liveth to make intercession for' them.

"As His answer proceeded, it was replete with discouragement and reprehension. Romanists complain that 'Protestants have translated the words, What have I to do with thee?" (Northcote.) In the article 'Catholic Versions of Scripture' (*Dublin Review*, vol. ii., April 1837, p. 487,) it is said that the translation of the words in St. John ii. 4, 'What is it to thee and to me, woman?' is erroneous, and that the accurate reading of the words is this, 'What have I to do with thee?" He who with seeming candour makes this admission nevertheless presents the following interpretation: 'The expression used by Jesus Christ meant only, in our opinion, *Is this my business, or thine? the supplying of wine is not our business.* And He said so to show that the miracle which He would work should not be considered wrought for the sake of the bridegroom, but only for the sake and on consideration of His mother, who desired it. What a new evidence of Christ's condescension towards His mother!' (Melia.) New or old, it is much like the meaning suggested in the Romanist rendering rejected by Romanists, 'What is it to me and to thee, woman?' 'The supplying of wine is not our business,' Jesus is made to say, but the supplying of wine towards the close of the feast, in condescension to whosoever, was *His* business, which none else could do, and He was about to act accordingly. The writer first quoted in this paragraph, opposed to the common Romanist translation, is now with and now against his versatile fellow-Marian quoted last. 'Observe, not, what is *it* to me and to thee?' as it has unfortunately been of late years misprinted in some of our Bibles, but only, 'What is to me and to thee?' (Northcote). Thus in effect he accepts the Protestant translation, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' or, 'What hast thou to do with that which belongs to me?'"

The utterances at Capernaum, in which Christ twice over prefers spiritual to natural relationships, must be a sore trial to the faith of Romanists. The evidence is too plain of an intention to interfere with Christ's mode of advancing the interests of His kingdom: there is small possibility, one would think, of explaining away Mary's action, and still less of perverting the Saviour's words. But there is

one device available which in such cases may always be relied on, viz., vituperation of Protestants. With a preternatural sensitiveness indicative of disease, the Romanists exclaim against the Reformers as having brought "a charge against our blessed Lady of rudeness, pride, arrogance, ambition, and blasphemy," because they cannot exculpate her from all blame on this occasion. Very rude of the Reformers certainly, and it is no wonder if some of them in their recoil from Mariolatry went too far in the opposite direction. But does not the charge of the Romanists itself, in part at least, remount a little higher, and constitute an impeachment of the manuscripts? How unfortunate that the writers of the Gospels were not gifted with foresight of what would be necessary to faith and salvation in the nineteenth century! We may rest assured that if a conclave of cardinals had had the settling of the text, whatever they might have added, they would certainly have taken away the only references to the Virgin that Christ makes in the course of His ministry. The charge against the Protestant interpretation is one that can hardly be pressed when that interpretation comes to us supported by such names as those of Theophylact, who "taxes her of vainglory and of guilt in endeavouring to draw Him from teaching the word"; of Tertullian, who "pronounces her guilty of credulity"; and of Chrysostom, who accuses her "of vainglory, infirmity, and madness for this very thing." A Romanist asserts concerning the Annunciation that "upon her will, at that moment, the coming of our salvation depended." It is much more certain that at the moment of her appearance in Capernaum, her will, if obeyed, would have made our salvation impossible.

The same policy of exaggeration, misrepresentation, and interpolation is pursued by Romanists under the very shadow of the Cross. They rend the seamless vesture, the symbol of our redemption (Rev. xix. 13), giving part to Christ and part to Mary. Of the four words addressed to her, the first alone furnishes a foothold to superstition, and a very precarious one indeed. Christ said, "Woman," and of course He meant that she was the woman that is—*not* spoken of in "*it* shall bruise thy heel." The Scriptures speak of a first and second Adam, the Romanists add a first and second Eve. Certainly, Eve was with Adam in the fact and guilt of the transgression, but as a medium of the transmission of original sin, it is as if he

ate of the fruit alone. So Mary was with Christ on Calvary in bodily presence and heartfelt sympathy, but as accomplishing the work of our redemption, "He trod the winepress alone." The words to the beloved apostle afford just as scanty grounds for false interpretation. The title "Mother" is, however, eagerly caught at: imagination is invoked, and instantly John becomes the representative of the faithful, and Mary the mother of us all. "Observe that Jesus Christ has not said this to *Saint John*, but to *the disciple*, to show that the Saviour appointed Mary the common mother of all Christians who are called His disciples" (Liguori). As if John in his own Gospel were ever known by any other name than "the disciple." And since the words were spoken to all Christians, why were not the other two Marys addressed as well, for they were standing by?

But if there is not much room in these words for false renderings, the events of the Crucifixion and the doctrine of Atonement taught by it afford ample scope for misrepresentation and exaggeration. Mary's grief is made to swallow up the sufferings of Christ, as streamlets are lost in the ocean. Both in art and in literature the centre of the scene is displaced, and instead of the agony of the Redeemer for the sins of the world we are directed to the agony of the Virgin for the loss of her Son! The words of the weeping prophet are put into Mary's lips, as she bends over the lifeless body of Jesus, "O all ye that pass by the way, attend and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow!" The mother's natural sorrow is then invested with the same virtue as the Son's deep God-inflicted anguish, and the merits of Christ are supplemented, not to say supplanted, by the boundless merits of Mary. Hence, by a logical necessity, whatever is true of the sinless Redeemer is true of the Immaculate Virgin.

"Mary was chosen, one says, 'to repair the primeval transgression' (Orsini). Another raves thus: 'O admirable mother, present me to thy dear Son as His eternal slave, so that, as He hath redeemed me by thee, by thee He may receive me.' 'Devotion to the most holy Virgin Mary is necessary to all men, simply for working out their salvation.' 'It is Mary alone who has found grace before God, without the aid of any other mere creature: it is only by her that all those who have found grace before God have found it at all; and it is only by her that all

who shall come afterwards shall find it.' 'She has reached a point of grace immense and inconceivable; in such sort that the Most High has made her the sole treasurer of His treasures, and the sole dispenser of His graces, to ennoble, to exalt, and to enrich whom she wills.' 'It is by Mary that the salvation of the world has begun, and it is by Mary that it must be consummated.' 'The Father has not given, and does not give His Son, except by her, He has no children but by her, and communicates no graces but by her. God the Son has not been formed for the whole world in general except by her; and He is not daily formed and engendered except by her in the union with the Holy Ghost; neither does He communicate His merits and His virtues except by her; neither does He form the members of our Lord's mystical body except by her; and through her alone does He dispense His favours and His gifts. After so many and such pressing examples of the most Holy Trinity, can we, without an extreme blindness, dispense ourselves from Mary, and not consecrate ourselves to her, and depend on her to go to God, and to sacrifice ourselves to God?' (Montfort)."

It is not in the New Testament alone that we find such wholesale perversion of the plain meaning of words. The allegorical method opens a wide door to vain imaginations concerning the events, objects and personages of the Old Testament. The interpretation by inspired writers themselves of many of these as symbols of Christ; ought to have checked those who indulge in such a spirit: instead of which, it seems to have encouraged them. They do not seem to have arrived at their conclusions by any such circuitous process as the argument that whatever was spoken of Christ is *ipso facto* applicable to Mary. History, prophecy, ceremony, doctrine, are boldly appropriated to the uses of Mariolatry: no rendering is too harsh, no connection too obscure, to serve the purpose of exalting the mother at the expense of the Son. She is "the tree of life replanted in the abodes of men by the hands of God Himself:" she is "that happy ark which, amidst a universal shipwreck, remained safe and uninjured:" she is "that ladder which Jacob beheld reaching from earth to heaven, by whose steps the angels of God ascended and descended, on whose top leaned God Himself:" she is "that bush which, in the holy place, Moses beheld blaze on every side, and amidst the crackling flames, neither consumed nor suffered the least injury." Sarah, Rebecca and Rachel, are her prototypes in the times of the patriarchs: Deborah, Jael, Ruth, Abigail, and even Bathsheba and Abishag in

the days of the judges and the kings. David calling himself "the son of thy handmaid," means to dedicate himself as the child of Mary, from whom he asks and receives all he desires in his Psalms, and in whose honour they are virtually composed. Solomon aims at her, when describing the excellencies of Wisdom in the Proverbs, and the glories of the Spouse in the Song of songs. Isaiah is full of the same praises, from the ox and ass of his first chapter, which prefigure the brute tenants of the Bethlehem cave, to the bride and bridegroom of the sixty-first, both of them typical of Mary. And Jeremiah, as we have seen, frames for her lips the most touching appeal of the Lamentations. In the Proverbs this burlesque upon interpretation falls little short of blasphemy, for as the original of Solomon's Wisdom, pre-existence is solemnly ascribed to the daughter of "St. Joachim" and "St. Anna."

If all this be as sound doctrine as Romanists would have us believe, then they are consistent enough in their enforcement of the duties they would have us perform. Let heaven and earth unite in adoration of Mary, for she is the greatest wonder that the world has seen. She has all the prerogatives of Deity without participation in the Divine nature! Hitherto we have prayed in the name of Christ, and have been assured that He could hear us, because omnipresent and omniscient. Henceforth we are to offer our prayers to Mary: let us not too curiously ask how it is she comes to know them. Let it suffice for us that the Church has spoken, and in any seeming contradiction between the Church and the Word, let us "hear the Church," which thunders out anathemas direr than any uttered by prophet or apostle. If, therefore, Deuteronomy says, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," and the Church bids us bow before the image of the Virgin, let us observe the positive precept as safer than the negative one, and hope for the discovery of a Protestant interpolation in the ancient books of Moses. Let us accept each new Papal revelation of some hidden glory of Mary as a conspicuous illustration of the wonderful grace of God, which will not leave the world without an infallible teacher, and not be so profane as to suggest the possibility of infallible contradictions. But if we shrink from this blind servility, let us search into the grounds of these pretensions: let us not fear to break the bounds which human authority would place to the right of private

judgment, and however reverently we regard what transcends finite comprehension, yet let us refuse to accept as dogma what is contradictory to itself and to common sense. Let us inquire into the process by which fictions so monstrous have come to be believed by multitudes as implicitly as the evidence of their own senses, and seek to learn some lessons from the history of superstition as to the tendency of the human mind, first to hold the truth in unrighteousness, and then to forsake its straight causeway for the crooked paths of error.

Mr. Robinson has two chapters in connection with this part of the subject, one entitled "Development of Doctrine," in which he traces the descent of Mariolatry, and the other, "Full-blown Error," in which he illustrates the lengths to which it is carried. It is acknowledged on all hands that the Marian heresy has small countenance in Scripture. The most bigoted ecclesiastic cannot but admit that if Scripture alone be taken as the foundation, the edifice is much wider than the base. Hence the necessity, first for admitting tradition to an authority co-ordinate with that of the canon, and then of the doctrine of infallibility in the Church, whether located in the whole body of the faithful, or, since that admits the possibility of divided judgment, in a general council, or still more conveniently, since that is liable to the same weakness, in the human head of the Church, who may at least be expected not to enunciate self-contradictions in one and the same breath. The dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin has thus a closer connection with the personal infallibility of the Pope than may at first sight appear: unanimity in the sanctioning of new doctrines is to be more easily attained in the future than in the past. Theology is no longer a science demanding the profound investigations of the most cultured intelligence: it shares the same fate under Papal absolutism as political economy under imperial despotism. Both are consigned to oblivion: but it is inevitable that both should have their revenge. There might be some pretext for this short and easy method of learning the mind of the Spirit, if Papal pronunciamentos were confined to the task of defining opinions concerning facts and stopped short of the revelation of facts themselves, especially such as took place nearly two millenniums ago. We can understand how, in the course of ages, additional illumination might

fall for instance on unfulfilled prophecy, how new and real harmonies might be detected in the various parts of Scripture, and how the hidden treasures of revealed truth might pour out their inexhaustible wealth at the feet of an individual or body of Christians devoted to the task of exploring the inheritance of the saints. This is one kind of development of doctrine, and a perfectly legitimate one, such as finds its analogy in the gradual unfolding of the truth while the inspired records were as yet incomplete. But the Papal development of doctrine includes the discovery, if we may not rather call it the invention, of new facts as well as new interpretations of old ones. The immaculate conception, the miraculous assumption and the mediatorial position of the Virgin, are of this kind. They are not put before us as opinions we may lawfully hold, but as facts long withheld but now by the peculiar grace of God made known. Surely the Pope ought not to rage so furiously against the present age: Heaven must have a special regard for us, since it makes him the channel of so many marvellous revelations. No such honour was put on the ages before the Reformation, and yet they were ages of faith.

In the meantime, the question presents itself why these facts were not made known at the time at which they took place? We will quote Mr. Robinson on this point: his irony is very delicate, and his argument irresistible.

"An eminent ecclesiastic (Dr. Newman) accounts for the writers of the New Testament not mentioning the greatness of Mary by venturing the supposition that when they wrote 'she was or may have been alive.' 'Just one book of Scripture, certainly written after her death,' he says, 'exhibits her in its description of the woman clothed with the sun.' Why in that book is she spoken of so obscurely that millions of Christians are unable to perceive that she is spoken of therein at all? Why is she only alluded to once, if ever, in that one book? How is it that, after the constrained silence, there was not a gush of testimony? Wherefore did not St. John write a memoir of her after her departure? How did the Church flourish without any proclamation of her magnificence from the day of her Son's crucifixion to that of her decease? Why should the sacred writers be so delicately silent concerning her while she lived? Were they more her friends than, for Christ's sake, friends of the race to whom a knowledge of her exceeding greatness was of course vitally momentous? Was it right to feel so much for the one

human being of whom Jesus was born, and so little for the thousands on whose behalf He died? Were St. John and others afraid that, if they described her greatness, they would make her proud? Was it not as bad to hurt her feelings and try her temper by publishing her littleness? If they might wound, why might they not also in compensation, and for the world's benefit, support her sense of dignity? She was incapable, it is alleged, of any fault. Why, therefore, did the Lord never directly commend her? For what reason did the evangelists and apostles so scrupulously refrain from acknowledging her excellent glory? If modern workmen about the Church know, surely its inspired builders were not ignorant that she was born and died immaculate. Ought they not in their day to have acted upon such knowledge as much as any illuminated Italian or Englishman is bound to do so in ours?

"But the Apocalypse is not the only book of the New Testament which must be supposed to have been written after the Virgin's death. The Crucifixion is believed to have taken place A.D. 29, and the author of the suggestion referred to is in circumstances to honour the tradition that Mary left the world fifteen years afterwards. Allowing that, as some think, she lived twenty-four years after the Ascension of Christ, her death took place in the year 53. Of all the books of the New Testament, only the Gospel according to St. Matthew and St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians were published before that date. The rest of St. Paul's Epistles, the Gospels of St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, the Epistles of St. James, St. Peter, St. Jude, and St. John, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, all were subsequently written. It was fifteen years later than A.D. 53 when St. John wrote his first and chief Epistle; the Revelation was written by him in 96 or 97; and his Gospel is believed to have been his last composition. Familiar with those conclusions of men honest and learned as himself, Dr. Newman must cherish his novel and uncatholic opinion somewhat uncomfortably; and he ought to tell us why, in the Gospel according to St. John, not Mary's majesty is noticed, but her infirmity. Supposing her to have been all that Romanists see in their deified Lady, if it were possible for the New Testament writers, from whatever motives, to conceal her greatness while she lived,—if such a belief were not a reflection upon their inspiration as well as honour and zeal,—it would be incredible that no one else was inspired to record her excellence when she died."

As little do the ancient fathers of the Church favour the original sinlessness and ultimate enthronement of Mary. "Nothing is said about her in Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Polycarp, and the fragments of Papias." Ignatius "only

says of her what is said in the inspired Gospels and the Apostles' Creed." Justin names Mary as frequently as does Ignatius, but only to insist on her virginity and obedience." Chrysostom "speaks of her recklessness and vainglory," and Origen, Basil, and Cyril "accuse her of the sin of doubt." Augustine "speaks of her new birth," and Bernard, the last of the Fathers, "questioned the mystery" of the immaculate conception of the Virgin. Coming to the middle ages, we find the protest maintained. In 1150 Peter the Lombard "taught as the ancient doctrine that Mary was first purified from sin at the Annunciation." In the middle of the thirteenth century, Bonaventura "agreed with the fathers that Mary was conceived in sin," and Thomas Aquinas expressed his concurrence in the view. The action of councils was equally tardy. The feast of the Conception of Mary, first celebrated in the East in the time of the Emperor Heraclius, in the seventh century, "did not come to be observed in the West till the twelfth, and then not in Italy but in France;" but this feast was not in honour of her conception as immaculate. In 1457 the Council of Avignon did not venture to proclaim such a doctrine, but excommunicated "all who should preach or dispute publicly to the contrary." The first Pope to venture on a similar measure was Sixtus IV., who, in 1483, "excommunicated those who affirmed that it was heretical to maintain that Mary was conceived without sin." Even the Council of Trent, in 1546, "left the point unsettled, proceeding no further than to pass, after a stormy discussion and amid tokens of disunion, the following resolution: The Synod declares that it is not its purpose to include the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, mother of God, in its decree upon original sin, further than to revive the bull of Sixtus the Fourth relating thereto, together with the penalties ordered therein." "In July, 1615, Paul V. formally instituted the office commemorating the immaculate conception, and in 1617 issued a bull forbidding any one to teach or preach a contrary opinion." In 1622 Gregory XV. issued another, "forbidding any one privately to speak or write against the original sinlessness of the Virgin." In 1661, Alexander VII. expressed the doctrine in stronger terms, but did not enforce it by penalties. In 1708, Clement XI. made the celebration of the festival of the immaculate conception binding on all the faithful. The consummation of the great apostasy is

thus described by Mr. Robinson, from whom we have been quoting in this paragraph:—

"The time was approaching when it would be perilous not to believe, with the heart, that the Virgin was conceived without sin. A Pope was coming, as fast as a century could bring him, who would make this modern notion a dogma of faith necessary to situation. From Gaeta, February 2nd, 1849, Pius IX. wrote to all bishops of the Roman fold, asking them how soon they thought he might crown the work of Sixtus IV., Paul V., Gregory XV., Alexander VII., Clement XI., and their respective coadjutors. Answers were not received from all to whom the encyclical was addressed; and of the more than five hundred who did reply, not a few, including the Archbishops of Paris and Rouen, warned the unwise master-builder against precipitation, and, plainly as they could, told him they considered the new doctrine unsound and unsafe. A few years would find these very remonstrants, on pain of hell, publicly teaching, and pretending to believe, the unscriptural dogma. In 1854, at a meeting of cardinals and bishops, convened in the Jerusalem of Catholics, . . . some so far forgot themselves as to inquire what had been the vote of the general episcopate. The circular had not been so much a sincere letter of consultation as the formal herald of a foregone conclusion; and it was not the time now for discussion, but for settlement. In the Basilica of the Vatican, on the 8th of December, 1854, being the festival of the Conception of Mary, 'perhaps to the Christian world the most important day that has dawned since the Council of Trent,' the venerable Pope, with careful ceremony and hysterical tears, read in a loud voice the following improvement upon the definition of Alexander VII.:—'After we had unceasingly, in humility and fasting, offered our own prayers, and the public prayers of the Church to God the Father, through His Son, that He would deign to direct and confirm our mind by the power of the Holy Ghost, and having implored the aid of the entire heavenly host, and invoked the Paraclete with sighs, and He thus inspiring, to the honour of the holy and undivided Trinity, to the glory and adornment of the Virgin, Mother of God, to the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Catholic religion, by the authority of Jesus Christ our Lord, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, we declare, pronounce and define that the doctrine which holds that the blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her Conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the Omnipotent Power, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any man shall dare—

which God avert—to think otherwise than as it has been defined by us, let them know and understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and, besides, by their own act, they subject themselves to the penalties justly established, if what they think they should dare to signify by word, writing, or any outward means. . . . Let no man presume to infringe this our declaration, pronunciation, and definition, or to oppose and contradict with presumptuous rashness. If any should presume to assail it, let him know that he will incur the indignation of the Omnipotent God, and of His blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.' (Preuss, Pusey, Husenbeth)."

