
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.

OCTOBER, 1880.

ART. I.—*The Lord's Supper: Uninspired Teaching. From Clement of Rome, A.D. 74, to Canon Liddon, of St. Paul's, London*, 1875. Vols. I. and II. By CHARLES HEBERT, D.D., of Trinity College, Cambridge, late Vicar of Ambleside. London: Seeley and Co. 1879.

IN nothing has the tendency of human nature to pervert the best gifts of God been more clearly seen than in the treatment which the Christian religion has received at the hands of its professed followers; and in no part of that religion has this tendency been more strikingly exhibited than in that sacred memorial of the redemption of mankind which was termed in Scripture "The Lord's Supper." In its original institution the most simple of all religious ordinances, it became in the hands of men an inexplicable mystery. In the Apostolic age a pledge of soundness in the faith, it became in the keeping of the successors of the Apostles a fertile source of the worst superstition. In the Divine intention a bond of brotherly love, it was changed by ecclesiastics, who called themselves emphatically "the Church," into an occasion of the most cruel persecution; so that, as, in the days of Pagan persecution, men who refused to throw a grain of incense on the fire in honour of Cæsar were put to a cruel death, in later times the martyrs, who rejected the Roman doctrine of "Transubstantiation," which the Holy Spirit had taught them was "idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians," were compelled to seal their testimony with their blood, which thus became, as of old, the seed of the true Church.

The Lord's Supper, at the time of its original institution, was not an ordinance like baptism, intended for a single celebration at the beginning of the Christian life, but for a continually recurring remembrance of the Saviour's death, and for a sign of perseverance in communion and fellowship with Him. Thus St. Paul declares in writing to the Corinthians: "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." Hence, during the Apostolic period of the Church, so simple was the manner in which the rite was observed, that it only bore the appearance of a religious service in the fact that every meeting of believers was marked with a strong overflowing of religious feeling, which solemnised the whole life, and impressed on every action a stamp of holiness. The name of "The Lord's Supper" was given to this ordinance by the inspired Apostle, because it was, as the Evangelists teach, "after supper," *i.e.*, after the Jewish Passover, which was sacrificed "between the two evenings," or, as we should express it, "at sunset," that our Saviour instituted the rite. "Toward evening" He perhaps partook of the first Communion, on the day of His resurrection, with the two disciples at Emmaus. It was at the same hour, thirty years later, that the Apostle Paul "broke bread" with the brethren at Troas, when he "continued his speech until midnight." There is no evidence, as we shall presently have occasion to show, of there being any change in the hour of administering the Lord's Supper until the end of the second century, or perhaps the beginning of the third; though this is, alas, one of the most fruitless subjects of controversy in the present day.

Although Neander considers that the Agapé was not introduced until the end of the second century, the weight of evidence seems to show that it belonged to the age of the Apostles, when the Lord's Supper was immediately preceded by the Agapé, or feast of charity, as St. Jude terms it, when he mentions the "spots" ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις, and Christian brotherhood was seen in all its beauty; when the distinctions of rank and social position were laid aside, and all met and sat down together with the consciousness of their oneness in Christ. Immediately after this, and as a concluding part of the Lovefaest, bread and wine were laid on the table. And the bread was then broken and distributed with the wine among all the guests after Christ's

example and appointment. That such was the practice in the Apostolic age appears by what occurred at Corinth in connection with the Lord's Supper. The disorders and profanation which St. Paul reproved there could not have happened if an ordinary supper, at which different classes met, had not formed the commencement of the more strictly religious ordinance. Notwithstanding these disorders, the Agapé continued to be observed down to the fourth century, and in Tertullian's time must have been productive, when suitably conducted, of the best effects in encouraging brotherly love, in the suppressing of distinction between rich and poor at the Lord's Table, and in exhibiting a very striking contrast to the ordinary Pagan feasts. The evidence is as decisive as anything of this nature can well be, that the primitive Christians, and their immediate successors of the second century, partook of the Lord's Supper *in the evening*, after the feast already mentioned, where the elements used were, as our Lord had commanded, *bread and wine alone*, though in the middle of the second century, as we learn from Justin Martyr, *water* was mixed with the wine, and partaken of by all present. No such superstitious act as adoring these elements was ever thought of, nor was such a thing known as a pretended "sacrifice," save that of the worshippers when offering the sacrifice of their lives to the service of their Master. Nor were the doctrines of "Transubstantiation" or "the Real Objective Presence" ever heard of in those Apostolic times. Nor were lights used on such occasions, save for the purpose of affording light to the congregation. Nor was any distinctive dress worn by the minister who presided at the sacred rite. Incense was never used at such a time, and the superstition of what is nowadays termed "the Eastward position," could never have been adopted by those who remembered the promise of the Master, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." Such was the mode by which the primitive Christians were wont to realise the presence of their absent Lord.