After this, what should we expect but the dogma of the Pope's infallibility,—and the Old Catholic schism?

Although the Marian heresy is thus, as an accepted article of the Romanist's ever-changing creed, of comparatively recent introduction, the causes which have combined to bring about this result are by no means new. Those causes are very numerous, some of them very subtle, and by no means all of one type. They may be classified as the intellectual, the religious, and the moral. Under the intellectual we should place first the metaphysical spirit, which delights to traverse paths unfrequented by the generality of men. The Eastern Churches have always been distinguished by the subtlety of their philosophy, and even the more practical Western nations are sufficiently represented by the ingenuity of the schoolmen and the sometimes profound, always obscure, metaphysics of modern Germany. For minds so constituted the mystery of the Incarnation has had a deep fascination, and it is no wonder that it should lead to the prior question of the relation of the Virgin Mary to the Redeemer. For this has seemed a field where the dialectical imagination might disport itself without suspicion of irreverence. Side by side with, or rather over against, the metaphysical, we must place the æsthetic tendencies. These are not, it is true, wholly intellectual: their development demands as a pre-requisite a certain culture of the sensibilities and affections, and also certain sensuous surroundings and incentives, which they again react upon and stimulate to greater refinement and indulgence. Still the intellectual element predominates. The reciprocal action of cause and effect is nowhere more conspicuous than in the way in which religion has fostered

art, and art again fashioned and moulded religion. Nor has the influence been always other than beneficial. The greatest of the old masters, though not uninfected with the Marian enthusiasm, sought the moral and religious improvement of their times as much as Hogarth or Holman Hunt. But there is too good reason for Mr. Robinson's view of the influence of art upon religion as expressed in the title of one of his chapters—"The Collusion of Art." He shows how the progress of Marian idolatry may be gradually traced in the pictures of the Virgin from the time when she occupies a subordinate position, like Peter and the Baptist at the side of Jesus Christ, to the representations in the seventeenth century of the Immaculate Conception. Sober even to severity must be the art that would be true to the teaching of the Gospels. The subjects they afford are inexhaustible, but an earnest moral purpose must breathe through their whole treatment. A dispensation from such strictness is granted to worshippers of Mary. The apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations furnish the field which inspired writings do not throw open to the sensuous propensities of the human mind. And Papal priestcraft has not been unwilling to see its blasphemous conceptions embodied in the most daring forms, such as that of "the Madonna and Child seated side by side with the Trinity, the Holy Spirit resting on her crowned head." In such service art has been as much degraded as religion. Some have painted their wives, others their mistresses, as representatives of the Virgin. "Under the influence of the Medici the churches of Florence were filled with pictures of the Virgin, in which the only thing aimed at was an alluring and even meretricious beauty." Painting is not the only one of the fine arts that has been prostituted at the shrine of this impiety: architecture and song have lent the glory of their names. The most gorgeous fanes in Christendom have been reared to the honour of the Virgin, and the most exquisite anthems that ever greeted mortal ears are those that have echoed through their aisles.

Religious motives have also given a powerful impetus to the Marian development. Genuine religious fervour first prompted those extravagant laudations of the Virgin which we find among early fathers of the Church who would have shrunk in horror from the conclusions to which a literal rendering of their unguarded effusions has seemed to lead.

Advocates and apologists of Christianity sought to smooth the way to the reception of the mysterious doctrine of the incarnation by investing its human medium with more than human attributes. The edification of the faithful being obviously promoted by meditation on revealed mysteries, some whose creed was that the end sanctified the means sought to promote that edification by manufactured mysteries, and so successfully plied their craft that the true reverence for spiritual verities degenerated into gaping curiosity and unhealthy appetite for legendary lore. In the stronger and purer minds, however, there was no such degeneracy. The truth received by them into honest and good hearts brought forth fruit unto perfection, and was no more vitiated by the admixture of superstitious falsehood than the seed in the furrow would be by a sprinkling of chaff. Such men as Bernard, Bonaventura and Thomas à Kempis were saints indeed: in them profound respect for the Virgin was the unnecessary but innoxious accompaniment of religious dread: it stopped short of the extremes of modern times. Even to the sinful and profane the exaltation of Mary seemed to afford a hope that might have been more immediately founded upon the merits of Christ. As a few Protestants have represented the Son's mercy as propitiating the Father's wrath, making the first Person the representative of the sterner, and the second of the milder attribute,—so also many Catholics have regarded Christ as less accessible since His Ascension, and as Himself conciliated by a wholly human mediatrix. This false humility and groundless fear must have been a grievous hindrance to spiritual men, and will sufficiently account for many of the abominable doctrines of Popery, such as prayers for the dead, the sacrifice of the mass, the meritoriousness of good works,—without the necessity of supposing any diabolical conspiracy in their invention. The monastic system also both countenanced and was countenanced by the supposed virginity of Mary. At the opposite pole of religious thought and feeling, excessive devotion to the Virgin came into contact with Pagan mysteries, and gratified the old idolatrous instinct in those who but imperfectly comprehended the meaning of Christianity.

This suggests the third class of motives which have tended to the fostering of Mariolatry, viz. the moral. Here, also, there is a good and a bad side. The spirit of chivalry, in the days in which it flourished, was in alliance

with the worship of Mary, and its tendency was anything but evil. The many orders of charity, whether they retained their first principles or not, were connected with the honour of Mary. But the evil vastly preponderates over the good. The name of Mary has been supposed to convey a dispensation to sin, as well as a dispensation from it. The introduction of a female divinity has pandered to the same evil passions in the temple of God as in the Pagan Pantheon. And priestcraft has converted the beliefs it has thus fostered into mighty engines of spiritual despotism. Well may the tyrants of the Catholic Church ascribe might and dominion to Mary. The Mary of their fables, the Mary of their mass-houses, confessionals and inquisitions is, indeed, the shadowy potentate that leads captive myriads of deluded human beings, now by the charms and now by the terrors of her name. She flatters the wealthy profligate that he may purchase heaven by his offerings, and the sentimental devotee that she may win it by her tears: she likewise plants her foot on the neck of the heretic who dares to doubt her power, and hardens the inquisitor to stretch his recusant brother on the rack. This is the Papal Mary, but not the Mary to whom Gabriel brought glad tidings, and whom the crucified Christ committed to the care of the beloved disciple. Let her image be cast down from its pedestal: it is not the likeness of a New Testament saint, but that of a Pagan Deity.

The causes of the apostasy suggest, if that be possible, the cure. Hopeless, indeed, seems any prospect of a general return of the Church that styles itself Catholic to truly Catholic principles. Too strenuously has it stopped its ears to testimony from within and from without; too deeply is it committed to soul-destroying error, to render any spiritual or even ecclesiastical reform at all possible. The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. And so strong is the grip of the priest on the neck of the people that restoration of individuals seems almost as difficult as that of the whole body corporate. Even in foreign parts heathens and infidels are less intractable than the votaries of Popish superstition. But the one remedy is that which alone must be presented. Only the exaltation of Christ will avail to abase the worshippers of Mary. Never will Papists be converted by going half-way to meet them. Ritualists have turned Romanists by scores and hundreds,

but how many Romanists have been weaned from their errors by the self-denying exertions of their brethren of the Anglican fold? Meantime, if the conversion of Papists seem a difficult task, let us see to it that the perversion of Protestants be not made too easy. The signs of the times have betokened evil days, but latterly they seem to have been brightening. The Protestantism of the country is aroused. The bishops, to a man, have declared themselves. Both the present and the late Prime Minister have spoken. Best of all, a spiritual quickening is visible in the great centres of our population. Let us hope that, though the evils of Popery and semi-Popery still abound in our midst, the crisis is passed, and the full tide of evangelical activity has set in, which will sweep away all the earth-works that, like foolish children, its enemies have been erecting while it has been at its ebb.

But Popery will long fight for the recovery of her ancient supremacy, and will long boast of her successes, however certain it may be that both here and in the world at large she is destined to utter collapse. Her intrigues are as subtle as ever with the peasant in the cot and the peer in the castle. Well will it be for our youth to be fortified against her insidious advances. And no better book can be found for this purpose than the learned and logical, yet interesting and edifying, work we have had the pleasure of introducing to our readers.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. ENGLISH AND FOREIGN THEOLOGY.

Records of the Past: being English Translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments. Published under the Sanction of the Society of Biblical Archæology. Vol. V. Assyrian Texts. London: Bagster & Sons.

THIS cheap, elegant, and profoundly interesting series of translations from the cuneiform and hieroglyphical writings is, we presume, by this time, familiar to most of our readers. The volume now published, a twin to its Egyptian predecessor, is devoted to the monumental literature of Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia. Under the first of these three sections, Mr. Fox Talbot gives us a revised translation from the second-hand Assyrian text of a curious story, touching the infancy of an old Babylonian king, Sargina, or Sargon I., which has points of resemblance to the Scripture account of the hiding of Moses in the ark of bulrushes. A pleasant piece of romance, this may very well lead off the weird procession of annals and histories which follows. The fifty pages, or more, in which Mr. George Smith continues, from a previous volume, his "Early History of Babylonia," provoking as their contents are, by the fragmentary character of the texts, and by the uncertainty which sometimes attaches to the rendering, are really among the most wonderful, if not the most important portions of the present work. The translations are made, for the most part, not from that type of the Babylonian language, which belongs to the same kith and kin with the Assyrian, the Hebrew, and other Shemitic tongues, but from quite a different type, allied in structure to the so-called Turanian languages, such as the Turkish and the Tartar. That contemporary scholars, English, French, and German, should have succeeded first in reading the various forms of the arrow-headed inscriptions, then in recovering the absolutely lost languages of the ancient inhabitants of Chaldæa, Mesopotamia, and adjacent countries, especially when in the case of one of these languages, the Turanian-Babylonian of which we speak, there was no cognate to serve as a bridge and stepping-

stone, must always remain a prodigy of human genius, industry, zeal, and perseverance. Besides the primeval monarchs, whom Mr. Smith calls from their graves, several later kings of Babylon figure in our volume. Nebuchadnezzar is well represented by Mr. Rodwell's translation of the famous India House inscription, written in ten columns on a stunted pillar of black basalt. The same scholar translates an inscription of Neriglissar, from a terra-cotta cylinder, brought from Babylon and preserved at Cambridge. Mr. Fox Talbot brings up the historic rear of the Babylonian division of the work with a castigated version of the inscription of Nabonid, Belshazzar's father, from the four cylinders found at the corners of the Temple of the Moon at Mugheir (Ur of the Chaldees). For reasons, some of which he assigns, Mr. Talbot controverts the generally received opinion, that the Bel-sar-ussur named in the inscription as the monarch's eldest son, is the Belshazzar of the Bible. We do not know what arguments the translator may have in reserve on this question; but those which he advances are singularly unsatisfactory. The inscriptions belonging to the Assyrian monarchies, which are translated in the volume—those, namely, of Tiglath Pileser I., who reigned some eleven or twelve hundred years B.C.; of Shalmaneser II., who died 823 B.C.; and of Tiglath Pileser II., B.C. 725-727—have appeared in other forms before; but we are thankful to see them again with such modifications and amendments as further light and study have seemed to require. The first of the three inscriptions is that which, eighteen years ago, was translated with such happy results, simultaneously and independently, by four cuneiform scholars, as a test of the trustworthiness of the principles upon which the arrow-headed writings were in course of decyphering. The second is the inscription on that priceless monument in the British Museum, whose quaint sculptures, human and animal, little English children daily gaze at with open-mouthed astonishment, the black obelisk found by Mr. Layard at Nimroud. The third inscription, or rather string of inscriptions—that of the second Tiglath Pileser—has a surpassing interest for the student of Scripture, from the circumstance that no fewer than five Hebrew kings are mentioned in it. The names of the translators of these three records—Sir Henry Rawlinson, Mr. Sayce, and Mr. Rodwell—are a guarantee of the substantial correctness of the renderings; and we commend the results of their learned labours to the thankful perusal of the many whom they are fitted to advantage. Writings in the Persian cuneiform are unhappily few in number. The great Behistun inscription has already appeared among the translations in the "Records." Mr. Talbot retouches, in the present volume, an old version of the inscription of Darius from Nakshi Rustam; and with this we must be content. For those who do not love annals, but have a vein for the

supernatural and mythical, Mr. Sayce and Mr. Talbot, in the conclusion of the volume, provide a dainty dish of translations from that strange old Tatar-Babylonian language already named. A Hymn to Ishtar, the Venus of Babylon; the War of the Seven Evil Spirits against Heaven; and certain wonderful tables of Dog Omens and Birth Portents; these are the programme of the feast; and we are in a position to assure the guests that there is plenty more of the same sort of viands to come, if they will only be patient, and give their accomplished and toiling hosts time to prepare it. We trust thousands of copies of this truly astonishing series of volumes are bought and read by the educated classes of our countrymen.

The Assyrian Eponym Canon: containing Translations of the Documents and an Account of the Evidence on the Comparative Chronology of the Assyrian and Jewish Kingdoms from the Death of Solomon to Nebuchadnezzar. By George Smith. London: S. Bagster and Sons. 1875.

THE chronology of the kings of Judah and Israel has for ages been one of the problems of Biblical criticism; and a much larger number of students than the public ever knew of have given it up as insoluble. Recently, however, an unexpected light has dawned upon the question; and if for the moment, at certain points, the darkness lingers, or is even intensified, there is reasonable prospect that ere long this ancient puzzle will be cleared away. The light comes as usual from the East. These old-world Babylonians and Assyrians, stargazers, soothsayers, and magicians as they were, were astronomers and chronologists likewise; and among the precious wrecks of their literature, which have lately been exhumed and recovered to Science, is a series of chronological tablets, indisputably authentic, containing lists, extending from B.C. 911 to B.C. 647—*i.e.* according to the Ussherian dates in our Bibles, from the reigns of Jehoshaphat and Ahab to the time of Manasseh—of certain Assyrian state officers, called *limus*, after whose names, as in the parallel case of the chief archons, or eponyms, at Athens, the successive years of the national history were designated. This Eponym Canon, as it is usually called, taken in connection with other historical records of the Assyrians now in course of decyphering by our cuneiform scholars, supplies a trustworthy chronology, synchronizing with the greater part of the period of the Israelitish monarchs of both kingdoms, and furnishes a most important critical instrument for determining and adjusting the regnal dates of the Books of Kings and Chronicles. In the volume before us, Mr. Smith explains in many interesting details what the Eponym system of

the Assyrians was; he translates the Canon as it is found in several copies among the terra-cotta tablets of the British Museum; he discusses with admirable clearness and candour the views held by other scholars, either as to the intrinsic value of the Canon, or as to its bearings upon contemporary Scripture chronology; and he argues, modestly yet firmly, on what appears to us to be the only scientific basis—the entire truth, that is to say, simply clerical errors excepted, alike of the Assyrian and the Hebrew records—the more difficult questions arising out of a comparison of the two series of dates. We must refer our readers to the work itself for the particulars embraced by this outline, contenting ourselves now with saying, that where the author is in conflict with other authorities, he generally, we think, makes good his ground; that his book is by no means a dull catalogue of names and years merely, but is rich in illustration of the history, life, and habits of the peoples who figure on its pages; and that the publication of the volume constitutes an epoch in the Old Testament criticism, which all after writers on Biblical chronology will respectfully acknowledge.

Notes on the Greek Testament. The Gospel according to St. Luke. By the Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A., Assistant Master at Wellington College, late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1875.

THE design of this book is to edit a portion of the Greek Testament for use in the highest classes of public schools. The bulk of the notes turn upon questions of grammar, but the narrative itself receives adequate illustration in all points of geography and antiquities. Exegetical difficulties are fully recognised, and the fruits of recent criticism put at the disposal of the student. His attention is also directed throughout to the spiritual lessons of the Gospel. The whole work is well done, and likely to be exceedingly useful both to school-boys and to older though not yet ripe scholars. The Introduction on the literary characteristics of St. Luke, and the probable sources of his history, is peculiarly well executed and suggestive. Mr. Carr wisely makes prominent the special value of the New Testament for the philologist, viz. that it enables us to trace the process by which the classical Greek passed into the modern tongue without a break. He is, perhaps, rather inclined unduly to press niceties of expression, such as the use of the imperfect or aorist tense, or the employment of this or that preposition. But this is an error in which he is countenanced by most New-Testament scholars; and, at any rate in a school book, it is better to err on the side of pedantry than of careless-

ness. The theological comments, doubtless from a fear of sectarianism, are apt now and then to degenerate into vague sentiment. It would have been better less carefully to have avoided the conventional terminology. These, however, are trifling defects, and we shall be glad to see other parts of the New Testament edited on a similar plan.

The Types of Genesis, briefly Considered as Revealing the Development of Human Nature. By Andrew Jukes. Longmans. 1875.

We must be content to be set down among the "carnal" who cannot "receive" the mystical doctrines of Scripture unfolded by Mr. Jukes as hierophant. He well says, "It is not a point for debate. Arguments are of little service here. Paul may argue if he will, but John, though he tells what he has seen and handled of the Word of Life, only testifies." We will not attempt argument of any kind, and only say that the "testimony" of the Apostle who had seen the Lord, and had the insight into His Word which only inspired love could give, and the testimony of this modern prophet, have nothing in common but the name. On his first page Mr. Jukes quotes St. Paul to show how much more he perceived in Genesis than the letter, "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined into our hearts;" and, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things have passed away, behold all things are become new." On p. 50 he gives us his view of the four streams that issued from Eden,—"These are four sources of truth, and only four, accessible to men: the first—Pison—intuition by which we get an acquaintance with moral or spiritual things: the second—Gihon, since the Fall the stream of Egypt—perception, through the senses, by which we only get an acquaintance with material things and their properties: the third—Tigris—testimony, by which we learn what others have found out through perception and intuition: the fourth—Euphrates—reasoning or reflection. The first compasseth the land of Havilah, where there is gold," &c. Now if any one cannot see the difference between the use which St. Paul makes of Genesis and that of Mr. Jukes, which is fairly represented by the above quotations, it is, as the author himself says, "no matter for debate. Arguments are of little service here."

Our judgment, however little weight it may have with the author and those enlightened like himself, and however great the risk we incur of being called "earthly and gross" for refusing to give to this most ingenious massing of clouds the name of dry land, is this:—Some part of this book is occupied with the fair deduction of spiritual truth from historical narrative, an extension of the thought of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the

Hebrews, worked out as only a thorough and intelligent student of the Scripture could elaborate it. Much more is ingenious illustration of New Testament truth and Old Testament history, often to the uninstructed eye so far-fetched that the illustration diverts attention from the thought, but passable as illustration only. More still is such allegorical interpretation as in the smallest quantities is of doubtful value, and when largely indulged in is ruinous to rational study.

A truly spiritual meaning in every part of Old Testament narrative there assuredly is, which we should have endeavoured to describe in some such words as follow, had not Mr. Jukes himself done it so well in his preface, p. xv.: "Do I then despise the letter? God forbid. With sincerest faith I receive it, and thank God for it, throughout Scripture. Most precious is it, speaking to all in words of truth, showing how the outward daily life on earth may be sanctified, and is watched and cared for by God. Especially now, when so many act as if the earthly calling were a path of which God took no notice, and in which faith availed us nought, most precious is the letter as showing God, for He changeth not, in all His providence over the outward path of those who love and fear Him, showing how the path of lonely men, if they walk with Him, their wells and sheep and feasts and wars are all His interest: that not a marriage, birth, or death—not the weaning of a child, or the dismissal of a maid—not the bargain for a grave, or the wish respecting the place of burial—but He watches and directs it. Thus precious is the letter: a daily guide and comfort to us as dwellers here." The sole difference between us is that while our author evidently considers this teaching of "the letter" as of small value compared with the precious inner meaning such as has been cited in the case of the four rivers of Eden, we regard the former as all-instructive and important, the latter as but little removed from nonsense.

Christian Psychology; the Soul and the Body in their Correlation and Contrast, being a New Translation of Swedenborg's Tractate "De Commercio, &c.," with Preface and Illustrative Notes. By T. M. Gorman, M.A., sometime Curate of St. Mary Abbott's, Kensington. Longmans. 1875.

In a somewhat bulky volume of over 550 pages, we have perhaps 50 full pages of Swedenborg's treatise, and the remainder is Mr. Gorman's. Perhaps we should rather say Mr. Gorman's compilation, for a large part of the copious and wearisome notes he appends to the text consists of extracts either from the incomparable Swedenborg himself, or the miserable and blind philo-

sophers who fail to perceive his transcendent excellencies. Mr. Gorman's own forte appears to lie in the accumulation of epithets which he liberally bestows when he writes of non-Swedenborgians, after this fashion: "meanest and most malignant subterfuges," "offensive and slanderous epithets" (such as "visionary" when applied to Swedenborg!), "shamefully distinguished in unchristian and unmanly attempts." Dr. Maudsley is "daringly unscrupulous," indulges in "grossly malicious slander," and "foul misrepresentations," he is "flippant,—profane," the "class to which he belongs" (whatever that may be) "threatens to become a dangerous and intolerable social nuisance," &c., &c. Cardinal Manning fares in some respects worse than this.

Such amenities as this apart, we have no worse fault to find with Mr. Gorman than that, while praising his author for being "plain, artless, and lucid," he does not imitate him. We have in the matter he has printed here, not a book, but the undigested materials for a book. The writer seems unable to use to purpose the extracts which he has heaped together from many varied sources, and when we come to his own work, we find more abuse than reasoning. In its present shape the book is not likely to find many readers.

Works on the Higher Life.

Perfect Love; or, Plain Things for Those who need Them, concerning the Doctrine, Experience, Profession, and Practice of Christian Holiness. By J. A. Wood. London: Elliot Stock. 1875.

Fulness of Grace: The Believer's Heritage. By the Rev. J. E. Page. London: F. E. Longley. 1875.

In the Power of the Spirit; or, Christian Experience in the Light of the Bible. By the Rev. W. E. Boardman. London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co. 1875.

The Upward Path; or, Holiness unto the Lord. By A. M. James. London: Religious Tract Society. 1875.

The appearance of these books is another token of the deep interest which is being everywhere felt on the subject of the Higher Life. "There are thousands among God's people to-day," Mr. Page says, "who long for a life of freedom and rest, but know not how to reach it." It is the object of these volumes clearly to place before the reader the fact of a high Christian experience, and to show the way of its attainment. And it is remarkable what substantial agreement there is between their teachings on these particular points, although on questions of doctrine, and in modes of expression, there is considerable diversity. The author of *Perfect Love* is, we believe, a

minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, and though the English editors "have not deemed it wise to retain such positions as were calculated to provoke profitless discussions among lovers of holiness," they have not attempted the impossible task of effacing the denominational stamp of the work. The quotations of which it largely consists are made, almost without exception, from well-known Methodist writers upon the subject. Its authorities are the Methodist standards: and it is evidently addressed specifically to the Methodist people. The author's aim is simple and unmistakable: it is to remove much existing ignorance and misconception by a clear and full explanation of the Methodist doctrine of Perfect Love. In keeping with this design an eminently plain and straightforward style is used, and the catechetical form has been adopted. We may add that the spirit of the work is thoroughly honest. We find just such questions as inquirers or opposers would naturally put, and they are answered plainly as by one who is too sincere in his convictions to seek any evasion.

The doctrinal part of the work begins with the distinction between Regeneration and Entire Sanctification, which is followed by an exhibition at some length of the nature of each. "The regenerated soul does not commit sin, though he is conscious of remaining inbred sin. The sanctified soul neither commits sin nor feels any consciousness of remaining inbred sin." This is the familiar doctrine which is enlarged upon, and supported by numerous extracts. Further on, the difficult question of the relation between Temptation and Sin is discussed. "Sin begins whenever the temptation begins to find inward sympathy, if known to be a solicitation to sin." "If we mistake not, the temptations of the entirely sanctified are usually sharper and shorter than others. They are also entirely from without, as there are no foes within a sanctified heart: all is peaceful and right there." The chapter headed "Holiness Attainable," is designed to prove the doctrine from Scripture. And here a defective terminology becomes an inlet to confusion of ideas, which destroys, in our opinion, much of the value of this important part of the work. The terms "perfect love," "entire sanctification," "sanctification," "holiness," "purity," are throughout the book used synonymously; but we should hardly have expected such a confusion between holiness as such, and holiness in its entirety, as the following passage indicates. "We argue that holiness is attainable from the fact that it is taught in the Bible as having been experienced. 'And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified.' 'And Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man, and a holy.'" These Scriptures may, as Mr. Wood says, be plain and positive; but we think they cannot be relied upon to prove the doctrine which his book

expounds. Other doubtful texts are pressed into the service of the doctrine: while, on the other hand, the passages of John's First Epistle, from which this work takes its title, are conspicuous by their absence. It is, doubtless, true that if a severe criticism should reject much of the author's proof, there would still remain strong evidence of the doctrine advocated: but it is all the more to be regretted that a demonstration sufficiently strong in itself should have been impaired by doubtful additions. Later on in the book an important distinction is drawn between purity and maturity. They are "distinctly two things. Even babes in Christ may become pure through the cleansing power of Jesus; but they cannot become mature Christians at once. This requires development, experience, and improvement." How the blessing thus obtainable in the present is found and kept, we are clearly informed. "The conditions of retaining perfect love are the same as those by which it was obtained; namely, a complete submission of the soul to God up to its present light, and simple faith in Christ for present salvation." The remainder of the work is taken up with replies to objections to seeking perfect love, advice to those who profess its enjoyment, and miscellaneous answers to questions on different phases of the subject. An interesting narrative of the author's own experience closes a book which will, we are sure, afford much welcome light and help to many who are honestly desiring guidance into the perfect love of God.

No one can rise from the perusal of *Fulness of Grace* without the feeling of being brought very near to a higher religious experience. Mr. Page possesses the art of gaining his reader's sympathy at once, and then quietly attracting and persuading to a holy life. In a series of little articles, gracefully written, and abounding in apt illustrations, we are taught the secret of a pure and restful life. We learn that a full surrender to the claims of God, coupled with a simple trust in the Sanctifier, will assuredly bring a definite experience, in which the New Covenant promises are ours, and all our need is constantly supplied out of the fulness of Jesus. We recognise again the following distinction. "It is important also to discriminate between what is held out as present privilege, and that maturity of Christian character which is the result of years of discipline and growth. The two things are distinct: the present privilege being a condition in which the growth of the soul in grace shall be freed from embarrassing impediments. . . . The life of holiness is not the end of the course, but a higher path of progress. Here is a road we know well, the centre of which is uneven with ruts and patches of stone. By its side runs a raised causeway, smooth and firm. The traveller may take his choice between the higher and lower way. Even so in the one highway to heaven there is a lower path in

which doubts and fears hinder, and easily-besetting sins prove "stones of stumbling." But for the comfort of travellers to Zion a higher pathway has been prepared by the "King." The life of full sanctification is not to be connected with "a continual straining of effort to keep the blessing. It is nothing of the kind! 'We which have believed do enter into rest.' *Enter into rest!* Let the reader mark that well. It is not something grasped by agonised effort, and held in trembling carefulness lest it be lost: it is a coming out of dim twilight into the broad sunshine, and onward 'walking in the light.'" Still further, "this promised privilege is more than experience of rest. Holiness of character will be the practical outward expression of the love of God perfected." It is strongly enforced that "the secret of a holy, victorious life is not in firm resolution, not in strong and repeated endeavours, not in careful adherence to precise rules, but in an indwelling Christ." These extracts will serve to give some idea of the teaching of this book—which will be none the less useful to those general readers for whom it is doubtless meant, because the author carefully abstains from obtruding denominational views. We are convinced that to every earnest reader it cannot fail to be made a blessing.

Some of the doctrinal statements in Mr. Boardman's volume do not, we think, tend to increase its usefulness. After citing instances of Christians, many of them Methodists, being "suddenly lifted up into Christ, and filled with the Spirit in an experience which stood at the beginning of a higher plane of Christian life and power," and enumerating the different names by which such experience has been designated, he makes the assertion: "The name given it in the New Testament is 'The Baptism of the Holy Ghost.'" In this phrase special emphasis is to be laid on the article. On a subsequent page we read "*The* baptism. *The* baptism, I say; not *a* baptism, but the *gift* of the Holy Ghost as an abiding, guiding, teaching, girding, strengthening one." And in yet another place, "There is one, only one baptism of the Holy Ghost, though there be many and very great and precious renewals or refreshings by the Spirit afterwards." That baptism of the Spirit is not given in conversion. "Conversion, therefore, and the baptism of the Spirit are separate and distinct experiences, though they may, and ought to, come very near together . . . Our Saviour makes this distinction in connection with the promise of the Spirit as an indwelling one, Who is *with* you, and shall be *in* you; these are His words. The Spirit is with us to convince before we are converted, and to regenerate us in the new birth; and He is with us to work in us everything that is of God afterwards. But this is entirely a different thing from His coming in to possess us fully." There are two distinct Christian experiences, one of liberty, the other of endowment.

Of conversion it is said, "This is what we call an experience, and this is what is called in New Testament phraseology, a baptism. The Baptism of Repentance, so styled both by John the Baptist and by our Lord Himself. We call it also the new birth, and conversion." The Scripture passages upon which these statements are based are those with which we are familiar elsewhere, and which, where they are not obviously misinterpreted, admit of satisfactory explanation. The denial of the fact that the regenerate soul, however imperfect in faith and holiness, is still the temple of the Holy Ghost, is so notably unscriptural, as very seriously to detract from the usefulness of this work. There are other faults which might be noticed, such as a misleading use of the word "infirmity," and a certain boldness in spiritualising which seems hardly justifiable: but it is a more grateful task to turn to the merits of the book. Mr. Boardman's great power lies in vivid and effective illustration of the experience which he is commending. Very truthful pictures are drawn from the ordinary spheres of life of long-continued struggle with sin and failure, and a final emergence, through consecration and faith, into a life of victory. In some cases the experience seems to have been undoubtedly that of the most thorough sanctification of heart.

The object of *The Upward Path* is "to suggest thoughts which may tend to strengthen and comfort some of God's children who are anxious to overcome the difficulties in the way of attaining a really spiritual life." In a quiet, meditative style which suffers somewhat by comparison with the vigorous writing of the other books, the author gives us some helpful thoughts upon the subjects of the Personal Love of Christ, True Consecration of Heart to God, Christ's Strength made Perfect in Weakness, Communion with God, the Example of Christ, the Guidance of the Holy Spirit, Contemplation and Active Service, Fellowship with Christ in Sorrow and Suffering, Spiritual Progress, and on Looking for the Second Coming of our Lord. One extract will show the substantial agreement of the author's views with the teachings of the works which we have discussed above. "These two points, of implicit faith in His love, and of absolute self-surrender, are so urgently insisted upon by Jesus Christ, that we may come to one certain conclusion. If, whilst trying to serve Him, we fail again and again in overcoming temptation; if we still make little or no progress against the sins which most easily beset us, it must necessarily be for lack of having truly fulfilled one or other of the two principal conditions. Either we have not thoroughly and sincerely given ourselves up to Christ, or else we have not a real, appropriating faith in His love. Consequently we have been unable to 'abide in Him.'" We do not doubt that the book will prove serviceable to many readers.

The Economy of Thought. By T. Hughes, Author of "The Human Will, its Function and Freedom," &c. Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.

WE believe that this book is the product of much study, that it is written with sincere desire to stimulate thought and inquiry about very important matters, nay, that there is even some valuable material of a certain kind for those who will be at the trouble to search for themselves. We regret that the peculiar use of certain words, the involved and cumbrous sentences, and, we must add, the cloudiness of thought as well as expression, will probably repel those whom Mr. Hughes wishes most to attract.

Letters to a Sceptic on Religious Matters. By Rev. James Balmes. Translated from the Spanish. Dublin: W. B. Kelly. 1875.

THE writer is a Spanish priest, and the letters—so the preface tells us—were written to a real sceptical opponent, and not to an imaginary one. The work is curious on several grounds. The Roman Catholic apologist undertakes the defence not only of first truths of religion, doubted or denied by the sceptic, but of the doctrine of Purgatory, the invocation of the saints, and the veneration of relics.

There is a preface by an ecclesiastical dignitary of Salamanca, from which we gather that literature and theology are in a poor way in Spain at present. His exultation over this work of Mr. Balmes' is such as can only be accounted for by a great dearth of works of a high order. The very moderate ability displayed in the *Letters* is enthusiastically lauded, and a victory is claimed of which we see little proof in the discussion itself. Nor is the style adopted in the preface one to reassure us on the subject of clerical moderation and candour. "The *Letters*, rather than a book or a treatise, are a mirror and an example; a mirror in which is reflected the weakness of the sceptic's proud reason; an example or proof of how far the humble reason of the believer can reach. In the former all is doubt, confusion, want of connection; in the latter, all is consequence, firmness, light. The sceptic's arguments, devoid of reasons sufficient to defend a theory, which he has not, or to support a system, which he is incapable of founding, only serve to manifest the disgraceful treason his weak intelligence has committed against the cause of truth; the apologist, on the contrary, penetrated with the importance of that cause, and ready to sacrifice his existence in it, enters the arena with conviction in his understanding and confidence in his heart, certain to find

arguments teeming with reason and common sense, with which to crush his adversary."

This is not pleasant writing, and in spite of such laboured eulogy we cannot find in the *Letters* of Mr. Balmes any important contribution to Christian apologetics.

Character Studies in the Old Testament. By James Rankin, M.A., Minister of Muthill. London and Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons. 1875.

AN encouraging example of the way in which Old Testament narratives may be turned to good account by an earnest and intelligent preacher. Mr. Muthill shows sufficient insight into Biblical history, and is particularly happy in the analysis of character. In the hands of a competent teacher the method of exposition and comment here followed cannot fail to be very effective. It gives the opportunity for plain teaching concerning the conduct of human life, and for the illustration of great ethical principles, in a way that is at once vivid and practical.

Redeeming the Time. And other Sermons. By the late Maxwell Nicholson, D.D., of St. Stephen's Church, Edinburgh. London and Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons. 1875.

THESE are plain and practical sermons delivered by Dr. Nicholson in the ordinary course of his ministry, and never intended by him for publication. To the members of his congregation they will serve as a memorial of a good man and of a useful ministry. Possibly they may be of wider service still, though our expectations, as we have often said, of the usefulness of printed sermons, save under special circumstances, are not very sanguine.

The Ministry of Reconciliation. By the Rev. John Brown Johnston, D.D., Govan, Glasgow. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.

ANOTHER volume of sermons of which we can speak well, without being able to say that here is anything of exceptional merit. The author, at the close of the thirtieth year of his ministry, has complied with the request of his friends and selected a number of his discourses for publication. So far as we have examined them, they appear to be sound, sensible, and orthodox.

II. GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Æneids of Virgil done into English Verse. By William Morris, Author of the "Earthly Paradise." London: Ellis and White, New Bond Street. 1876.

MR. MORRIS could scarcely have hit upon a more signal service to do to our exotic literature than that of translating the *Æneid*, unless, indeed, it were the still more exacting task of translating the *Odyssey*; and the version of the great Mantuan's Epic which this versatile and most prolific author has just put forth is one of the most successful of his many admirable translations. At a first glance it might not have been expected that he who has shown himself so wholly at home among the rough as well as the smooth places of the vigorous Icelandic classics, should also be at no loss how to deal with so notable a piece of highly civilised workmanship as the *Æneid*; but the result shows that, given congeniality of subject, and Latin verse and Icelandic prose, the short leap of sharp Icelandic anapæstics and the "long roll of the hexameter" are all as one to the poet of the *Earthly Paradise*, so far as regards the question of pressing them in noble form into our literature. The metre Mr. Morris has chosen for his *Æneid* is one where there was a service to do for the metre as well as for the poem; that, namely, in which Chapman did his grand version of the *Iliad*. Of rhyming metres none present so near a possibility as this for rendering the hexameters of Virgil line for line; and with no unrhymed metre can we hope, in hands less Miltonic than Milton's, to see any fair compensation given for the richness and variety of the original. Doubtless Chapman felt this in undertaking his long and glorious labour of translating the Epic of "Homer, Prince of Poets," as he calls him; but with all the beauty of versification to which he attained in the *Iliad*,—a much more nearly equable excellence than he attained to in any of his original works, excellent as they are piecemeal,—with all the barbaric gorgeousness into which he transfigures the grand simplicity and perfect ungarnished rectitude of Homer, he still left the fourteen-syllabled couplet an instrument from which other hands should be able to strike new harmonies, and rise a step or two higher in the direction of perfect beauty. And Mr. Morris has ascended several steps from the point at which Chapman left the metre; indeed he has made it a clearly beautiful thing in itself, as gracious and flexible and changeful in its beauty as the three Chaucerian metres in which the whole of the tales of the *Earthly Paradise* are alternately composed. In point of diction, we note no change whatever in this book as compared with the series of Mr. Morris's mature works. It is the same vigorous idiomatic

Saxon English, with that tenacity of noble obsolescent words which can be used without affectation, and with that clear ring of healthful enjoyment of a pure speech, that his readers have now been used to for so many years.

As regards literality of rendering, no one who does not want a word for word translation will find any reason to complain. For our part, having again and again maintained the position that a poetic translation cannot be done without full licence of paraphrase, provided only the sense be preserved, we find Mr. Morris wonderfully literal. Perfectly easy, and never approaching to servility, he seems constantly to run naturally into almost as close a version as might serve for a "crib," and yet maintains throughout the higher poetic qualities.