Nevertheless the doctrine of the Lord's Supper has been the most prolific subject of controversy which has afflicted the Christian Church during the eighteen and a half centuries of its existence; and even to this day, as Canon Farrar declared at the Croydon Church Congress with some truth, but with unnecessary bitterness, "the

very sacrament of love and unity, of which a Wesley and a Keble sang with equal gladness, is made a wrangling ground of *savage and opposing ignorances*." We fear that the charge of "ignorance" must be laid at the door of this severe censor of others in another direction, no less important in the economy of the Gospel. Canon Farrar has recently interpreted a doctrine which finds expression in the solemn words of the Church of England Liturgy as "the bitter pains of eternal death," in such a manner as if seeking to provide a common meeting-place in *purgatory* for the disciples of all schools, whether believers or not. On this subject, it may be observed in passing, a powerful writer has justly remarked in the *Contemporary Review* of May, 1878, that "Canon Farrar arraigns the impenetrable prejudices of his opponents, and yet brings forward his own boyish predilections as subordinate proofs of his theories. He inveighs against the ignorance of Scripture, which stands in the way of his views, and is obliged himself to appeal to tradition. . . . Is it with this message that ministers of consolation are to repair to the home of the bereaved, or the bedside of the dying? The very question lays bare to every thoughtful man the keen mockery of such a ministry to 'a mind diseased.'" Were we writing on this subject, other instances might be given of the inconsistency of this vigorous antagonist of modern abuses. On this particular point, however, it should not be forgotten that a few years before this, Canon Farrar, in a series of sermons on *The Fall of Man*, preached to the University of Cambridge in 1868, appears to take a totally different view of the doctrine of eternal punishment, which he subsequently endeavoured to subvert.

The primitive doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as distinct from the Roman theory of "Transubstantiation," or its feeble representative in the Established Church, which we may call the modern conception of it, known in the present day as "The Real Objective Presence,"—a theory invented by the late Archdeacon Wilberforce in 1848,—has been ably defended by the late Dean Goode, Doctors Vogan, Harrison, Jacob, and others. But by none more efficiently than by Dr. Hebert, formerly Vicar of Ambleside, in the work now before us, which is appropriately named *The Lord's Supper: Uninspired Teaching. From Clement of Rome, A.D. 74, to Canon Liddon, of St. Paul's, A.D. 1875.* We regard Dr. Hebert's work as a most important con-

tribution to the many works on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper which have been published during the present generation. Its value is beyond praise, not only on account of its impartiality and of its fulness — for it contains the thoughts of between three and four hundred eminent divines during eighteen centuries of continuous Church history since the day of Pentecost on the single doctrine of the Lord's Supper,—not only on account of its giving the originals in Greek and Latin, accompanied by a fair and plain translation of them all, with some well-written and interesting comments of the author himself, but also for the plan on which the work is executed: the author's desire, as he states, being to enable every student to judge for himself as to the opinions held in any age, and by each divine who has written on the subject. Such an invaluable catena the Church of Christ has never yet possessed; and the fairness with which the catena is produced affords a striking contrast to the one given by Dr. Pusey on the same subject, which elicited from Bishop Thirlwall the remark that it was "calculated to bring catenas into disrepute."

Lest we should be thought to be doing an injustice to Dr. Pusey, we will mention two or three instances to explain our meaning. In the year 1843 Dr. Pusey published a sermon, which he had preached before the University of Oxford, entitled *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent:* to which was added a catena in the form of "Extracts from some writers in our later English Church on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." Amongst various other authorities he has given lengthy extracts from Hooker, taken from his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, as they appear in Keble's Edition, Book V., c. 67, §§. 4, 5, 7 and 8, but for some unexplained reason he has omitted all notice of §. 6. Now this paragraph contains as plainly as words can express Hooker's real meaning on the subject, which reads as follows:

"*The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament,* but in the *worthy* receiver of the Sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth. . . . I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ when and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but *only in the very heart and soul* of him who receiveth Him."