Those who have never read Virgil in Latin with sufficient ease to enjoy him thoroughly should not fail to try the taste of the *Æneid* in English as now for the first time worthily set before English readers; and none but very good classic scholars can have any idea how thoroughly enjoyable a book the *Æneid* is, or how much many of the greatest writers of modern times are indebted to it. Some of these debts come out with quite a fresh clearness in Mr. Morris's strong English, as, for example, that of Sir Walter Scott for the archery match in *Anne of Geyerstein*, which seems to be taken from the following passage in the Fifth Æneid descriptive of the shooting at a bird tied to a mast:—

"Then with their strength of all avail they bend the bows about
Each for himself: from quiver then the arrows forth they take:
And first from off the twanging string through heaven there went the wake
Of shaft of young Hyrtacides, and clave the flowing air,
And, flying home, amid the mast that stood before it there
It stuck: the mast shook therewithal; the frighted, timorous bird
Fluttered her wings; and mighty praise all round about was heard.
Then stood forth Mnestheus keen, and drew his bow unto the head,
Aiming aloft; and shaft and eyes alike therewith he sped;
But worthy of all pitying the very bird he missed,
But had the hap to shear the knots and lines of hempen twist
Whereby, all knitted to her foot, she to the mast was tied:
But flying toward the winds of heaven and mirky mist she hied.
Then swift Eurytion, who for long had held his arrow laid
On ready bow-string, vowed, and called his brother unto aid,
And sighted her all joyful now amidst the void of sky,
And smote her as she clapped her wings 'neath the black cloud on high:
Then dead she fell, and 'mid the stars of heaven her life she left,
And, falling, brought the shaft aback whereby her heart was cleft."

Wherever we open the volume we find work of this quality, and, when occasion demands it, work of a greater weight and intensity, as in the scene of Anchises' apparition to Æneas, farther on in the same book, after the conflagration among the ships:—

"But now the wain of mirky night was holding middle sky,
When, lo, his father's image seemed to fall from heaven the high,
And suddenly Anchises' lips such words to him poured forth :
"'O son, that while my life abode more than my life went worth ;
O son, well learned in Ilium's fates, hither my ways I take
By Jove's commands, who even now the fiery bane did slake
Amid thy ships, and now at last in heaven hath pitied thee :
Yield thou to elder Nautes' rede ; exceeding good they be :
The very flower of all thy folk, the hearts that hardiest are,
Take thou to Italy ; for thee in Latium bideth war
With hardy folk of nurture rude : but first must thou be gone
To nether dwelling-place of Dis ; seek thou to meet me, son,
Across Avernus deep : for me the wicked house of hell
The dusk unhappy holdeth not ; in pleasant place I dwell,
Elysium, fellowship of good : there shall the holy Maid,
The Sybil, bring thee ; plenteous blood of black-wooled ewes being paid :
There shalt thou learn of all thy race, and gift of fated walls.
And now farewell : for dewy night from midway-faring falls,
The panting steeds of cruel dawn are on me with their breath.'
"He spake, and midst thin air he fled as smoke-wreath vanisheth.
'Where rusheth thou ?' Æneas cried : 'Where hurriest thou again ?
Whom fleest thou ? who driveth thee from these embraces fain ?'
"So saying, the flame asleep in ash he busied him to wake,
And worshipped with the censer full and holy kneaded cake
The sacred Vesta's shrine and God of Pergamean wall."

We might multiply telling extracts until we had extracted the whole work ; but we must be content to give one more passage, in which Mr. Morris seems to us to have dealt with the difficulties of the original in a particularly felicitous manner. Such a passage is the speech of the Cumæan Sybil to Æneas, on his arriving at her Avernian home, as instructed by his father :—

"Then she fell speaking :
'Man of Troy, from blood of godhead grown,
Anchises' child, Avernus' road is easy faring down ;
All day and night is open wide the door of Dis the black ;
But thence to gain the upper air, and win the footsteps back,
This is the deed, this is the toil : Some few have had the might,
Beloved by Jove the just, upborne to heaven by valour's light,
The Sons of God. 'Twixt it and us great thickets fill the place
That slow Cocytus' mirky folds all around about embrace ;
But if such love be in thine heart, such yearning in thee lie,
To swim twice o'er the Stygian mere and twice to see with eye
Black Tartarus, and thou must needs this idle labour win,
Hearken what first there is to do : the dusky tree within
Lurks the gold bough with golden leaves and limber twigs of gold,
To nether Juno consecrate ; this all these woods enfold,
Dim shadowy places cover it amid the hollow dale ;
To come into the underworld none living may avail
Till he that growth of golden locks from off the tree hath shorn ;
For this fair Proserpine ordained should evermore be borne
Her very gift : but, plucked away, still falleth not the thing.
Another golden stem instead hath leafy tide of spring.
So thoroughly search with eyes ; thy hand aright upon it lay
When thou hast found : for easily 'twill yield and come away
If the Fates call thee : otherwise no might may overbear

Its will, nor with the hardened steel the marvel may'st thou shear.
—Ah! further,—of thy perished friend as yet thou nothing know'st,
Whose body lying dead and cold defileth all thine host,
While thou beseechest answering words, and hangest on our door:
Go, bring him to his own abode and heap the grave mound o'er;
Bring forth the black-wooled ewes to be first bringing back of grace:
So shall thou see the Stygian groves, so shalt thou see the place
That hath no road for living men.'"

These extracts will be quite sufficient to vouch for the poetic quality of the work, and also, for those who are disposed to go farther, the adequate accuracy of the rendering. We can but add that the book is one of the most delightful we have had the pleasure of reading for some time.

Poets and Novelists. A Series of Studies. By George Barnett Smith. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 15, Waterloo Place. 1875.

THE chief claim made for these papers by the author is that they are "exhaustive," whatever that may mean. They certainly exhaust the list of persons of high genius whose works are published by the highly respectable firm of Smith, Elder and Co., Mr. Browning being honoured with the dedication of the book in place of one of the "exhaustive" studies of his works. In the case of Mrs. Browning, Mr. Smith exhausts his vocabulary of laudatory phrases — and not without propriety; for that most gifted of all women-poets since Sappho, highly as she is respected and admired, can scarcely be said to have come to the fulness of her fame yet; and it is a thankworthy task to help forward the work of widening the circle of her influence. To us, however, it seems that such work is likely to be hindered somewhat by the institution of absurd comparisons; and when Mr. Smith goes out of his way to speak disparagingly of Shelley in extolling Mrs. Browning, one naturally suspects him of either knowing nothing whatever about poetry, or caring for nothing but the establishment, for whatever motives, of the particular reputation he may have in hand. Mrs. Browning was a poet through and through, with a conscience and aims nobler than her intuitions. Her instinct in matters of form, however, was constantly at fault; and, though she never degenerated into prosiness, and was gifted with a superlatively fine imagination, it cannot but be disadvantageous to her to set up a comparison between her works and those of the greatest lyric poet produced in England, or indeed in the whole modern world. That she will bear comparison with almost any of her contemporaries may not unreasonably be admitted, because the substantive qualities of her work are as far above those of most contemporary work, as her instinct for form is behind that of some dozen or so of our recent poets; but this is surely

admitting enough. The other essays are on Thackeray, Peacock, the Brontës, Hawthorne, Fielding, and a lot of small poets, including Mr. Robert Buchanan, who has a paper to himself, and of whom the rest are lumped together under the extraordinary term "fugitive poets." We have heard of fugitive poetry, and also of printed poetry; but we should as soon have expected to hear of a printed poet as a fugitive one. To use the word in Mr. Smith's own sense, we should consider him a fugitive critic; these essays, though readable enough, often carefully thought out, and sometimes even instructive, being wholly of the fugitive order, without consequence or interdependence. They are not properly "a *series* of literary studies;" they are merely a lot of articles reprinted in a very pretty volume; but if there were a few more or a few less, or if you changed the order of those that are here in the volume, in any imaginable way, no inconvenience would be experienced by the reader, and the book would be just as much a connected whole as it is at present.

Incidents in the China War of 1860. Compiled from the Private Journals of General Sir Hope Grant, G.C.B., Commander of the English Expedition. By Henry Knollys, Captain Royal Artillery, Author of "From Sedan to Saarbrück," and Editor of "Incidents in the Sepoy War." Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1875.

Of modern books concerning "wars and rumours of wars" in which the English have been actively concerned, few are more interesting and graphic than General Sir Hope Grant's reminiscences of campaigns in which he took part. When he entrusted his diaries to Captain Knollys, to edit therefrom the work published under the title of *Incidents in the Sepoy War*, the result was a book which received and deserved very considerable attention; and in following the same course with his Chinese diaries, the General did the next best thing to editing them himself. The clear, nervous, straightforward style in which Sir Hope Grant set down at the time of their occurrence the incidents of the Chinese War of 1860, convince the reader, at the same time, of his ability to write a good book, and of the perfect trustworthiness and justice of his record. Entrusted to Captain Knollys during the General's lifetime, the book did not appear until death had made it impossible for the author to ratify the deeds of his editor; but we have no doubt that Sir Hope Grant would have found the work done in such a manner as to leave him nothing to desire. As material for the history of the smaller wars of England the volume is invaluable; and as a book for general reading it is stirring to a high degree, and as instructive

as is likely to be the case with records of treachery, barbarity, and ignorance on the one side, gallantry and pillage on the other. Of the many situations of intrinsic and enthralling interest in even such an unchivalric war as the China War of 1860, few if any are more so than that of the capture and return of Lock and Parkes and the five French prisoners; and nothing could be better narrated than Sir Hope Grant's account of this transaction. But the volume is rich in such narratives; and, if it is also a little crowded with dry official documents, it is perhaps not more so than is necessary for the maintenance of the solid character of a historical record.

The Pilgrim of Scandinavia. By Lord Garvagh, B.A., Christ Church, Oxford, and Member of the Alpine Club. London: Sampson, Low, Marston, Low and Searle, Crown Buildings, 188, Fleet Street. 1875.

THOSE who have once been bitten with an interest in Iceland, through the medium of her unique and noble literature, are naturally prone to seize upon any one of the few books of Icelandic travel which are put forth from time to time by travellers sufficiently hardy to encounter the rough fare of a journey

"Betwixt the Ice Hills and the cold gray sea:"

and for such the narrative of Lord Garvagh's visit to Iceland will have a considerable interest. For the ordinary reader of travels, who expects to find whatever voyage-book he lights upon filled with thrilling adventures and accounts of hunting and so on, the book will have no charms; but for such as care to follow a modern traveller, with all appliances that money can buy, over the desolate land inhabited and traversed so many centuries ago by such hardy and unfurnished heroes as Gisli the Outlaw and Grettir the Strong, the book is full of a quiet attractiveness that will ensure its acceptance. After visiting Iceland his lordship proceeded to Norway; and he records his experiences and impressions of that, the parent country, as well as of the off-shoot island. The book is, on the whole, very pleasant reading, even for "general" readers; and everything that good typography and get-up could do to render it more pleasant, has been done unsparingly. The designs are well done, and those of Drontheim Cathedral, especially that at page 193, are worthy of attention as examples of *bond-fide* wood-cutting.

History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin. By the Rev. J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D. Translated by Wm. L. R. Cates. Vol. VI. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1875.

WHEN the news of Dr. D'Aubigné's death reached England there were many who felt as though they had lost a friend. It is

gratifying to find that we have not also lost the completion of his deservedly popular history. Only a few chapters remained unwritten, for the veteran author, seeing that his time must now be very short, laboured with unflagging industry and ardour, "counting the minutes," as he said, that he might reach the end of his fifty years' toil. The very end he did not reach, but he died within sight of it; and his manuscript, left nearly ready for publication, will bring the history down to Luther and a little farther. We still have to lament that the account of the Reformation in Geneva must remain unfinished. Calvin is D'Aubigné's hero, for whom he has the fullest sympathy and the most unqualified admiration; and we would gladly have followed him through the times of the great Reformer's most powerful influence upon his chosen city and on Christendom. In this sixth volume (the eleventh of the whole work) England has no share, but we may hope to see it occupy some part of subsequent pages. The editors warn us that there will be important gaps in the narrative; for instance, the Life of Knox will be very incomplete, if not altogether wanting. We have, however, before us the progress of purified truth in Scotland traced down to the death of Cardinal Beatoun, and the story of Calvin's early ministry in Geneva, his banishment, and recall. The two narratives are unconnected, and may be considered separately. The book devoted to Scotch affairs comprises the beginnings of the Reformation in that country, where, perhaps, it took a firmer hold than in any other; where certainly it made the most striking and permanent change in the national character. Scotland as it has appeared in modern times, Scotland as noteworthy in general history and literature, is the direct result of Protestantism, and the early stages of that great transformation are necessarily full of interest. The first representatives of the Scottish type of Christianity, sober, learned, and matter-of-fact, yet with a capacity for calmly intense enthusiasm, are brought into contact with the ignorant, cruel, and crafty barbarian, with no virtue but courage, and no loyalty but to his family. That is the Scot of the Middle Ages. Hamilton and Wishart, persecuted by the Beatouns and Arrans, are the two eras in conflict.

Yet we must confess to a feeling of dissatisfaction as we read D'Aubigné's chapters. He is not at home in Scotland; the time and land of the foreigner are everywhere apparent; there is a lack of intimate acquaintance with the history, the manners, and the scenery of the country where for awhile he must lay the scene. This is the more to be regretted because the interest of the early Scottish Reformation turns very greatly on minute circumstances. It is the fruit of the personal influence exercised by one or two comparatively obscure men, subjects rather for the biographer than the historian. Much detail is necessary to make us realise

their individuality and understand their labour. Hamilton and Wishart are politically unimportant, evangelists rather than theologians, and martyrs instead of statesmen. They carry on the impulses that greater minds have originated, and impart but little that is lasting from themselves. Not even a Scotchman would compare them with the great leaders of the Reformation. Scotland has, indeed, one name not unworthy of such comparison, a personality as strong and marked as Luther's, a statesmanly genius more rude and violent, but as true, and, in the end, more permanently effective, than Calvin's. But with John Knox we have, in this period, very little to do. We hear of him only as the friend and disciple of Wishart, the humble and resolute follower who sits with drawn sword to hear the preaching and defend the life of the man who is to be known chiefly as his forerunner.

The Scottish Reformation ultimately attained a character of its own most strikingly peculiar. It is strange to see how completely it was due in origin to external impulse. Dr. D'Aubigné's reference to the influence of the Culdees is almost amusing in its remoteness. These half-mythical exiles from Roman Britain may have had much to do with the history of Christianity, but for the cradle of the Reformation we need not go farther back than Dr. Wickliffe, whose follower, Resby, was burnt at Perth early in the fifteenth century. The next martyr is Crawar, a Bohemian Hussite, who wins at least, one distinguished convert in Archbishop Graham. Campbell, of Cessnock, is again avowedly a Lollard. Hamilton learnt the truth at Paris, and Wishart at Cambridge. It is German and English writings that first spread the principles of Protestantism, and the influence of Henry VIII. is its great support. Indeed, Scotland shows little independence of thought or policy till the new religion has begun to work. There is an English and a French party at court, but no Scottish. The success of the first Reformers would have been bound up with the triumph of a faction. It was well for Scotland that they failed, and delayed the establishment of a pure Church till it could rest on the basis of a powerful, popular conviction.

When Dr. D'Aubigné passes to Switzerland, the spirit of his style changes, and we recognise at once the native. Instead of vague allusions to "gloomy seas" and "misty lochs," there is an abundance of vivid local colouring, the narrative moves rapidly, while the glow of the writer's enthusiasm carries us along even where we cannot share his estimate of the character, or his judgment on the deeds of his hero. It would, indeed, be a gain to philosophic history if M. D'Aubigné had cultivated a colder impartiality. The greatness of Calvin would not have suffered from more frankness of criticism, and our confidence in the historian would certainly be increased had he displayed more

charity toward the opponents, and more freely recognised the excesses of the friends of the Reformers. We desiderate this in the Scottish history, but more frequently in the Swiss. Scarcely any but the basest and most selfish motives are allowed to the Catholics: "lying" and "trickery" are their methods of gaining their ends. Even Sadoleto, whose ability and politeness are admitted to distinguish him from ordinary priests, is credited with no worthier spirit than "flattery," "wheedling," and the most disingenuous misstatement of his adversary's case, and "concealment of what he must have known." A Catholic, in Dr. D'Aubigné's opinion, cannot sincerely believe that the Protestant doctrine of faith is injurious to morality. With so much evidence to show how frequently the Calvinian doctrine has, in inferior hands at least, manifested an Antinomian tendency, we cannot be surprised that an opponent should imagine a necessary sequence. Still less pleasing is the faint blame, or actual apology, which we find for the violence of word and deed which is the greatest reproach of the Reformation. The suppression of the Catholic practices, and establishment of evangelical ministers at Yverdun, at the point of the sword, is described as "a transformation of the Church in somewhat soldierly fashion;" and Calvin's calling his adversaries to their faces dogs and swine, is sufficiently justified because the metaphors are taken from Scripture.

It is more difficult to apportion excuse and condemnation to Calvin's early history in Geneva, as a whole. No one will question his superiority to all personal interest and ambition, or his heroic devotion to the cause of God. We may even grant that his grasp of the problem of the Reformation was wider, and his conception of the Christian Church truer, than that of, perhaps, any other Reformer. But it is impossible not to feel a certain repulsiveness in his system of society, akin to that inspired by his minutely rigorous theology, nor to repress all sympathy for those who even violently strove for freedom of private life. Toleration, of course, was unthought of at the time, and it would be a great mistake to attribute to Calvin alone the narrow despotism associated with the name of Geneva. M. D'Aubigné shows most strikingly that, on the very day of Calvin's arrival, fierce defiance was uttered in the Council against the enactment compelling all men to attend the preaching of Farel. The confession of faith, enforced under civil penalties, was not altogether the work of Calvin, though his influence at this time was, probably, already greater than that of his colleagues. In the great contest with the magistrates, which led to the banishment of the Reformers, they have clearly put themselves in the wrong; and though the interests of pure religion are plainly at stake, it is hard to see how the authorities could have acted otherwise than they did. It is true the new government of the city had been

elected chiefly under the influence of opposition to the ministers, —an opposition which sprung, to a great extent, from their so rigidly enforcing faith and morality on those who were not at heart sincere followers of the Reformation. But when the Church of Geneva had systematically placed discipline and authority in the hands of the Council, it was scarcely consistent to refuse obedience when the opinion of the city had changed. The enemies of Farel and Calvin might plausibly demand from them an example of submission, and certainly the magistrates who had appointed them had a right of dismissal. In the Geneva Church, as then organised, the voice of the freely elected magistrates was the voice of the laity. To this the ministers would not yield, and we must grant that the purity of the Church would have been sacrificed if they had; but still the question at issue was whether the preacher or the civil government was to rule. Ultimately it was decided in favour of Calvin, but at the cost of the liberty of the citizens, and we cannot condemn the magistrates so absolutely as M. D'Aubigné does. When Courault preached in defiance of their prohibition, and in hostility to their rule, they were bound to imprison him, and when Farel and Calvin repeated the defiance, undeterred by his punishment—when they, practically, laid the whole town under an interdict, by refusing to administer the Lord's Supper,—while all this was complicated by the delicate relations of Geneva to Berne, we cannot wonder that the unyielding ministers should be banished, and others put into their places. We may regret the triumph of the laxer party, and see that, in this case, licence rather than liberty was the result, but we cannot regard this portion of Calvin's life with unmixed admiration.

Dr. D'Aubigné's laborious and interesting work will, doubtless, long remain the popular history of the Reformation, as it is well entitled to do, but there is still wanted a more impartial account, with a wider grasp of principles, a deeper insight into motives, and a fuller recognition of the excesses, errors, and imperfections of the Reformers and their party.

The translation calls for a word or two. It is pleasant to read, easy and fluent, but at times the French idiom is a little too closely observed; and we hope that Mr. Cates, in subsequent volumes, will avoid the frequent occurrence of colloquialisms, that, at times, more than border upon "slang."

Historical Course for Schools. History of America. By John A. Doyle. London: Macmillan and Co. 1875.

WHETHER the admirable little volumes of Mr. Freeman's Historical Course are likely to be much used in schools may be fairly doubted, but for the private reading of young students

they are excellently suited, and form a very valuable addition to our educational literature. Mr. Doyle has done the work allotted to him very well. Accuracy is a matter of course in this Series, but it never degenerates into "dull honesty." The interest of the narrative is maintained without the aid of detailed description and rhetorical colouring, which are necessarily excluded from so brief a book. The great difficulty in writing the early history of the United States under such conditions lies in the absence, for the most part, of stirring events, in the multiplicity of parallel lines that have to be followed, and, above all, in the parochial character of colonial life. Afterwards, in narrating the two great wars, the want of unity is still felt, but there is no lack of interest or importance in the events, and it becomes not altogether easy to preserve a due impartiality. Mr. Doyle succeeds in keeping his readers well aware that they are tracing the beginnings of a great nation, and skilfully reminds us that it is almost the only one of whose early fortunes we have anything like adequate information. His fairness carries him through even the struggle that preceded the Secession without giving offence to either Abolitionist or Confederate. The chief defect of the volume is in dealing with the separate colonies, whose constitutional history is too much alike to require minute narration. A more general sketch of the process by which the thirteen states came to possess similar forms of government would have saved space and avoided a great deal of repetition. It is rather strange that the history which covers the shortest period should form the largest and most expensive volume of the Series. Had Mr. Doyle imitated more closely his chief's example of masterly compression, as shown in the General Sketch that opened the Course, he might perhaps have found room to justify his title. The United States is not America, and we should have been glad to see more than the present meagre and incomplete account of the Spanish colonies.

Thucydides—Books III. and IV. Edited, with English Notes, by G. A. Simcox, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1875.

Taciti Historiæ, I., II. Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by W. H. Simcox, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1875.

Mr. G. A. Simcox and, though to a somewhat less extent, his brother, Mr. W. H. Simcox, are so industrious as editors and writers, that the critic, in taking up a new volume of theirs, is well able to form some expectation of what he is likely to find. There is sure to be a fine instinct of scholarship, an abundance of epigram, not always very transparent, great acuteness, and not a

little want of condescension to the needs of average mortals. Mr. G. A. Simcox's edition of Juvenal, even in its expanded form, is the delight of scholars, and too often the despair of schoolboys. The notes on the Speeches of Æschines and Demosthenes on the Crown, published jointly by the two brothers, were always acute and suggestive, but rarely exhaustive, showing abundance of scholarship, but avoiding, sometimes unduly, any parade of learning. The same characteristics mark their latest additions to the *Catena Classicorum*. Mr. G. A. Simcox's notes on Books III. and IV. of Thucydides contrast most curiously with those published in the same series seven years ago by Mr. Bigg on Books I. and II. The difference in the style of annotation is seen at a glance when the volumes are opened. Taking two passages *ad aperturam libri*, we find that Mr. Bigg gives twenty references and quotations, while Mr. Simcox gives but a single reference. The translations of the former are fairly numerous, those of the latter rare. Mr. Simcox's object seems to have been simply to elucidate Thucydides; and for this purpose he clears up difficulties in the historical or geographical allusions, and brings out the force of the language by frequent paraphrases. But it is evidently not his intention to treat Thucydides mainly as a means of teaching Greek. We can fancy as we read his notes that we are listening to the acute remarks of a thoroughly-competent Oxford "coach" preparing a pupil for the "schools." Of the kind of annotation which it professes to be, it is an excellent specimen.

The character of Mr. W. H. Simcox's notes on Tacitus is very similar. They are in no way a storehouse of facts about the language of the Silver Age, or the history of the time, as, for instance, Mr. Mayor would have made them. They are a series of scholarly and acute remarks on the difficulties which would present themselves to an ordinary reader of Tacitus. To such they will be undoubtedly very helpful; and in the inexplicable absence of any good English commentary on the Histories—a work at once difficult and popular—they will be heartily welcome. Mr. Simcox has an opportunity of showing himself at his best in the introduction, where he deals in three chapters with (1) the life and times, (2) the character and opinions, (3) the style and language, of Tacitus; and he does himself full justice. They are all excellent, and the first two surprisingly fresh, considering the well-worn nature of the theme.

Climate and Time in their Geological Relations: A Theory of Secular Changes of the Earth's Climate. By James Croll. London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co. 1875.

This is an extremely clever and powerfully reasoned treatise. Its author is master of his subject, and of the many collateral ones

essential to its discussion. But it somewhat detracts from the satisfaction one has in the contemplation of so much industrious and learned ingenuity that it merely presents with great plausibility, and sustains, by clever arguments, the *opinions* of its author. We are no nearer facts since this book was written than before. If ever the great question it discusses be settled by human investigation, it can only be by the accumulated researches of centuries. Geology has no greater difficulty to dispose of than "time," and the most difficult of the difficulties is the determination of the cause and the ages of glacial epochs. The well-read geologist will find pleasure in this book from the fact that it is controversial, and discusses directly or incidentally important facts to which the investigations of the past few years give current interest,—such as the source of ocean currents, concerning which it is well known that the author holds views entirely opposed to Dr. Carpenter; and probably the most startling incident at the session of the British Association, recently held at Bristol, was the declaration of Sir W. Thompson, after Mr. Croll and Dr. Carpenter had read controversial papers on this subject, in which each sought to strengthen his position by the use of some facts recently discovered on board the *Challenger*, that Mr. Croll was now proved finally wrong, and that Dr. Carpenter's position was irrefragable. The book also discusses the origin of changes in climate and the glacial epochs in geological history; the probable age and origin of the sun; a method of determining the mean thickness of the earth's sedimentary rocks; the effect on climate of a change in the obliquity of the ecliptic; theories of glacier motion; the nature of heat vibrations; the cause of regelation and other similar subjects.

On the principal question, the cause and age of the glacial epochs, Mr. Croll is obliged to build up a theory the constituents of which are largely imaginary. M. Adhémar was the first who pointed out that if an ice cap accumulated at either pole a displacement of the earth's centre of gravity would ensue. He supposed such a cap to accumulate to a thickness of sixty miles. This, he presumed, took place alternately upon each pole at intervals of ten thousand years, the reversal from one pole to another, accompanied by universal deluge. The last occasion was the Noachian Deluge, when the then (supposed) great northern ice cap collapsed, and the vast accumulations of water rushed to the south: but when the ten thousand years have elapsed the great catastrophic flood will rush back again from south to north!

The diversity of opinion existing on the subject, and the absurdity of authoritative dicta about the incompatibility of Scriptural chronology with "facts" as at present known, was strikingly illustrated in the geological section of the Bristol meet-

ing of the British Association. They had a "great glacial day" for the discussion. Dr. Ricketts affirmed that no polar ice-sheet *could* have been formed, for the glacier systems of North America and Europe would condense so large an amount of moisture from the air that none would be left for Polar ice. The Rev J. Gunn declared that the term "Glacial Period" was a mistake; the facts implied great oscillation of land, and not necessarily intense cold. Mr. Mackintosh affirmed that the work of transporting rock masses was no evidence of glaciation; coast ice was the chief agent. The general impression left on the mind of the meeting was the smallness and inadequacy of our knowledge of the subject.

Mr. Croll believes in a succession of vast ice-caps, and argues thus: The relative positions of the sun and the earth materially affect the climate of the latter. These positions, it is affirmed, are altered by the precession of the equinoxes and periodical changes in the eccentricity of the earth's orbit. At present our winter hemisphere is always nearest the sun; the earth travels fastest in this part of her orbit, and therefore the winter half-year is nearly eight days shorter than the summer. But the precession of the equinoxes has brought this about, and will again change it. Besides this, the orbit of the earth is also subject to a regular series of changes. Its eccentricity is at this time diminishing, and, dating from the year 1800 A.D., will continue to do so for 23,980 years. After this it will once more increase. The result of this great cyclic change will be that when the eccentricity is greatest that half of the globe which has its winter farthest from the sun (this at present being the southern hemisphere) will have its winter longer than its summer by no less than thirty-six days. This would reduce the sun's direct heat by one-fifth. This must make ice accumulate more in winter and reduce the chances of its disappearance in summer. Vast accumulations of ice and snow constantly reduce the temperature. There is no accumulation of heat—the sun's rays are reflected back into space; while in snow- and ice-covered regions thick fogs arise which prevent the action of the sun's rays.

We know now that the southern hemisphere is colder than the northern. Icebergs, for example, are seen in latitudes as low as 37° S. If, then, the eccentricity of the earth were at its greatest, instead of at its least—that is, if the southern winter were not eight, but thirty-six days longer than its summer—Mr. Croll believes that Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and what is now the temperate region of South America, would be covered with one vast ice-cap. This state of things must have, we are told, repeatedly happened, and its recurrence is in three maxima of one thousand years apart. These are to recur at the periods 800,000, 900,000, and 1,000,000 years asunder!

It is impossible not to admire the ingenuity of the theory; but it must be remembered that it *is* a theory, and nothing more.

The book is handsomely printed, well illustrated, and written in a cultured and careful manner.

The Creation: the Earth's Formation on Dynamical Principles in Accordance with the Mosaic Record and the Latest Scientific Discoveries. By Archibald Tucker Ritchie. London: Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1874.

WE regret, considering the object which this book has in view, to be compelled to say that it is a cumbrous and useless work. How it has ever reached a "fifth edition" is to us a mystery, unless the editions were extremely small. It contains nearly seven hundred pages of closely printed matter; its method of reasoning is apparently so severe as to have quite a mathematical aspect; but we have rarely seen such a total lack of real scientific knowledge, with such a calm assumption of it. If the author hopes to aid the cause of theology by the presentation of such "science," he is strangely mistaken. Those who know nothing of science and accept the reasoning in faith, will be merely building upon sand; whilst those for whom the book is ostensibly written—men of science—will never, we venture to affirm, except for the study of one more of the "curiosities of literature," get beyond the ninth page. On that page, and in the one before it, the author is discussing some very large biological questions. He begins by endeavouring to explain what it is to be possessed of life or the living principle (p. 8), and for *this*, in the year 1875, he goes for evidence to Baron Cuvier! Then comes the knotty question of the distinction between the animal and vegetable kingdoms. He admits that there is a difficulty, but he is prepared to meet it, and he gives a series of animal "qualifications," and affirms that all that are not possessed of these are vegetable. The first is, "*Animals are possessed, in some form or other, of an alimentary cavity or intestinal canal!*" In reading this we felt that it must be simply a typographical blunder; and only gave up this view when we had read the remainder of the reputed animal characteristics. It seemed incredible that such a statement should be made by an author claiming knowledge of the "latest scientific discoveries." The facts are absolutely the reverse of this. An immense proportion of the entire sub-kingdom PROTOZOA are absolutely without *a trace* of either "alimentary cavity" or "intestinal canal." This is absolutely true of the whole class *Gregarinidae*. It is true universally of the class *Rhizopoda;* the Amœba is simply a motile lump of vital jelly, without any preference as to what part of its body it digests with, employing that part which is nearest to its prey and most convenient to

itself. The *Foraminifera*, one and all, are without a trace of cavity or tube of any kind; they are mere specks of sarcode, with the power to secrete carbonate of lime, and build exquisite shells. The *Radiolaria* are the same, and the most recent view of the *spongidæ*—that they are composed ultimately of flagellate monads—places them in the same category. Thus, at least three-fifths of the whole of one sub-kingdom of the animal world is not possessed of what the author of this book authoritatively declares to be the first distinguishing feature of an animal as opposed to a vegetable.

The next canon is that "*They* (animals) *are endowed with a circulating system.*" And even if this were universally true, so are vegetables. In *Valisneria spiralis*, and in *Chara*, cyclosis is as visible under the microscope as the circulation in the web of a frog's foot. But it is not even true universally of animals. What circulation have the *Gregarinidae*, or the *Amoebae*, or the *Foraminifera*? Nay, what circulation, in the proper sense of the word, have the *Hydrozoa* or the *Actinozoa*?

The third dictum is still more remarkable. It affirms of animals, that besides the three elements—oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon, *which both plants and animals contain, the latter have a fourth, namely, azote or nitrogen, which enters more largely into their composition.* Has our author never heard of "protoplasm," or the physical basis of life? Does he not know that a definite albuminoid matter, with a fixed chemical composition, constitutes the basis of the living matter of plants and animals alike? Surely before a sixth edition of this remarkable volume is published he will have acquainted himself with the "latest scientific facts" of biological chemistry.

We are told, in the fourth place, that animals "possess the power of respiration." Does this mean that they universally possess organs of respiration? If so it is as absolutely unfounded a statement as all the preceding; and if it does not mean this, and intends to assert merely a general interchange of gases, this has an application quite as complete to plants as to animals; and in the lower grades the animal and the plant behave, in this particular, precisely alike.

"And lastly," says our author, "*Perhaps the superaddition of sensibility to the common living principle is requisite to complete the characteristic property of animals.*" How sensibility completes their characteristic *property* we fail to see. The statement has no distinct meaning; we have been dealing with what we suppose the author would call *properties*. Which does it complete? But this is of small importance: is sensibility confined to the animal world? Have plants no sensibility? Mr. Darwin has recently shown that a particle of hair, the eight-thousandth part of an inch in length, and weighing the seventy-eighth-thousandth part of a grain, if dropped upon a leaf of the common sun-dew is quite enough to

cause contraction of the tentacles; while the thirty-millionth of a grain of phosphate of ammonia will do the same. The author must have heard of the Mimosa, or "sensitive plant." In the savannahs of Tropical America, where it abounds, it is known that the distant sound of a horse's hoof will cause a whole area of this beautiful plant to droop and contract its leaves. Electricity will kill plants; narcotics will paralyze them. What stronger proof do we need that they share with animals this singular power? Every canon, then, by which the author of this book would distinguish the vegetable from the animal kingdom is absolutely without the shadow of a foundation, and this at once makes the entire book, with all its apparent rigidity of reasoning, simply useless. For we have not selected an isolated example; we might take many more, and show, with equal clearness, the fallacy of this author's "facts." The whole treatise aims at showing that geological facts and the Mosaic record (literally interpreted) may be reconciled by believing that there was a time when the earth, although moving round the sun, did not move upon its axis; but that *light*—of the real nature of which, as revealed by "recent science," the author has not the most remote conception—by some extraordinary "expansive" power which it is supposed to possess, set the earth whirling on its axis, that cataclysms ensued, and that the whole labyrinth of geological fact can thus be explained, and Scripture vindicated. We are sorry to be compelled to characterise a book with such an object in this way; but with the eyes of the scientific world upon such books, and upon the theological reception that is accorded to them, we are bound, in the interests of theological truth, to declare our total disapprobation of it almost from beginning to end.

The Origin of the Stars, and the Causes of their Motions and their Light. By Jacob Ennis, A.M., Principal of the Scientific and Classical Institute, Philadelphia, &c., &c. First London, from the Fourth American Edition. London: Trübner and Company 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill. 1876.

THE wonderful discoveries made by our cousins across the Atlantic from time to time are truly amazing; and we should not be surprised if, before long, some citizen of the United States, with as long a string of honorary additions to his style as Mr. Jacob Ennis boasts of, were to suddenly wake up and "discover" that the earth revolves round the sun, or that the blood circulates. *The Origin of the Stars* is at once amusing and instructive: amusing by reason of its gigantic immodesty, instructive, first, as to the strange intellectual condition (for such a

"go-a-head" nation as our cousins) which can tolerate or be taken in by the assumptions of "discoveries" long settled or upset; and secondly, as a collection of facts in astronomical science. Mr. Ennis claims to have discovered not only that the force which originated and set in motion the whole of the astral system was gravitation, but also that the cause of stellar light and heat is chemical action. Of course, on the first point we have Laplace and his latter-day followers over again; and we should imagine that the great speculator himself and all his followers, happening to come after Newton had discovered the law of gravitation, have taken as a matter of course that that law was at the root of their theory, whether such theory be true or false. At all events, that highly ingenious scientific speculator, Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his Essay on Nebular Hypotheses (printed over and over again both in England and in America), clearly refers the whole assumed nebular process to the law of gravitation; so that in bringing forward a heap of calculations and parallel circumstances to support this theory Mr. Ennis has simply made no discovery at all, whatever he may have done to support or confuse the theory itself. Whether that be true or false is wide of the question; but at all events, Mr. Ennis has no claim whatever to the discovery. We are glad to see that he admits the superiority of Newton to himself on one score, namely, that of mathematics. Mr. Ennis confesses he is but a very ordinary mathematician; and as Newton is likely for the present to be regarded as superior to Mr. Ennis in the capacity of discoverer also, we shall not yet have the pleasure of congratulating our cousins on the invention of a process for growing Sir Isaacs like mushrooms.

A Fine Old English Gentleman, exemplified in the Life and Character of Lord Collingwood. A Biographical Study. By William Davies, Author of "The Pilgrimage of the Tiber," etc. Sampson Low. 1875.

OUR public services have always been conspicuous for the subordination of private feeling to public duty. That it has been so is a credit to the national character, and has also been greatly conducive to our national success. Other nations have not always been so happy in this respect. The break-up of the French Empire in India, for instance, is a notable example of the house divided against itself. The chief reason of our exemption doubtless is that, along with some inevitable grumbling, it has usually been a point of honour among subordinates to work harmoniously together with their chiefs. Thus the good spirit has been fostered: and those who have learned to obey have, when the time came, been fit to command.

Cases, therefore, like that which was made public in *The Memoir of the Life of Admiral Sir Edward Codrington, with Letters, &c., &c.*, by his daughter, Lady Bourchier, 1873, are as rare as they are unedifying. Still more seldom are the aspersions sometimes indiscreetly cast by juniors on their seniors laid open to the world by the still greater indiscretion of biographers. Mr. Davies takes the very best way of meeting the charges contained in Sir Edward Codrington's letters, by simply mentioning them, and then allowing the life of Lord Collingwood to speak for itself. Such a life, detailed as it is with loving care in the volume before us, does speak for itself, and proves that the title of *Fine Old English Gentleman*, which Mr. Davies has chosen, is thoroughly deserved.