To omit such a passage as this when pretending to give

Hooker's views on the doctrine of the Real Presence reminds us of the old story of the play of *Hamlet*, with the part of Hamlet itself left out. It is not, however, difficult to explain the reason of the intentional suppression of this part of the evidence from Hooker, as Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon* affirms that "the Church of Christ taught not an undefined, but a Real Objective Presence of Christ's Blessed Body and Blood. . . . We receive in the Eucharist not only the flesh and blood, but Christ Himself, both God and man" (pp. 23, 24). Hence Dr. Pusey naturally affirms that "the Council of Trent, and our Articles, each could be so explained as to be reconcilable one with the other" (*English Church Union Gazette*, July, 1866, p. 197). This is expressed still more strongly by his disciples and by the organs of his party. Mr. Gerard Cobb, a lay Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, in his *Kiss of Peace*, says: "The Church of England holds *precisely* the same view of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as the Church of Rome." The *Church News* of July 9, 1869, affirms that "the English Church was really one with the Church of Rome in faith, orders, and *Sacraments*." So the *Union Review* of July, 1867, when under the editorship of Dr. F. G. Lee of Lambeth, teaches: "We give the people *the real doctrine of the Mass;* we are one with the Roman Catholics *in faith*, and have a common foe to fight." So the distinguished Roman Catholic divine M. Capel, in his controversy with Canon Liddon in the beginning of 1875, which we are glad to see Dr. Hebert reports in part at the close of his second volume (pp. 732—736), after speaking of "the organised dishonesty of Ritualism, and its deleterious influence on English family life," says: "The practical result of such prayers as those in the *Vade Mecum* is to imbue the minds of Ritualists with *our* doctrines of the *Real Presence* and *Transubstantiation*. While this discussion has been going on, I have made it a point to ask many of the converts from Ritualism whether they are *conscious of any difference* between their present and their former faith on this doctrine? The invariable answer has been, *Not the least;* I only perceive more clearly what is meant. . . . It is unsatisfactory to find Canon Liddon excusing the line '*Bread into His flesh is twined*,' on the plea that it is in all probability due to inadvertence. Had the Canon examined a few of the advanced books of devotion, he would have found that it is the usual way to express, as in Mr. Carter's book,

the doctrine of *Transubstantiation.* In *The Night Hours of the Church the doctrine is stated in the plainest way,* p. 173. Bread and wine are *substantially** changed into the body and blood of Christ."

These testimonies from Romanists and Ritualists alike are fully sufficient to show that there is no difference whatever in their teaching respecting the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Hence Mr. Maskell, formerly chaplain to Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter, at the time of his secession from the Church of England in 1848, wrote: "I have heard both clergy and laity of the Church of England declare that they accept and believe all Christian truth, as it is explained in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. With regard to such a statement by any of our laity, it is curious, to say the least of it, and probably was never made by any who had read and understood the Tridentine Canons. But as to clergymen, ignorance cannot be supposed; and for them, bound as they are by subscription to our formularies, thus to speak, has always seemed to me amongst the greatest of all achievements of human intellect. Subtle as we know the mind of man to be, and wide its range, I cannot but confess that the more I think of it, the more I am amazed at so wonderful an example of its power and capacity" (Maskell's *Second Letter on the High Church Party,* p. 64).

If anything further were required to contradict Dr. Pusey's hallucination (we can use no other word) that there is no essential difference between the decrees of Trent and the Articles of the Church of England on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it may be seen in this. The 20th Article declares that "the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner." The Council of Trent teaches: "If any one saith that Christ given in the Eucharist is eaten spiritually *only,* and not also sacramentally and really, let him be accursed" (Session XIII. Canon 8). And in the 4th canon of the same session the Council decreed: "By the consecration of the bread and the wine, a conversion takes place of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole

* Canon Carter, in his "Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury" *On the Present Movement,* says, with great plainness of speech, "substantially there is no difference at all between us and the Church of Rome in regard to the Holy Eucharist" (p. 11).

substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. Which conversion is by the Holy (Roman) Catholic Church conveniently and properly called Transubstantiation."* To which the Article before quoted replies: "Transubstantiation in the Supper of the Lord is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." This stands so much in the way of Dr. Pusey's theory respecting the identity of doctrine on the Lord's Supper between the Churches of England and Rome, that some of his disciples affirm that it was not *Transubstantiation*, but *Transaccidentation* which the Reformers condemned, the 28th Article *non obstante;* and they have endeavoured to console themselves by hoping that the Convocation of Canterbury would make a distinct declaration that the Church of England was in no wise opposed to the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. As this petition was threatened in 1867, and the process of incubation has now been going on for many years without the decree having come to its birth, we conclude its promoters have at length come to the conclusion of the hopelessness of the attempt to bring the Tridentine decrees and the Anglican Articles into harmony with each other.