The Collingwoods were an old border family in Northumberland. The Admiral's great-grandfather lost all for Charles I., and another branch, the Collingwoods of Eslington, were ruined in the rebellion of 1715. The name occurs in the *Border Minstrelsy* and the *Jacobite Ballads*. Thus in *Derwentwater's Goodnight*, the Earl says:

> An' fare thee well, George Collingwood,
> Since fate has put us down;
> If thou and I have lost our lives,
> King James has lost his crown.

The family, thus impoverished, settled at Newcastle-on-Tyne; and there, in September 1750, Cuthbert, the future admiral, the eldest of three sons, was born. He was educated under the Rev. Hugh Moises, at the same school with Lord Eldon and Lord Stowell, the former of whom used to speak of him as having been "a pretty and gentle boy." At eleven he was sent to sea under the care of his cousin, Captain, afterwards Admiral Brathanite. Mr. Davies gives the well-known anecdote of his heart sinking when he went on board, his mother's tears still wet on his cheek, at the utter unfriendliness and unhomelikeness of everything around him. He sat down and wept; and when the kindly first-lieutenant came and cheered him up, the boy went to his box and offered his new friend a big piece of plum-cake that his mother had packed up for him. As our author well says, "the touching story indicates what lay at the foundation of his future greatness, simplicity and nobleness of character"—it is Collingwood all over.

Strange that such a nature, so full of tenderness, so yearning for home-life and its affections, should by circumstances have been so completely debarred from these! Of Lord Collingwood's fifty years in the navy, forty-four were passed in active service. Once he was twenty-two months at sea without dropping anchor! He was nearly thirty before he got his second epaulette. In 1776

he first met Nelson, both of the future heroes being under the command of Sir P. Parker. For some little time as Nelson got successive promotion, Collingwood took his place. Of this portion of his career (up to 1786), uneventful as far as "glory" is concerned, but rich in that schooling which brings out fortitude and patience and foresight and self-government, Mr. Davies gives an eloquent summary, justly attributing Lord Collingwood's future greatness to this long training, not only in sea-ways and sea-life, but also in the higher qualities of mind and soul. During this time, he and Nelson became close friends. "What an amiable and good man Coll. is," writes Nelson in 1784, "all the rest are geese." And again in 1786, off Martinique: "This station has not been over pleasant; had it not been for Collingwood, it would have been the most disagreeable I ever saw." These feelings were fully reciprocated; Collingwood writes in 1792: "My regard for you, my dear Nelson, my veneration for your character, I hope will never lessen."

The injustice which seems to have been Collingwood's lot in life, began in 1794, when, while others, his inferiors, received honours of all kinds, he was left wholly unrewarded for his share in Lord Howe's victory of 1st June. The whole fleet was surprised and indignant that his services should be so slighted; Pakenham, the Commander of the *Invincible*, to whom Collingwood had given way when he had crippled the ship opposed to him, himself seeking a fresh adversary, wrote: "If Collingwood has not deserved a medal neither have I, for we were together the whole day." The testimony of Rear-Admiral Sir G. Bowyer, who fell wounded into his arms early in the day, is still stronger. At the battle of Cape St. Vincent (1797) Nelson's words were: "Here comes the *Excellent* (Collingwood's seventy-four gun ship), which is as good as two added to our number." Of this engagement he was certainly the hero; his ship seemed to bear a charm of safety, and he passed from foe to foe (almost all over 100 guns) leaving each as soon as her flag was hauled down to go in quest of fresh prey. His engagement with the Spanish Admiral's ship, the *Santissima Trinidad*, with four decks and 132 guns—"such a ship," says he, "as I never saw before," is as remarkable as anything in naval history. It is characteristic of the man, who just before battle remarked: "Just about now our wives will be going to church," and who, describing the engagement to his wife, showed where his heart was by saying, with one of his usual "home-touches:" "We were not farther from her than the length of our garden," that he refused the St. Vincent medal while that for Lord Howe's victory was withheld from him. As firm as he was tender, he wrote: "I feel that I was then improperly passed over; and to receive a distinction now would be to acknowledge the propriety of that injustice."

Both medals were afterwards sent to him with a sort of apology for the detention of the former.

During the mutiny, the gravity of which is too much slurred over in our popular histories, his conduct was beyond all praise. He would not allow the word to be heard on his ship. "Mutiny, sir, mutiny in my ship," he would say to an officer making such a charge. "If it can have come to that, it must be my fault and the fault of every one of the officers." "Send them to Collingwood and he'll bring them to order," Lord St. Vincent would say when there were any more than usually refractory spirits. Yet this was done almost without severe physical means; it was the triumph of moral force, of inflexible resolution. Here is a case in point: "A seaman was sent from the *Romulus*, who had pointed a gun shotted to the muzzle at the quarter-deck, and match in hand had vowed he would fire unless he received a promise that no punishment should be inflicted upon him. 'I know your character well,' said Collingwood to him when he came on board the *Excellent*, 'and I have such confidence in my men that I am sure I should hear in an hour of anything you tried to do. If you behave well I'll treat you like the rest, and not notice what happened in another ship; but if you endeavour to excite mutiny, mark me well, I will instantly heave you up in a cask and throw you into the sea.' This man became a good and obedient sailor." Flogging was then universal; men got even the incredible number of 400 lashes; Collingwood never liked it; he kept a register of his floggings, though no official record was then required, during the greater part of a year. Twelve men suffered at different times from six to twelve lashes. Later in life he almost wholly gave up this mode of punishment. "I cannot for the life of me," he writes, "comprehend the religion of an officer who prays all one day and flogs his men all the next." One day his chief officer, seeing some men "scamping" their work, said: "I wish I was captain for your sakes." By-and-by Collingwood touched him on the shoulder and said: "Pray, Clavell, what would you have done if you'd been captain?" "I'd have flogged them well, sir." "No, you would not, Clavell: no, you would not; I know you better." Often, when a midshipman brought a complaint of a sailor, he would order the man to be punished next day, and meanwhile would point out to the youth that perhaps the fault was partly his own; anyhow that it was a very painful thing for a man much older to be disgraced, and would propose that he should request the man's pardon. Instead of flogging, he substituted the now universal punishment, removal from mess, watering grog, and extra duty. His care of his men was extreme, and was duly appreciated. Off Toulon, in 1808, he writes with just pride: "I've been long at sea, with little to eat: yet, though we never get fresh beef or

a vegetable, I've not one sick man in my ship." He maintained this healthy condition mainly by keeping his men in good spirits and in a wholesome frame of mind. He was always courteous to them: "If you don't know a man's name (he would say to his officers) call him 'sailor,' not 'you, sir,' and such offensive appellations." No wonder the crews of his successive ships called him "father." To his superiors he could, on occasion, make a strong protest. Off Cadiz, his ship was signalled for and directed to alter her course five or six times, and then a lieutenant was asked for. Collingwood went too aboard the Admiral's ship. As he walked the deck with Lord St. Vincent and Sir R. Calder, he was handed an order for two bags of onions. "Bless me," said he, "is this the service, my lord? Is this the service, Sir Robert? Has the *Excellent's* signal been made five or six times for two bags of onions? Man my boat, sir, and let us go on board again." And though pressed to stay to dinner, he refused.

That Nelson should have gone to win the victory of the Nile, leaving his old friend "the humiliating work of stopping the market boats, the poor cabbage-carriers of St. Lucas," is not to Nelson's credit. We know, however, they were side by side at Trafalgar; his refusal to allow Codrington to hurry home after which victory was the ground of the bitter remarks published by Lady Bourchier.

The saddest part of the Life is the weary waiting in the Mediterranean, under pressure of grievous ill-health. Time after time Lord Collingwood petitioned the Admiralty, and privately begged Lord Musgrave to recall him; but "no one else could do the delicate diplomatic work which he had long been managing there," and his life was sacrificed to the selfishness of those in office at home. He died as a Christian gentleman should die, as the ship's surgeon testifies, "I did not believe it possible that anyone on such an occasion could have behaved so nobly."

We wish we had room for extracts from the letters given by Mr. Davies in this most readable book (a book which should be in every midshipman's hands). They all show "how sound to the core and how rich his heart was in every good principle."

English History for the Use of Public Schools. By the Rev. J. Franck Bright, M.A. Period I. Mediæval Monarchy, A.D. 449—1485. Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1875.

THE object and character of this work are clearly stated in the preface: "It is intended to be a useful school book, and advances no higher pretensions." It is a singularly clear, correct, and well-arranged narrative of the long course of English mediæval history,

making no demand of previous knowledge on the part of the reader. Written as it is with constant reference to the school-room only, it hardly challenges the almost inevitable comparison with the brilliant pages of Mr. Green which, whatever their pretension, are altogether more suited to, and we can scarcely doubt were intended mainly for, the instruction and amusement of the general public.

The present volume—on Mediæval Monarchy—is the first of three into which the history will be divided; the two succeeding volumes will be entitled Personal Monarchy, 1485—1688, and Constitutional Monarchy, 1688 to the present time. Mr. Bright at once plunges into his subject. As will be seen from his division of periods for the three volumes, and as indeed he expressly states in his preface, he lays far more stress upon the later than upon the earlier periods. We have so much light, and such excellent text-books, for the times anterior to the Norman Conquest that we cannot regret that Mr. Bright should pass over them hastily to deal with the less known or less illustrated fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but it is a little startling to find oneself landed already at the end of four pages at the close of the Heptarchy and in the midst of the Danish invasions. And it is disappointing to find one so free as Mr. Bright generally is from the affectations and prejudices of the now dominant school of history carrying his Teutonism so far as, of set purpose, entirely to ignore the Roman occupation of Britain.

From the time of the Conquest the value and significance of the work are much greater. Two very clear and condensed chapters are given to the social progress of the nation, but in this respect there is hardly any comparison to be made with Mr. Green's full and interesting treatment. It is in the political history of the period, above all in the investigation of the relations held towards one another by the different forces in the nation at various times and in the analysis of the constitution of those forces that Mr. Bright spends his strength. It has often been remarked how aristocratic the whole course of English history has been, how the course of events has almost always depended on the attitude assumed by the aristocracy, but to the character and the elements of the aristocracy at different epochs little attention has been directed by our text-books. While every personal trait, every detail in the lives of the successive kings is narrated, there is frequently no mention of the names even of the great families by whose persevering policy the English constitutional system was built up. Within his narrow limits it was impossible for Mr. Bright adequately to work out this line, but he has fully recognised the importance of understanding the attitude successively adopted by the nobility as a whole, and of accounting for the different lines of policy of the various great houses, and he has

prefixed to his work a series of tables giving the genealogy of the most prominent of our mediæval families. As this is the feature of the book which will be most noteworthy by the historical student and general reader, we may dwell rather longer upon it.

The changes through which the English aristocracy has passed since the Conquest have been, of course, incessant, but there are four phases in its character which are specially distinct. They may be called the feudal and foreign, the constitutional and national, the chivalrous, and the phase of the aristocracy of wealth.

I.—1068—1173. After striving in vain to secure his throne by other means, the Conqueror was compelled, by the successive revolts of the English, to strengthen to the utmost the hands of his most trustworthy nobles, and to introduce into England in a modified form the local authority and practical independence enjoyed by the great feudatories of the Continent. On all the most important frontiers and in all positions of peculiar strategic importance great barons were placed with almost dictatorial powers. The house of Breteuil ruled at Hereford, the house of Meschines at Chester, the Montgomeries at Shrewsbury, the Beaumonts at Leicester, the Mowbrays on the Scotch borders. Their number was small, but they acted generally firmly together and drew support from their Norman estates and foreign alliances. Their character was essentially foreign; their object was irresponsible authority and local independence. The internal political history of England for the century after the Conquest is the history of their long struggle to carry out their objects. Against them were united all the other forces of the nation—the Crown, the Church, the minor nobility who had no hope of independence for themselves and needed protection and looked to the Crown for advancement, and the people. The struggle ended in the destruction or humiliation of all the great families of the Conquest. One after another they rose and were crushed, the Breteuils by the Conqueror, the Mowbrays by Rufus, the Montgomeries by Henry I. In 1173 a last desperate effort was made to overthrow the vigorous national centralising policy of Henry II. and his ministers, but, with the support of the Church, the people, and the ministerial nobility, Henry proved to be irresistibly strong, and the feudal party, as such, thenceforth disappears.

II.—1173—1307. All hope of independence of the central authority being destroyed, the barons turned their efforts towards rendering that authority as little oppressive as possible. A new nobility—individually less powerful but more numerous than the feudal nobility—had grown up in England, deriving their influence chiefly from the delegation of royal powers and from the grant of lands from the Crown. They had no estates in Normandy; their temper was essentially English. They became the leaders of a great

national league of nobility, Church, and people, the object of which was to set bounds to the despotic authority of the king and to save England from foreign influences. Chief among them were the Marshalls, Bohuns, Veres, Lacys; and most of the families which had constituted the old feudal party—such as those of Beaumont, Clare, and Bigod—united with them; although the foreign tendencies of a few of the old feudal families—those of Meschines, Mortimer, and Warrenne—were so strong that they acted rather with the king and his foreign favourites than with the national and constitutional party. After a struggle of a century the nobility had accomplished both their aims; their rights against the Crown had been ascertained and foreign influences had been put an end to.

III.—1307—1471. Having limited the royal authority and secured the practical possession of power to their own body, the nobility henceforth ceased to have any policy in common. The object of each noble came to be to secure his own share in the honours and emoluments of government. Their political action altogether deteriorates, becomes self-seeking and factious. The great families of Magna Charta—the Marshalls, Bohuns, Bigods, Clares—were dying out. A few—the Beauchamps, Fitz Alans, Mowbrays, Percys, Nevilles—maintained still to a certain extent the characteristics of an earlier epoch, possessing great local influence and generally adopting the tradition policy of opposition to the Crown and to foreign influences. It was they who supported John of Gaunt in his opposition to the Church, and who combined against and eventually deposed Richard II. But the typical noble of the period is the brilliant knight-errant of comparatively new family—the Staffords, De la Poles, Montacutes, Hollands—the companion-in-arms of Edward III., the participator in the daring schemes and afterwards in the misfortunes of Richard II., deriving importance from his personal qualities and his wealth, differing entirely from the older families in that he regarded his lands as a means of raising money rather than men, his one occupation to follow war for the sake of personal distinction and of the ransom of captives. After disturbing the peace of England by constant meaningless civil wars and revolutions, this chivalrous nobility put an end to its power by what nearly came to being an act of political suicide, in that terrible faction fight which culminated at Towton and Barnet.

IV.—Of the nobility of wealth that slowly arose to take very inadequately the place of the old families which perished in the Wars of the Roses, Mr. Bright has no occasion to speak in this volume.

It seemed worth while to dwell at some length on this subject because it is the most peculiarly distinctive feature of the book, but its value to the general reader as well as to the school-boy consists

not in any strikingly new views or original treatment of English mediæval history, but in the giving a thoroughly clear and by no means meagre account, the accuracy of which may be confidently relied upon, of the development of the English nation in all its more important phases prior to the accession of the Tudors. With such a choice before them as the histories of Mr. Green and Mr. Bright schoolmasters may, it is hoped, be confidently relied upon to place no other books in the hands of their older scholars, and of the two we should certainly say that Mr. Bright's is the better suited for the school-room.

History of Modern English Law. By Sir Roland Knyvet Wilson, Bart., M.A. Rivingtons: London, Oxford and Cambridge.

Sir Henry Maine has classified under three heads the various devices by which the strictness of archaic law is modified to meet the wants of modern society:—I. Legal fictions, preserving the letter of the old law, but evading its spirit. II. The appeal to another system, such as that of our equity courts, which, by virtue of a higher authority, inherent in its doctrines, may amend and override the harshness of the law; and III. Legislation. Sometimes all these modes of altering the laws are in operation at the same time, mutually supplementing one another; but in England, at the close of last century, the rules acted upon by the courts of equity were fast becoming as inflexible and as incapable of being adapted to changed circumstances as those of the courts of law. At the same time the unprecedented development of the nation rendered it absolutely necessary that great modifications should be introduced into its legal system. The consequence was that during the past half-century legislative changes have been carried out with a rapidity previously unknown in the history of our own or any other legal system.

It is the history of this great revolution in the rules which govern our conduct as citizens that Sir R. Wilson has undertaken briefly to write. He divides his work into three parts. The first gives a brief *résumé* of the law as it was in the days of Blackstone, with all its inconsistencies and shortcomings. He then goes on to describe the men by whose influence, and the way in which, they were remedied, and particularly the father of modern jurisprudence, Jeremy Bentham. Great as was the influence of Bentham, it would seem that Sir R. Wilson has somewhat overrated it. By his consistent and painstaking application of the Utilitarian theory to the subject of jurisprudence, Bentham has exercised a profound influence over all subsequent legislation, but he can hardly be looked upon as the propelling force that set on foot so great a movement. The exigencies of

society imperatively required that the work should be done, and the most crying abuses must have been, in any case, remedied; but the direction of the movement fell mainly into the hands of Bentham's professed disciples, Romilly, Brougham, and others, and his stamp is impressed upon it throughout. The third part of the volume gives a summary of the changes that have been made in the different branches of law, and is arranged similarly to the first part, so that it is possible to see at a glance what development has taken place in any department from the days of Blackstone to the present time.

The ground taken by this volume has scarcely been trodden before, and it must have been a work of the utmost difficulty to give anything like unity of interest to such a variety of topics; but Sir R. Wilson throws himself with such strong feeling into the subject that he fairly awakens one's attention and interest at once. His style, though anything but classic, is full of life and vigour, and his illustrations, sometimes grotesque, generally humorous, are always to the point. To have breathed life into such a subject is a great thing, but we cannot but regret that a work, in many respects so good, should not be better. The style sometimes becomes very slipshod, without any compensating liveliness, and there is great need of compression in parts. Still it is a valuable contribution to a study that has been hitherto neglected, and should prove of interest and service to many others than the legal student.

Moral Causation. Patrick P. Alexander, M.A. Blackwood. 1875.

This volume is a reprint, with additions, of a reply made by Mr. Alexander to Mill's criticisms of *his* criticisms of Mill's chapter on the freedom of the will in his "Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy." Readers will probably think that the stage of polemics has before this been reached at which it were to be wished there were some editorial or censorial power to say that "this controversy must end here;" especially when the subject of it is the freedom of the will. We cannot be surprised that Mr. Alexander has nothing new to say on *that* subject: had he any new or striking way of putting old arguments, and were his style pleasing and clear, we might have been glad, even at this distance of time, to read his reply to Mr. Mill, provided it had been divested of its detailed controversial form. But to read through his arguments and minute criticisms of criticisms of criticisms, written in a style which is stupidly personal without being telling, and slipshod without being easy, is, to us at least, wearisome and vexatious. Mr. Alexander justifies himself for what even he feels to be impertinences of style thus:—

"Writing pretty much to amuse myself, I choose to do so as I go along, and this primary object attained, it is my whim, perhaps, to be a little more indifferent than I should be as to whether, in thus amusing *myself*, I may not be giving offence to here and there a solemn and serious-minded reader."