Dr. Pusey was not the first to attempt this feat of ecclesiastical legerdemain, in endeavouring to prove how such contradictory dogmas might be held simultaneously by the same persons. The present Cardinal Newman, in his famous Tract No. XC., published in 1841, and four years before he seceded to the Church of Rome, explained his principle of interpreting the Articles in the following way: "Whereas it is usual at this day to make the particular belief of the writers of the Articles their true interpretation; I would make *the belief of the Catholic Church* such. I would say, the Articles are received, *not in the sense of their framers*, but, as far as the wording will admit, or any ambiguity requires it, *in the one Catholic sense*." Newman further

* The word "transubstantiation" appears to have been used first by Stephen, Bishop of Augustodunum, A.D. 1100. Cardinal Bellarmine admits that it was not imposed as an article of faith until a Council held at Rome, by Pope Gregory VII., A.D. 1073, proclaimed it. But it was not until 1215 that the fourth Council of Lateran decreed that the bread and wine underwent a *physical change*, which was termed "*transubstantiation*." Many, however, of the most distinguished Roman divines have acknowledged that the doctrine cannot be proved from Scripture, as Archbishop Tillotson in his *Discourse on Transubstantiation*, and Archbishop Stillingfleet in his *Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion*, have abundantly shown.

contended that as the Articles of the Church of England were "agreed upon in the Convocation holden at London in the year 1562," and the Council of Trent did not put forth its last decree until December 1563, "our Articles could not have been directed against the Decrees of Trent, because they were written before those decrees." But herein the Cardinal, or, speaking more exactly, the curate of Littlemore, Oxford, betrayed a remarkable ignorance of both history and chronology combined. What would be thought of an historian who should found an argument on the fact that the death-warrant of Charles I. is dated January 29th, 1648, and ignore the fact that the year then ended on March 25th, so that any event happening between January 1st and March 25th requires to be dated one year in advance of its nominal date up to the time of 1752, when the new style came into operation, and thus the death of Charles I. took place in reality in January, 1649, though the warrant reads, "Anno Dom. 1648."

Such was Newman's reasoning in Tract XC., relative to the Articles and the Council of Trent. The Convocation which passed the Articles began its sittings in January 1562 O.S., or really 1563 N.S., and continued to sit till the month of June, just six months before the conclusion of the Council of Trent. And during those six months only one single decree was passed on points mentioned in the Articles of the Church of England, viz., the 22nd Article, relating to "the Romish Doctrine of Purgatory and Invocation of Saints," both of which are described as "repugnant to the Word of God." But the Articles of the Church of England were not permanently settled in 1563. They were corrected in 1571, and finally passed at "the synod holden in London in 1603;" so that in reality Newman's allegation respecting the Articles not being directed against Roman error is of so weak and flimsy a nature, that it is marvellous to think how a man of his undeniable intellectual gifts, as well as his transparent honesty, could have believed it for a moment. And what effect had such logic upon the public mind in general? Never was a more just outcry than that against the propounder of such sentiments. This has been well expressed by eminent men of two very different schools, who have expressed their own and the general opinion entertained of him who could satisfy his conscience with such a style of reasoning. The late Archbishop Whately wrote concerning Newman's mode of treat-

ing the Articles in the following way: "The Rev. John Newman, in that famous Tract, No. XC., set such an example of hair-splitting and wire-drawing, of shuffling equivocation and dishonest garbling of quotations, as made the English people thoroughly ashamed that any man, calling himself an Englishman, a gentleman, and a clergyman, should insult their understandings and consciences with such mean sophistry." *

With this agrees the judgment of the late Bishop Phillpotts, as expressed in his Charge of 1842, and published in the appendix of the new edition of his *Letters to the Late Charles Butler* "On the Insuperable Differences which Separate the Church of England from the Church of Rome;" in which the Bishop states that "the motive of his present republication (1866) is to meet the renewed attempts which are made to reconcile the differences between the Articles of the Church of England and those of the Council of Trent." In this work the Bishop characterises Tract No. XC. as "by far the most daring attempt ever yet made by a minister of the Church of England to neutralise the distinctive doctrines of our Church, and to make us symbolise with Rome. I shall be excused if I detain you for a few minutes in unravelling the web of sophistry, which has been laboriously woven to cover it" (p. 319.)

Thus it will be seen that while Newman's original attempt to harmonise the Decrees of Trent with the Articles of the Church of England was made in 1841, the universal chorus of disapprobation with which it was met was faithfully described by the High Church Bishop of Exeter in 1842, and still more severely condemned by the Broad Church Archbishop of Dublin in 1853; and yet so confident was Dr. Pusey that all the world were wrong, and he alone right, that when he published his *Eirenicon*, in 1865, he wrote of the aforesaid Tract, No. XC., that it had "done good and lasting service by breaking off a mass of unauthorised traditional glosses, which had encrusted over the Thirty-Nine Articles. The interpretation which he then put forth, and which in him was blamed, was at the time vindicated by others without blame. No blame was attached either to my own vindication of the principles of Tract XC., or to that of the Rev. W. B. Heathcote. I vindicated it in

* *Cautions for the Times*, p. 351.

my letter to Dr. Jelf, as the *natural* grammatical interpretation of the Articles; Mr. Heathcote, as the *only admissible interpretation*" (p. 30).

However reluctantly, therefore, we are compelled to come to the conclusion that Dr. Pusey's reasoning powers are under so peculiarly warping an influence as to be unable to see the immorality of such a course as is shadowed forth in Tract No. XC., which was so sternly condemned by every one whose mind was not fettered by the same fatal prejudice. It is to us simply incomprehensible how such a man could deliberately persuade himself that Newman's mode of interpreting the Articles, so as to bring them into perfect harmony with the Decrees of Trent, was "the only admissible interpretation." And this is in fact the way in which Dr. Pusey, who has been more engaged in controversy than perhaps any two other men of the present generation, has ever carried on his arguments against opponents; either to decline controversy, as he has done of late, on the score that he is growing old, or else when engaged in the fight to select his supposed supporters, and then to omit all those parts which tell against him. We could give innumerable instances of this sort of partisan warfare had we more time and space at our disposal. We have already called attention to his treatment of Hooker respecting the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. We will give another instance of similar treatment of the same high authority pertaining to a subject which has been much discussed of late, viz., that of Auricular Confession.

About three years ago we received a letter from Dr. Pusey, in which he said: "I am forming a *catena* of our writers who have written more or less in favour of Confession. I do not think that your friends or yourself know whom they are resisting." On the appearance of this promised catena we found that it formed a portion of the work of a Roman Catholic priest, entitled *Advice to those who exercise the Ministry of Reconciliation through Confession and Absolution, being the Abbé Gaume's Manual for Confession, &c., and adapted to the use of the English Church.* As Dr. Pusey's apparent object was to show identity of doctrine on the subject of Auricular Confession between the Churches of England and Rome, we were but little surprised, after the experience of the past, at seeing the skilful way in which he manipulated his witnesses so as to make them apparently tell in his favour, though in reality they were all

against him. We give one or two specimens of this very questionable treatment of great authorities on a subject which once excited universal condemnation, when Lord Redesdale called the attention of the House of Lords to a work which some of Dr. Pusey's followers had put forth, entitled *The Priest in Absolution*, Part II., and which has been fittingly described by one of the English bishops as "reeking with obscenity."

In his catena in support of auricular confession in the Church of England, after quoting a passage from Hooker at p. lxxxvii., which Dr. Pusey considers is in favour of his own views, he studiously *omits* the following from the same author: "It is not to be marvelled that *so great a difference appeareth between the doctrine of Rome and ours*, when we teach repentance. We teach, above all things, that *repentance* which is one and the same from the beginning to the world's end; THEY, a *sacramental penance of their own devising and shaping*. WE labour to instruct men in such sort that every soul which is wounded with sin may learn how to cure itself."*

Dr. Pusey's treatment of Archbishop Usher is of a similar kind. He represents that high authority as saying: "No kind of Confession, either public or private, is disallowed by us, that is any way requisite for the due execution of that ancient power of the keys which Christ bestowed upon His Church." And there Dr. Pusey stops short. Had he continued the sentence immediately following, his readers would at once have seen how different was Usher's view of Confession from that taught and enforced by the Church of Rome. For Usher distinctly says, "*the thing which we reject is that new picklock of Sacramental Confession*, obtruded upon men's consciences, as a matter necessary to salvation, by the Canons of the late *Conventicle of Trent*."†

Dr. Pusey's treatment of Hooker and Usher, as well as of many others whom we cannot stop to adduce, is calculated not only to bring the whole subject of catenas into disrepute, by showing how thoroughly unreliable the well-known leader of the Ritualistic party is in such matters, but it also seems to prove that the learned doctor has not even the courage of his convictions. When the late Dr. Vogan, Prebendary of Chichester, published his treatise on *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist* in 1871, he en-

* Keble's Edition of *Hooker*, iii. p. 74.

† Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, p. 75, Cambridge Edition, 1835.

deavoured to bring the controversy to a practical issue by courteously inviting Dr. Pusey to defend his interpretation of our Lord's words at the institution of the rite, but this was declined, and in such a manner that it drew from the late Bishop Thirlwall, one of the most masterly minds which the Church of England has produced in the present age, the following remarks, contained in a letter addressed to the *Times*, July 25th, 1874, which places Dr. Pusey's conduct respecting the controversy on the Lord's Supper in its true and proper light. After speaking with commendation of Dr. Vogan's *True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, the Bishop continues as follows: "The appearance of such a work, so temperate in its earnestness, so modest, so charitable, is, independently of the value of its conclusions, a very rare and refreshing phenomenon in our controversial theological literature. Dr. Vogan believes himself to have proved by an irresistible mass of evidence that the doctrine of the 'Real Objective Presence' in the Eucharist taught by Dr. Pusey and his friends, *has no support either in Holy Scripture or in Catholic antiquity;* that it is *a novelty of very recent date*, the product of this nineteenth century, the consequence of a strange oversight which the author has placed in the clearest light. Such being the character and such the main design of the work, the manner in which it has been received by the persons whose theological position it most deeply concerns is not a little remarkable. One might fancy that a word of command, issuing from some invisible centre, had gone round the Ritualistic party *to neglect and ignore* Dr. Vogan's book, and if possible to bury it in contemptuous silence. The person who might most naturally have been expected to notice it in some way or other is Dr. Pusey. If Dr. Vogan's view of the true doctrine of the Eucharist is the right one, a very large part of the labours of Dr. Pusey's life has been much worse than useless. On this important matter he has misled all who relied on his authority into mischievous error. He, beyond any other man, is responsible for the evils which now afflict the Church. If his other occupations did not leave him leisure for answering Dr. Vogan, he might have committed the task to one of his disciples. That none of them should have undertaken it spontaneously is only a little less surprising than the master's silence. But there is something still stranger than this. Two years ago Dr. Vogan sent Dr. Pusey a copy of his book, but has never received a

word of acknowledgment. Within the last three months he has applied to Dr. Pusey, both privately and publicly, in the hope of learning from him whether he had or had not correctly represented his doctrine of the 'Real Presence.' Dr. Pusey's first and last word in reply is that he '*declines all controversy.*' Considering that *controversy has been the chief business of his life*, it is not surprising that he should be a little tired of it. No controversy, however, was proposed to him. He was only asked for information highly important to the cause of truth, and which would not have cost him more time than his letter to you. The exceeding harshness of the whole proceeding, so difficult to reconcile either with charity or common courtesy, indicates that he had some strong motive for his silence. But most people will consider it as expressive of one of two things—either that he regards Dr. Vogan's work as beneath his notice, or that he feels it to be unanswerable. No one who has read it will believe the possibility of the first of these alternatives. The inference I may leave to the reader."*

The practice of ignoring all controversial works on the Lord's Supper, when proceeding from men of Evangelical principles, such as the works of the late Dean Goode or Drs. Harrison and Jacob, has been the weapon employed by the *Guardian*, the *Church Times*, the *Union Review*, and other periodicals of the Ritualistic school. At this we are not astonished; because it has been the invariable habit of the party which the aforesaid periodicals represent to look down upon Evangelicals very much in the same way as the heathen regarded the Apostle Paul and his fellow Christians, as the "offscouring of all things." But as to Dr. Vogan, who was not accounted, we believe, to belong to the Evangelical school, it is indeed most remarkable that Dr. Pusey and his followers should have treated him in the way they have done. No better proof of their discretion and their discipline as a party could be afforded than the death-like silence which they displayed towards Dr. Vogan, when he courteously invited Dr. Pusey to point out any error he might have committed in his statement of the latter's views on the Lord's Supper, and was met by a determined refusal so to do. Possibly the well-known historic fact that

* Letter of Bishop Thirlwall to the *Times*, July 25th, 1874, with the signature of "Senex-Anglicanus," and acknowledged by his nephew to be his in a letter to the *Times* of Oct. 15th, 1875, after the Bishop of St. David's decease, and at his own request.

Dr. Pusey himself, as well as two of his prominent disciples, Archdeacon Denison and Mr. Bennett of Frome, had been alike condemned by three different courts for erroneous teaching on the subject of the Lord's Supper may have influenced him in his refusal to notice Dr. Vogan's appeal. But it cannot be denied that this suspicious silence is the virtual acknowledgment of defeat.

In the valuable treatise before us Dr. Hebert has proceeded upon an entirely different plan from that of Dr. Vogan. It cannot be called a controversial work, for it is a collection of the most valuable *excerpta* on the subject of the Lord's Supper from all theological writers of note, from the first to the nineteenth century; and its impartiality is beyond praise, so that we are now in possession of a work which enables us to trace, step by step, the growth of error on the subject of the Lord's Supper, from the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, as revealed in Scripture, to the teaching of the Church of Rome in the thirteenth century, when "Transubstantiation" became an Article *de fide*, and which has now been revived in the Reformed Church of England under the specious and misleading title of "the Real Objective Presence."