We are very glad that Mr. Alexander has succeeded in amusing himself, we can only say he has not amused us. Perhaps it may amuse some of similar taste with himself to read the facetious remarks about Mr. Mill's nose (p. 21), but we will not insult our readers by supposing that they have sufficient curiosity to wish to see them transcribed. Specimens of the writer's taste in other matters may be found in his use of such words as "flawed" and "monstered," in his heading the pages of his ethical discussion with "cast-off clothes of Hume fit Mr. Bain ill,"—"Shockingly ill, in fact,"—"Shockingly," and in the opening of his reply to an argument of Mill's about Ravaillac thus:—

"But let us suppose a case. Suppose Ravaillac to have had a pretty wife, or—seeing he was a priest, let me rather say a pretty mistress—(it may be hoped that in a Protestant country this suggestion will be well received, as certifying the piety of the writer, and suppose the gallant Henry to have got his eye upon her," &c. (p. 58.)

We think that such a writer, who has no valuable argument to induce the reader to tolerate his flippancy and vulgarity, might have been content with the verdict passed upon the first edition of this book which he candidly quotes (Preface, p. iv.):—"The success of this work was, sooth to say, not much. I am not aware that anyone ever either bought or read it; and the notices of it in the press were few, slight, and, for the most part, rather contemptuous." We are sorry Mr. Alexander cannot learn from experience, and for our part shall be surprised if the judgment on the appeal case be not a confirmation of that previously given, and the sentence more severe.

Ernst Rietschel, the Sculptor, and the Lessons of His Life. Autobiography and Memoir. By Andreas Oppermann. Translated by Mrs. G. Sturge. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.

THE autobiography is the best part of this book, telling as it does, in artless fashion, the oft-told story of a genius in humble life, the hardships of fortune, and "man's unconquerable mind." The story may contain few new features, but the simplicity of the narrative imparts a charm of its own; and, brief though it is, it leaves a distinct and pleasing impression on the mind. The second part supplements Rietschel's account of himself, and furnishes a tolerable account of the sculptor's works. This part

has been considerably abridged by the translator, and, we should judge, wisely, as the book, is long enough for English readers. There is no distinctive merit about the memoir itself; the translation, which is by the hand of the lady who translated Strauss' *Ulrich von Hutten*, succeeds in reproducing, in natural English style, a thoroughly genuine picture.

Dickinson's Theological Quarterly. Vol. I. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1875.

THE first complete volume of this valuable journal is now before us, and we heartily congratulate both editor and publisher upon the success of what was a somewhat novel undertaking. Theological readers of almost every shade of opinion, and of every stage of proficiency, will find much to interest and help them in this new Theological Quarterly. Amongst the contributors to this first volume are the late Professor Tischendorf, Professor Luthardt, Dr. Rothe, of Heidelberg, Dr. Pressensé, Professor Godet, of Neuchatel, Dr. M'Cosh, Dr. Noah Porter, Dr. Woolsey, President Sturtevant, and Dr. W. M. Thomson. These names will sufficiently guarantee the tone and standard of writing attained. If, in addition to German and American scholars, the editor can secure the services of English divines of similar standing to those we have named, the value of this Quarterly will be further enhanced.

The Homes and Haunts of Luther. By John Stoughton, D.D. London: The Religious Tract Society.

THE plan and the execution of this life of Luther are alike excellent. It was a labour of love to Dr. Stoughton to follow the footsteps of the great Reformer, visiting the many cities, castles, churches, and monasteries that are associated with his memory. The narrative includes all the main facts and incidents of Luther's life, described in connection with the scenes where they took place. The illustrations are very good. The view of the cathedral at Worms, of the castle of Marburg, and of streets in Wittenberg, Eisenach, and Coburg are particularly charming. There is also a good print of Luther's study in the Wartburg, accompanied by the following description: "It is rather a small room, now wainscotted, for the most part, with a portion of the original wall in plaster. Near this part stands a Dutch stove, dug out of the castle rubbish, and a bedstead in which Luther is said to have slept in the castle of Gleichen. The table at which he wrote has been carried away in chips, but in its place is found another, at which, we are told, he sat as a boy in his father's house. Over it is his portrait by Cranach the elder, with portraits of his parents

by Cranach the younger. A framed autograph letter by Luther hangs on the wall; under it are his father's mining lamp and the money-box which the Eisenach schoolboy carried about on his begging excursions. A joint of a whale's backbone, used as his footstool, lies on the floor, and a piece of the beech at Altenstein, where he was captured, is also preserved. Chests, with Bibles of Luther's translation, and other books, complete the furniture of this interesting room, where, in the guise of a squire, with his hair and beard grown very long, and attended by 'two noble youths,' he spent so many months. On the plastered portion of the wall is shown the spot where he threw the inkstand at the devil." After giving an account of Luther's bodily and spiritual sufferings during that period, more than sufficient to account for the frenzy in which he threw his inkstand at what appeared to him a palpable foe, Dr. Stoughton adds: "At all events, Luther, in that room, did throw plenty of ink at the devil; for there he wrote against auricular confession, the abuse of the mass, and clerical monastic vows; there also he composed expositions of certain psalms, finished his declaration of the Magnificat, began to write his Church Homilies, and worked hard upon his translation of the New Testament."

The reader will be interested to see at the end of the volume a facsimile of the original words and music, of "Ein' Feste Burg," dating from the year 1530, and recently discovered.

Sonnets of the Sacred Year. By the Rev. S. J. Stone, M.A. London: The Religious Tract Society.

Mr. Stone has written a series of poems on some subject connected with the services of each Sunday and chief festival of the Christian year. It is not an unkindly criticism to say that this is a task which Keble has rendered very difficult for all who come after him. To avoid any seeming plagiarism on the plan of the "Christian Year," as well as to disclaim comparison with it, the author has chosen the sonnet as the measure for the whole series. Mr. Stone's verse is always devout and thoughtful, and if we say that on the whole he has accomplished his self-appointed task with tolerable success, it is saying a good deal. To produce a series of sixty sonnets of high poetic merit would try the powers of a master poet.

We select the sonnet for the sixth Sunday after Trinity as a fair specimen of the writer's tone of thought and power of expression.

> "The feet of Israel pressed the living sod—
> The margin of that deep baptismal wave
> Wherein their ancient foe had found a grave
> Beneath the mediator's lifted rod—

To stand or move, a nation born to God:
Dead to an evil past, henceforth alive
To see the Lord's salvation, or to strive
On the war-track their steadfast Leader trod.
Alas! how few endured! they turned again
In heart to Egypt, vexed his righteous soul
In despite of his tender stern control—
Received the manifold grace of God in vain.
On us the ends are come! Pray, Christian, pray,
Lest thou, like these, i' the end be cast away."

The History of Protestantism. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D. Illustrated. Vol. I. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

THE first volume of Dr. Wylie's *History of Protestantism* amply fulfils the promise with which its early numbers began. It is written in a clear, readable style, not without the enthusiasm that its great subject deserves, and we heartily trust that it will awaken kindred feeling in the minds of its many readers. We need not say how entirely we disclaim the spirit of disparagement and contempt with which some modern religionists affect to regard the Reformation. To us nothing appears to recoil more completely upon its authors than the abuse which certain English writers have not been ashamed to pour upon the dear and honoured name of Luther. Messrs. Cassell are doing good service to the cause of religious truth and liberty in publishing a history of Protestantism, which, from its literary and pictorial merits, cannot fail to be widely read. The illustrations are abundant, and many of them of extraordinary merit.

Life of Robert Gray, Bishop of Cape Town, and Metropolitan of Africa. Edited by his son, the Rev. Charles Gray, M.A., with Portrait and Map. In Two Volumes. London: Rivingtons. 1876.

THE inordinate length to which this biography extends is chiefly due to the desire of Bishop Gray's friends to give a final account of the ecclesiastical suits and controversies with which his name is associated. Outside the Anglican Church Bishop Gray's name is hardly known, except in connection with the case of Dr. Colenso and the Bishopric of Natal. These volumes contain the entire history of the costly, cumbersome, and unsatisfactory processes through which it was sought to purge the Anglican Church in South Africa from the great scandal of its heretical bishop. Let the reader who has an appetite for this kind of literature, betake himself to the abundant supply here provided. To us the blasts and counterblasts of episcopal authority, the timid boldness of Convocation, the appeals to the Privy Council, the curious com-

binations of religious zeal, party warfare, and political caution, are anything but edifying or pleasant.

On the primary merits of the case, that is, with regard to the heretical character of Dr. Colenso's writings, the judgment of the great majority of Christian people throughout the world was unanimous, and the sympathy of all the Churches was with the Bishop of Capetown in his distressing position as colleague, or rather ecclesiastical superior, of a notorious impugner of the faith. But the ecclesiastical and political considerations by which the issue was complicated, were by no means matters of faith, including questions on which both sentiment and opinion will be found to differ widely. Hence many within the Anglican Church, as well as numbers belonging to other communities, were unable to go heartily with Dr. Gray in the course of action which resulted in there being two bishops of Natal, one sustained in his position by the decision of the Privy Council, and the other by his ecclesiastic peers and superior. We are fully able to appreciate the unselfishness, the strong sense of duty, the regard for the Church's purity which characterised Dr. Gray throughout the whole painful Colenso case, as indeed in all his public conduct; but, on the evidence of the letters and journals now published, we cannot form an equally favourable opinion of his judgment and discretion. Dr. Gray's ecclesiastical principles were altogether too high to be carried out in a Church so closely related to the State as is the Anglican Church, without inevitable collision with the law. An instance of this is reported at length in the first volume. A certain Mr. Long, a clergyman in the Bishop's diocese, declined to obey his summons to a Diocesan Synod, or to call his parishioners together to elect a lay delegate. For his contumacy the Bishop finally deprived Mr. Long, and appointed another clergyman to take charge of his parish. Mr. Long obtained an interdict from the Supreme Court to prevent the Bishop disturbing him in his church. Thence sprang a trial, whose result was that the Supreme Court gave a verdict in the Bishop's favour. This judgment was, on appeal, reversed by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, the Committee deciding that the suspension and deprivation of Mr. Long could not be justified.

Dr. Gray's biographer is guilty of a serious breach of good taste to say the least, when, in the report of the judgment delivered by Lord Kingsdown, he interpolates this sentence: "The learned speaker went on to make some observations, which must have struck everyone cognisant with the case as altogether mistaken and unfair, concerning the bishop's course of proceeding, &c." It is perhaps unfortunate that a decision at law cannot often give equal pleasure to both parties to a suit, but to charge the judges with being mistaken and unfair is happily not common amongst disappointed suitors in this country.

Dr. Gray allowed himself to write of the judgment in the following terms: "The judgment itself is a mean one. . . . But it is more than mean—it is in many ways unjust. . . . The judgment I consider a shabby one. . . . I trace throughout this whole judgment a very decided animus. To me personally the judges have been most unjust . . . they are to my mind an indication of that want of fairness and that dislike of spiritual authority which I think is strongly marked throughout this judgment. I believe a more grossly unfair decision was never given." If in his first irritation Dr. Gray could not help using such language as this in his private letters, excuses may be made for him, though at the expense of his dignity and weight of character; but his biographer should have been better advised than to publish communications saying so little for the Bishop's candour and self-control. It has indeed, within the last few years, become a kind of "note" of the advanced High-Church party to despise dominion and speak evil of dignities. Both Judges' law and Bishops' law are denounced in terms more rigorous than polite when they come into conflict with the practice of certain strong-willed clergy. This disposition is not in itself a pleasant one to contemplate, nor very safe for those who desire to unite the secular privileges of Establishment with their jurisdiction in spiritual things.

In reading Bishop Gray's letters we are continually struck with the want of discretion shown by the editor. It was surely not worth while, for example, to print a letter written in 1869, in which the Bishop says: "I do not feel it necessary to reply to his Grace of Buckingham. He insinuates untruths, however, if he does not state them, and he implicates Dizzy, for *he* told me that the matter about the novitiate was not before him, whereas the Duke says it had been submitted to him, some time before I saw him, in writing. . . . As for Gladstone, his great sin is proposing a measure involving robbery and sacrilege. I cannot get over that, but I confess that if his proposals as to property were fairer, I would submit to his disestablishment plan (which is admirable) very complacently. . . . Let him give the Church £8,000,000, and content himself with stealing the other eight, and I shall be satisfied. The Irish Church would then only have to carry into practice the Reports of the Lambeth Conference as to Synods and Court of Appeal, and it would be safe, and probably a new life would be infused into it, if it did not rush into Protestant extremes. If it would take up true Catholic grounds, it would gain upon Rome daily. If Protestantism is to be its watchword, it will die out in half a century."

It is hardly worth while to point out that it is the section of the Church that repudiates Protestantism as warmly as Bishop Gray, and takes up true Catholic grounds, which has furnished Rome with so long a list of converts. What is particularly offen-

sive in the foregoing extract is the Bishop's facility in denouncing as crimes what it appears are only hard bargains. Five millions sterling represent sacrilege and robbery, while eight millions will give satisfaction.

It is more agreeable to turn to the private life and domestic character of Dr. Gray. There he appears kindly, generous, and unselfish. He was unsparing in his labours, and was blessed with the aid and companionship of an admirable wife. But the whole impression left by these copious memoirs is of an energetic but ill-balanced mind; his views were, in our judgment, very narrow, and his sympathies from early life were cramped and limited by the straitest of church principles. Not to mention his utter inability to understand Nonconformists and Presbyterians, Dr. Gray had little charity for any other than High Churchmen. In his eyes a Low Churchman was little better than one of the wicked. He writes from Wynberg, March, 1848, "Mr. —— goes to Wynberg, an important parish utterly neglected and overrun by East India visitors, who, with long purses and pious purposes, are the pest of the place. *I caught one of them praying extempore in the church here last Sunday.*

". . . Things are now, as you may suppose, in a very disorderly state. The Junior Chaplain of the Cathedral, shortly before my arrival, introduced a book of hymns into St. George's, which gave great offence to the more sober Churchmen, and last Sunday he stuck a public notice on the Cathedral door, of the usual monthly prayer-meeting in the church schools. He and the other clergymen are the members of a little Evangelical Alliance."

One of the Bishop's troubles was that he could not get the Governor and the Colonial Legislature to see the deep and essential difference between the Church and the Sects. In one of his letters home he speaks of a terrible fright that the Governor had given him, from which we infer that the Bishop's sense of humour was not equal to the Governor's. "Sir Harry Smith does not understand church or education questions (and I have to watch him narrowly, lest he commit himself and hamper me). I have given him Hook's *Church Dictionary* to study. His great temptation is to compromise truth (not what he perhaps holds, but what the Church does) in the warmth of his heart, and desire to meet the wishes of all and agree with all. The other day he told me at luncheon that he was going to send for the Mahometan Imaums, and promise them schools. I could not say much as there was a large party, but he frightened me."

Robert Gray, the seventh son and twelfth child of the Rev. Robert Gray, Rector of Bishop Wearmouth, and afterwards Bishop of Bristol, was born in 1809. His education was irregular, being interrupted by ill-health, and by a short residence in the West Indies. He went up to University College, Oxford, in

1827, taking a pass degree in 1831. In 1831 he was ordained deacon. From 1834 to 1845 he was Vicar of Whitworth. In 1845 he was presented to the living of Stockton-on-Tees, and in 1847 was consecrated Bishop of Capetown. He died at his residence, Bishop's Court, near Capetown, on the 1st of September, 1872.

Money and the Mechanism of Exchange. By W. Stanley Jevons, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Logic and Political Economy in the Owens College, Manchester. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1875.

PROFESSOR JEVONS does not attempt, in his work on money, to decide or even to discuss the mysteries of what is generally called the Currency Question, but confines himself to the more immediate and practical aspects of his subject. As he observes, "There is much to be learnt about money before entering upon these abstruse questions, which barely admit of decided answers." The reader, then, need be in possession of very little financial knowledge in order to read this treatise on money with interest and advantage. The early history of money presents some curious facts, illustrating the difficulties in the way of exchange in primitive stages of society. The skins of animals were among the earliest materials of currency, and in one or two northern languages, as the Lappish, the word for money still retains its original meaning of skin or fur. Not only was leather money used in ancient Rome and Carthage, but it is said to have circulated in Russia as late as the reign of Peter the Great. It is generally allowed that, *pecunia*, the latin word for money, is derived from *pecus*, cattle. In the East Indies cowry shells have long been used as money. Corn has been the medium of exchange in remote parts of Europe from the time of the ancient Greeks to the present day. In Norway corn is even deposited in banks, and lent and borrowed. In certain parts of the Levant olive oil still serves as currency. Among other recorded articles of currency are cocoa-nuts, tobacco, and Indian corn (as late as 1732 these were legal tenders in Maryland), eggs, dried codfish, cotton cloth, straw mats, salt, cubes of benzoin, gum or beeswax in Sumatra, red feathers in the islands of the Pacific Ocean, cubes of tea in Tartary, and iron shovels and hoes in Madagascar.

Mr. Jevons gives, with great clearness, the main facts and principles that have to be taken into account in connection with a metallic coinage such as that now generally in use. In every community gold and silver coin have to run the gauntlet of many dangers, such as counterfeiting, clipping, and, in the case of gold coin, the process vulgarly known as "sweating." The chief precaution against these practices is to render the mechanical execu-

tion of the piece as perfect as possible, and to strike it in a way that can only be accomplished with the aid of elaborate machinery.

Most modern coins either have milled edges, or else bear a legend on the edge in raised letters, as may be seen in the French five-franc piece. Mr. Jevons differs entirely from those writers who advocate free trade in coining, and would leave the supply of well-executed coin to the ordinary competition of manufacturers. There is a curious fallacy in supposing that the competition of those who manufacture the coinage would help to keep up the standard of excellence. As a matter of fact, bad money drives out good money. "People who want furniture, or books, or clothes, may be trusted to select the best which they can afford, because they are going to keep and use these articles; but with money it is just the opposite. Money is made to go. They want coin, not to keep it in their own pockets, but to pass it off into their neighbours' pockets; and the worse the money which they can get their neighbours to accept, the greater the profit to themselves. . . . People, as a general rule, pass on from hand to hand indifferently the heavy and the light coins, because their only use for the coin is as a medium of exchange. It is those who are going to melt, export, hoard, or dissolve the coins of the realm, or convert them into jewellery and gold leaf, who carefully select for their purposes the new, heavy coin."

Though, from its limited size, it is not a cyclopædia of monetary knowledge, this work will give the general reader an admirable outline of the subject and its chief related topics, such as banking, the cheque and clearing-house system, paper currency, bills of exchange, and the money market. Professor Jevons unites in this, as in his previous writings, great accuracy of detail with philosophic breadth and insight.

A Pocket Compendium of the Doctrines, Institutions, Duties, and Evidences of Christianity. With an Introductory Preface by the Rev. G. T. Perks, M.A. London: Elliot Stock. 1875.

THE author of this little handbook is a missionary, who in the course of his labours has felt the need of a simple work introductory to Christian theology, that might be put into the hands of catechists, intelligent Sunday and day scholars, and local preachers. This want he has endeavoured to supply, and, in our judgment, so successfully as to deserve the cordial commendation which his work receives from Mr. Perks. There is no pretension to originality either of thought or method. The writer has aimed at giving a clear and useful outline of Christian doctrines and evidences, and follows for the most part the recognised leaders of Methodist theology, or, as Mr. Perks expresses it, "the

author belongs to the Evangelical Arminian School of John Wesley and Richard Watson." We have no doubt that this unpretending little volume will be useful, in the earlier studies at least, of local preachers and candidates for the ministry, or indeed of any readers who cannot consult the larger and more learned works that are to be found.