We must bear in mind that M. Capel in his controversy with Canon Liddon has proved that there is no difference between the doctrine of the Real Presence, as taught by the Ritualists, and that of the Church of Rome in its definition of Transubstantiation; that Dr. Pusey has declared that the Articles of the Church of England and the Tridentine Decrees are perfectly reconcilable one with the other; that an able writer of his school, the Rev. Dr. Littledale, in his tractate on the *Real Presence*, has defined the doctrine in the following words: "In the Holy Communion, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are 'verily and indeed' *present* on the altar, under the forms of bread and wine. . . . *The body and blood present are that same body and blood which were conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary*, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and ascended into heaven. This is the doctrine of the Real Presence." Seeing then that the organs of the Ritualistic party constantly affirm that they are "one with Rome in the faith," it seems a mere logomachy for any to contend that there is a distinction between the teaching of the Ritualists and of the Church of Rome on the subject of the Lord's Supper. It is true that some of the less candid members of the party

fence with the question when pressed,—as, for instance, the Rev. Mr. Bennett of Frome, when examined before the Royal Commission on Ritual,—pretending they do not understand what "Transubstantiation" really means. It may not therefore be amiss to point out what some distinguished divines have thought on the subject. "Transubstantiation," said the very learned Selden, "is nothing but rhetoric turned into logic." South called it "the most stupendous piece of nonsense that ever was owned on the face of a rational world." And Bishop Jeremy Taylor scrupled not to say, in his long enumeration of its absurdities: "By this doctrine, the same thing stays in a place and goes away from it, it removes from itself, and yet abides close by itself and in itself and out of itself. It is brought from heaven to earth, and yet is nowhere in the way, nor even stirs out of heaven. It makes a thing contained bigger than that which contains it, and all Christ's body to go into a part of His body; His whole head into His own mouth, if He did eat the Eucharist, as it is probable He did, and certain that He might have done."

A similar theory appears to have been held by some of the most superstitious heathen before the promulgation of the Gospel, and to have been censured in the style of Jeremy Taylor's reproof, by the greatest of the Pagan philosophers. "When we call wine *Bacchus*," argues Cicero in his *De Naturâ Deorum* (iii. c. 16), "and our fruits *Ceres*, we use *the common mode of speaking:* but can you imagine any person so mad as to think what he eats to be *a god!*" In a similar way the celebrated Clement of Alexandria, two centuries after the time of Cicero, and speaking as a Christian philosopher, says in his *Stromata* (vii. c. 5), "It were indeed ridiculous, as the heathen philosophers themselves admit, for man, the plaything of God, *to make God*, and for God to be the plaything of art."

Although the growth of error may be very slow, and its progress so gradual that it may be almost invisible and scarcely possible to detect, it would be difficult to account for the accretions which have gathered around the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, from the simple teaching of the Master and His Apostles in the first century to the full-blown doctrine of Transubstantiation as defined by the fourth Lateran Council in the thirteenth century, did we not remember that the germ of the corruption existed in the days of the Apostles, as St. Paul declares in his Epistle to the Thessa-

lonians, and that in due time men would have so far departed from the original faith of the Gospel that "God would send them strong delusion that they should believe *the* lie." Dr. Hebert has justly pointed out some of the reasons which may serve to explain this lamentable, dangerous, and ever-recurring error.

"In reading," he says, "the accredited writers on the Lord's Supper, one comes from time to time to a saying so decisive and incisive, that if one thinks out all its consequences, one might give way for a time to the belief that, after this saying had been put forth into the world of theological thought, no more fatal confusion would long remain. Take, for instance, a declaration of Luther in his *Captivity of the Church in Babylon*: 'Safer to deny everything than to concede that the mass is a work (*i.e.* of an atoning or justifying nature) or a sacrifice.' Take again Dean Comber: 'We deny this communion to be any new sacrificing of Christ: for there is but one sacrifice,' saith St. Ambrose, 'not many; and this is but the exemplar of that. This is only a memorial which the Lord hath delivered unto us instead of a sacrifice. As saith Eusebius, the sacrifice need not be reiterated. It is sufficient to remember it with eucharist and thanksgiving.' Or take Chrysostom's pithy conclusion, 'Our work in this sacrament is to promote the remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ.'

"Starting in thought from these and many more like sayings, one might give in to the pleasing imagination that surely from the date of the utterance of each, the making of the simple consecration of the elements into the presentation of an offering and a sacrifice to God would have ceased, and the opinions of leading churches would have moved back into accordance with the simple picture of the Supper in the pages of the Evangelists and St. Paul.