It is only right to say that there are some typographical errors, which we can only account for on the supposition that the author was unable to superintend the publication of his book. In another edition it is to be hoped that they will be corrected.

Hymns of Prayer and Praise. By Benjamin Gough. London: Elliot Stock. 1875.

THIS is, in our judgment, in every way the best of Mr. Gough's now numerous publications. The devoutness and fervour of his spirit move with more freedom in this class of composition than in any other, while the necessity for condensation and brevity belonging to the hymn is favourable in its effect upon Mr. Gough's style. He is evidently a thorough student of Charles Wesley, and appears now and again to catch his more jubilant measures with considerable success.

The Leisure Hour. 1875. *The Sunday at Home.* 1875. London: The Religious Tract Society.

THESE well-known publications keep their place at the head of the class of literature to which they belong. History, biography, travels, science, and art, in addition to direct religious teaching, are all well represented in their pages, and we cannot speak too highly of the Catholic Christian spirit that prevails throughout. To produce, and circulate upon a large scale, such wholesome literature is to render no small service to the masses of our country, and we sincerely hope that, with the present standard of excellence maintained, these periodicals may have, from year to year, a still wider circulation.

The Companion Concordance to the Holy Scriptures. London: Elliot Stock. 1875.

THIS Concordance is one of the most remarkable typographical productions we have ever seen. Although it contains reference to nearly 26,000 Scripture passages, a Bible index, tables of Scripture coins, weights, measures, etc., etc., it is little over four inches square, and only one-sixteenth of an inch thick. How type so small could be set up we cannot understand, and being printed, it should be read either by better eyes than ours or with the aid of a magnifying glass.

The Day of Rest. Illustrated Journal of Sunday Reading, 1875. With over one hundred full-page illustrations. London: Strahan and Co., Paternoster-row.

WE had the pleasure of giving a cordial welcome to *The Day of Rest* on the appearance of its first volume, and we are glad to be able to welcome it again in a later stage of its success. The promoters of this excellent cheap serial have maintained with great vigour and judgment the strife on which they entered at starting with the evil influences of the vile cheap literature of the day; and Mr. Strahan's example of competing with this vile literature by offering wholesome and instructive literature at equally low prices, is certainly leading other publishers to produce cheap serials of a better class than were formerly obtainable by the million. Mr. Strahan and his editor have pursued their former policy of obtaining the co-operation of writers of high standing, and his list of contributors for 1875 includes the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Derry, Professor Proctor, Miss Ingelow, Miss Fraser-Tytler, "A. K. H. B.," Mr. George Macdonald, Mr. William Gilbert, and numerous other well-known authors. The volume contains three complete stories of considerable length, and a profusion of biographies, poems, character-sketches, and miscellaneous articles; while there are some hundred illustrations of great variety, many of them rough enough, but generally graphic, and often extremely good.

The Picturesque Annual for the Young of All Ages, containing contributions by Louisa M. Alcott, Hans Christian Andersen, George MacDonald, William Gilbert, Björnstjerne Björnson, Lisbeth G. Seguin, Henry Kingsley, Matthew Browne, Charles Camden, H. L. Synnot, David Ker, Mrs. Broderip, The Author of *Lilliput Levée*, Mrs. George Cupples, Tom Hood, and others. With Five Hundred Illustrations. London: Strahan and Co., Paternoster Row.

The Picturesque Annual for the Young of All Ages is on the whole a better volume than *The Day of Rest:* it is no whit less earnest in purpose, and it is brighter and more attractive. The illustrations, which are five times as numerous as those in the other volume, are more uniformly good; and some of them are of great excellence, while the stories and other literary matter are excellently well adapted to the two-fold object of amusing and instructing. Miss Alcott's "Eight Cousins," which is included in this volume, is a far more than ordinarily good story for young people, maintaining worthily the well-deserved place that trans-

atlantic lady has gained in juvenile literature. Mr. G. MacDonald's Double Story is the same story as that which we notice at another page under the title of *The Wise Woman*, the name having been changed for some reason unexplained. The translation of Hans Andersen's "Lucky Peter" is well done, and forms a great adornment to the volume; and the volume (which is the year's collection of the excellent serial, *Good Things*) is too full of "good things" to admit of selection from its miscellaneous contents for special commendation.

Erasmus in Praise of Folly. Illustrated with many Curious Cuts, designed, drawn, and etched by Hans Holbein, with Portrait, Life of Erasmus, and his Epistle addressed to Sir Thomas More. London: Reeves and Turner, 196, Strand, W.C. 1876.

THE renowned treatise of *Erasmus in Praise of Folly* has been reprinted for the second time by Messrs. Reeves and Turner, and, in its present form, is a most elegant and valuable book. The treatise itself is far too well known to need any special remark on this occasion; but of the illustrations, as here reproduced, we cannot but say that many are admirably given. They vary in sharpness of line; and, as is well-known to art critics, the originals vary considerably in artistic merit, ranging from exaggerated grotesque to solid and splendid realism, and being executed with various degrees of perfection; but the plates, as given in the present reprint, are, taken altogether, an excellent collection, and most important, as illustrative of the genius of Holbein, for those to whom the original work by the master is out of reach. We must not omit to notice the beautiful typography of the volume; indeed, the whole get-up of the book is excellent, quite beyond that of the average of even careful reprints, and the venture deserves to be successful. It is to be remarked that there are a far greater number of illustrations in the present reprint than there were in the former one issued by Messrs. Reeves, which was altogether a smaller and less handsome book.

Jonas Fisher. A Poem in Brown and White. London: Trübner and Co., 57 & 59, Ludgate Hill. 1875.

THE author of *Jonas Fisher*, "a Poem in Brown and White," has not been good enough to set his autograph upon his work, and has thus afforded Mr. Robert Buchanan a favourable opportunity (not altogether lost) of getting up another fuss about himself. We cannot say we suspect Mr. Tennyson or Mr. Browning, or indeed anyone who has won ever such a small pair

of spurs in the fields of verse, of the authorship of this anonymous volume,—which, by the bye, though very much too polemical for poetry, is not without merit. Of *poetic* merit properly so called it has but little; and the religious and social questions discussed in it in jumpy lengths of rhymed prose, might have been discussed better in plain, unrhymed prose. There is a wise attractiveness to the reader's curiosity in the opening verses—

> "This story is not meant for girls,
> But, if they read it, will not harm.
> There's nothing vicious in its blood,
> Suppose some outbreaks should alarm
>
> "The superfine of either sex,
> Who will not call a spade a spade,
> Who love sleek devils better far
> Than angels homelily arrayed."

And we can endorse the assurance of the author that, if the young people of the present generation are tempted to read the book, it will not do them any particular harm. On the other hand, we are by no means convinced that it will do anyone any particular good, though written with obvious good intentions enough to furnish forth a dozen books with moral and religious purpose. It is a fairly interesting book of verse, and one not to be lightly taken up or put down; but we think it would have secured more readers had it been got into about half the number of stanzas contained in its two hundred and fifty pages. *Jonas Fisher* may have the luck to create something of a stir; but, even if it does, it will soon blow over.

END OF VOL. XLV.

BEVERIDGE AND CO. (SUCCESSORS TO R. NEEDHAM), PRINTERS, LONDON.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XLV.

'Albert Dürer,' Scott's, 149.
Alexander's 'Moral Causation,' 515.
'American Pulpit of the Day, The,' 262.
Amos's 'Primer of the English Constitution,' 254.
'Annual for the Young,' 526.
Archæological Society's 'Records of the Past,' 476.
'Assyrian Eponym Canon,' Smith's, 478.
'Atonement, The,' Dale's, 216.

Balmes' 'Letters to a Sceptic,' 487.
'Baptism of the Holy Ghost, The,' Mahan's, 84.
Barrett's 'Memorials of Mrs. Shaw,' 263.
Boardman's 'In the Power of the Spirit,' 482.
Brighton Convention and its Opponents, The, 84; comparison with Moody and Sankey, 85; Calvinism, 87; exposition, 89; Scripture phraseology, 91; sanctification by faith, 93; the Westminster confession, 95; Rom. vii. and Gal. v., 97; harmony with creeds, 99; Pelagianism, 101; mysticism, 103; baptism of the Spirit, 107; self-consecration, 111; faith, 113; the higher life, 117; sin in believers, 119; Mr. Wesley, 121; 'sinless' perfection, 125; 'out of darkness,' 127.
Bright's 'English History,' 511.

Carr's 'Notes on the Greek Testament,' 479.
Celtic Culture, 25; original identity of Celt and Teuton, 27; Aryan basis of old Irish law, 29; embittering effect of literature, 31; Irish 'law of distress,' 37; Brehons descendants of Druids, 41; internal evidence, 43; value of wealth in the old tribe, 45; mixed culture and barbarism, 47.
'Character Studies in the Old Testament,' Rankin's, 488.
'Chores Sanoti Viti,' Scott's, 149.
'Christliche Volkommenheit, Die,' Ritschl's, 197.
'Collingwood, Biography of,' Davies', 506.
'Compendium of Christianity,' 525.
'Concordance,' 525.
'Concordantiæ omnium vocum Novi Testamenti,' Bruder's, 381.
Cooper's 'Verity of Christ's Resurrection,' 262.
'Cosmo de Medici,' Horne's, 242.
Crawford's 'Doctrine of the Atonement,' 222.
'Creation, The,' Ritchie's, 503.
Croll's 'Climate of Time,' 501.

Daniels' 'Moody and his Work,' 211.
Dale's 'Atonement, The,' 216.
Darwin's 'Insectivorous Plants,' 256.
D'Aubigné's 'History of the Reformation,' 494.
Davidson's translation of the New Testament, 265.
Davies's 'Fine old Englishman; a Biography of Lord Collingwood,' 507.
'Day of Rest, The,' 526.
Day's 'Govinda Samanti,' 422.

Dickinson's 'Theological Quarterly,' 262, 517.
'Doctrines Respecting Sinlessness,' Newton's, 84.
Doyle's 'History of America,' 498.
Dutt's 'Peasantry of Bengal,' 422.

'English Peasantry,' Heath's, 246.
'English Portraits,' Sainte-Beuve's, 239.
Ennis's 'Origin of the Stars,' 505.
'Erasmus' Praise of Folly, 527.
Exploration of Palestine, The, 277; the reconnaissance survey, 279; Lake of Galilee, 281; Capernaum, 283; Gergesa, 285; Mount Gerizim, 287; site of Ai, 289; Robinson's arch, 293; age of south-west wall, 295; Pool of Bethesda, 299; ruins of Ophel, 301; M. Clermont Ganneau, 103; great witness altar, 107; Oreb and Zeeb, 111; sites of the Tabernacle, 113; hill of Hachilah, 317; cave of Adullam, 121.

Ferguson's 'Rudiments of Common Law in Senchusthor,' 25.
Fox's 'Perfectionism,' 84.
Fox's 'Revision of the Scriptures,' 224.
'Fulness of Grace,' Page's, 482.

Gervagh's 'Pilgrim of Scandinavia,' 494.
'God's Word through Preaching,' Hall's, 262.
Gorman's 'Christian Psychology,' 481.
Gough's 'Hymns of Prayer and Praise,' 523.
'Govinda Samanti,' Behari-Day's, 422.
'Gray, Robert, Life of,' Charles Gray's, 519.
Greenwell's 'Liber Humanitatis,' 251.
'Greek Testament, Notes on The,' Carr's, 479.

'Hades,' W. B. Scott's, 149.
'Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf,' Stahelin-Stockmayer's, 195.
Heath's 'English Peasantry,' 246.
Heaton's 'Leonardo da Vinci,' 323.
Hemington's 'Perfectionism,' 84.
'Homes and Haunts of Luther,' Stoughton's, 517.
Houssaye's 'Histoire de Léonard de Vinci,' 323.
Horne's 'Cosmo de Medici, 242.
Hughes' 'Economy of Thought,' 487.

'Incidents in the China War,' Knollys's, 493.
'India and its Native Princes,' Rousselet's, 422.
'Insectivorous Plants,' Darwin's, 256.

Jacquemont's 'Correspondance Pendant son Voyage dans l'India,' 422.
James's 'Upward Path,' 482.
Jerrold's 'Life of Napoleon III.,' 225.
Jevon's 'Money and the Mechanism of Change,' 523.
'Jonas Fisher,' 527.
Jukes's 'Types of Genesis,' 480.

Knollys's 'Incidents in the China War,' 493.
Knyvet's 'Modern English Law,' 514.

Latouche's 'Travels in Portugal,' 246.
'Leisure Hour,' 525.
Lenormant Francois, 'La Magie chez les Chaldéens et les Origines Accadiennes,' 1.
'Leonardo da Vinci,' 323; his youth, 327; estimate of his own capabilities, 329; Milan, 331; the Last Supper, 335; double-sidedness of his art, 337; his modernness, 339; the Joconde, 341; scientific amusements, 345; Michael Angelo and Leonardo at work together, 347; the bud, 349; our own missions, 351; his creed, 355.
'Liber Humanitatis,' Greenwell's, 251.
'Lost Footsteps,' Sweetman's, 264.

Magic and Sorcery of the Chaldeans, 1; the magic litany, 3; conjurations, 7; a Divine Interceasor, 9; vestiges of truth, 11; the Deluge tablet, 17; Ormasd and Ahriam, 21.
Mahan's 'Out of Darkness into Light,' 84.
Maine's 'Lectures on the Early History of Institutions,' 25.
McClellan's 'Translation of the New Testament,' 265.
'Methodism in Macclesfield,' Smith's, 254.
Methodist Conference of 1875, The, 168; Conference and the Connexion, 169; Presbyterian government, 171; laymen in Conference, 173; alternatives, 175; unity of the body, 177;

eclectic and Catholic, 179; neutrality, 181; Methodism as a revival, 185; present and past, 189; 'Holiness,' 191; entire sanctification, 193.
'Modern English Law,' Knyvet's, 514.
'Money and Mechanism of Change,' Jevon's, 523.
'Moody and his Work,' Daniel's, 211.
'Moral Causation,' Alexander's, 515.
Morris's 'Æneids of Virgil, 489.
'Mother of Jesus,' Robinson's, 436.

'Napoleon III., Life of,' Jerrold's, 225.
New Methodist Hymn Book, The, 356; kind of poetry suitable to hymns, 359; the Wesleys and George Herbert, 361; versification of Wesley and Watts, 363; translations from German, 365; influence of German Pietism, 367; Charles Wesley and Dr. Watts compared, 369; James Montgomery and Bishop Heber, 373; Keble's 'Sun of my Soul,' 377; importance of Scriptural hymns, 379.
Newton's 'Doctrine Respecting Sinlessness.' 84.
Nicholson's 'Redeeming the Time,' 488.

O'Curry's 'Lectures on Ancient Irish Civilisation,' 25.
Oppermann's 'Ernst Rietschel,' 516.
Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem, 277.

Page's 'Fulness of Grace,' 482.
'Palestine, Our Work in,' 277.
'Perfectionism,' Fox's, 84.
'Pilgrim Memories,' Stuart-Glennie's, 231.
Poems by a Painter, 149.
'Poets and Novelists,' Smith's, 492.
'Presbytery in the New Testament, The,' 381; analysis, 383; Old Testament elders, 385; origin of New Testament elders, 391; the council, 395; Presbyterianism, 399; the Apostle's delegates, 403; the elders at Miletus, 405; theories of unity, 409; bishop and presbyter, 413; power of the keys, 417; the Apocalyptic elders, 421.
'Primitive Faith,' Wray Saville's, 223.
'Psautier, Le,' Reuss's, 202.

Quarterly Statements of Palestine Exploration Fund, 277.

'Queen Mary,' Tennyson's, 235

Recent Translations of the Greek Testament, 265; text and criticism, 267; St. John's prologue, 271; faults of translators, 273; Greek cognates and particles, 275; recovery of Jerusalem, 277.
Records of the Past, 476.
Returns of Accommodation in Wesleyan Chapels, 129.
Reuss on the Psalms, 202.
'Rietschel the Sculptor,' Oppermann's, 516.
Ris's 'Léonard de Vinci et son Ecole,' 323.
Ritchie's 'Creation,' 503.
Ritschl on Christian Perfection, 197.
Robinson's 'Mother of Jesus not the Papal Mary,' 436; undue exaltation of Mary, 439; threefold aspect of Romanism, 441; the annunciation, 443; the magnificat, 445; the nativity, 447; the purification, 449; Cana and Capernaum, 453; Mary at the cross, 455; the apocryphal Gospels, 457; Mary, the second Eve, 461; silence of Scripture, 467; the immaculate conception, 471; the one remedy, 475.
Rousselet's 'Inde des Rajas," 422.
Royal Visit to India, The, 422; elephant fights, 425; portrait of Scindia, 427; the Baroda 'sports,' 429; moral effect of M. Rousselet's book, 431; question of missions, 433.

Sach's 'Text-book of Botany,' 249.
Sainte-Beuve's 'English Portraits,' 439.
Saville's 'Primitive Faith,' 223.
Scott, William Bell, Poet and Painter, 149; affinities with Shelley and Blake, 151; 'The Year of the World,' 153; outside the Temple, 155; 'The Old Scotch House,' 157; the graves of Shelley and Keats, 159; 'Kriemhild's Tryst,' 161; 'The Temptation of Eve,' 165.
'Selma's Story,' 263.
'Senchus Mor, The,' 25.
'Sermons out of Church, 251.
Simcox's 'Taciti Historiæ I., II.,' 499.
Sixth Report of Wesleyan Building Fund, 129.
Smith's 'Poets and Novelists,' 492.

Smith's 'Temperance Reformation,' 260.
Southnall's 'Recent Origin of Man,' 263.
'State of the Dead, The,' West's, 221.
Stone's 'Sonnets of the Sacred Year,' 519.
Storr's 'Conditions of Success,' 262.
Stuart-Glennie's 'Pilgrim Memories,' 231.
'Sunday at Home,' 525.

Taylor's 'Four Years' Campaign in India,' 263.
Tennyson's 'Queen Mary,' 235.
'Text-book of Botany,' Sach's, 249.
'Theological Instructor, The,' 224.
'Thucydides,' Books III. and IV., Simcox's, 499.
'Tour in Scotland, Recollections of,' D. Wordsworth's, 248.
Twentieth Annual Report of Wesleyan Chapel Committee, 129.

Universe, The Unseen, 49; how and why of universe, 51; author's position, 53; treatment of revelation, 55; physical axioms, 57; principle of continuity, 59; Christian miracles, 61; creation in time or eternity? 65; the 'unconditioned,' 67; the conservation of energy, 71; fate of the visible universe, 75; matter and ether, 79; the true continuity, 83.

'Virgil's Æneids in English Verse,' Morris's, 489.
Wesleyan Methodist Chapel Accommodation, 129; extension scheme, 133; returns collected, 135; analysis of statistics, 137; metropolitan scheme, 141; country districts, 143; Establishment and Methodism, 147.
Wesley's 'Collection of Hymns," 356.
West's 'State of the Dead,' 221.
Wood's 'Perfect Love,' 482.
Wordsworth's 'Tour in Scotland,' 248.
Wylie's 'History of Protestantism,' 519.

'Year of the World,' Scott's, 149.