"But what has been the fact all along? We come again and again to this fiction of the Supper being a sacrifice: as the great light of Oxford, John Rainolds said, *Ex sacramento fecerunt sacrificium;* and to this day not those only who are styled High Churchmen, but many others that are more or less opposed to them in general, thrust from them and would fain silence, as a matter of prudence, every equally distinct utterance that this sacrament is not to be regarded as a sacrifice, except as a surrender of ourselves afresh and as an occasion of offering up prayers through Christ, who alone is once for all our sacrifice. If the sayings cited above are just, how is it that people still shrink from this decisive teaching, and say that, in a certain sense, *quodam modo*, it is a sacrifice of Christ, and that in that sense the Christian minister is properly a priest, and that in that sense the table is an altar? All do not say all this; but it is all coherent. Admit a part and all the correlative terms and ideas follow.

"Is there any explanation of this ever-current anomaly, except the bringing into full light the actual language of the Fathers and leading men of the Church from the beginning until now? If we find that they are variable in their testimony, as one says who had deeply studied them at Louvain, as well as at Oxford, in the Church of Rome as well as in the Church of England (the immortal Chillingworth), 'there are not only some Fathers against others,' but 'the same Fathers against themselves,' 'traditive interpretations pretended, but few or none to be found;' this may explain the phenomena in the later ages. If, for one instance, Ambrose, the first Father cited by Dean Comber, not only calls the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, but insists, and no man more so, upon that change of the bread and wine into Christ's very natural body and blood, which is essential, according to Bellarmine, to its being a sacrifice. But some one will say, 'It is easy to make all these charges. Ambrose and all the rest of the early writers doubtless used strong expressions; but they only meant them to be taken in a spiritual sense.' But only hear him, and judge whether he bears out all that has been said.

"Hear him first on the mysteries. 'This body which we priests make came out of the Virgin.' Hear him again on the sacraments. 'That bread is bread before the words of consecration in the sacraments. When the consecration has been added, from bread it becomes Christ's flesh.' Can words be plainer or more express?

"It is possible to show ground for the belief that Ambrose taught two distinct and opposite systems of doctrine. But which grew with the greater strength and swallowed up the other for centuries? Accept the case of Ambrose, and go from him to the two greatest of the Latin Fathers, Jerome and Augustine; and say whether Jerome did not expressly teach two opposite systems, and whether Augustine himself be not liable to the same charge in a different degree. On reconsideration I think that the whole matter turned on Ambrose, the retired political—the man of the world, though not a philosopher. Ambrose above all stamps the indelible impression. Ambrose, to whom Jerome seems to have hearkened. Ambrose, who biassed the mind of Augustine himself, the apostle of the doctrines of grace, the brother champion with Jerome in treading down the chief heresies of the day. Thus were the teachings of the great fourth century settled. Nor was any serious change achieved in the system of doctrine that they left to the world till the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. Till then accretion after accretion of symbolic ceremonies fortified the teaching of the fourth century, viz., that the Lord's Supper is a sacrifice to God, and that the clergy are its priests, and that the table is its altar, and that in some way or other the bread and wine are changed into the real body and blood of

Christ. These admissions were fatal to the simplicity of the Church. In a word, what are called sacramentalism and sacerdotalism trod down everything; and in vain John Scotus Erigena, and Ratram, and Berengarius laboured and suffered. At last Wyclif of England sent over precious seed to Bohemia; and fire and blood at Constance ushered in the coming day of Luther, and Zwingle, and Calvin, and the English Reformers. If Christendom is still tried with the reappearance of the same διδασκαλία, what remains *but to revert afresh to the only fountain, and to bring all to the one standard?* It is just this necessity that alone can justify, if anything can justify in the eyes of many, the boldness and the magnitude of this work."—Vol. i. pp. 7—11.

A return to the only foundation, the sole source of all wisdom, the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make men wise unto salvation, as Chillingworth forcibly expressed it, "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants," is the only safe course to pursue. Leaving this in order to take up with the writings of fallible men, however near they may have lived to the time of the Apostles, however devoted they may have been in their hearts, or however intellectual in their gifts, is like Adam's expulsion from Paradise to the ground full of thorns and thistles, from which food can alone be extracted with labour and toil. We see this exemplified in a very remarkable way respecting the subject before us. Clement, the fellow labourer of St. Paul (Phil. iv. 3), and president of the early Christians at Rome, during some years of the first century, addressed an epistle to his fellow believers at Corinth, which was so highly esteemed that it used to be read in some of the churches * previous to the Council of Nice, with the inspired writings of the Evangelists and Apostles; and, as may be seen at the British Museum, is bound up with the oldest copy of the Scriptures which we possess, viz., the celebrated *Codex Alexandrinus.* But inasmuch as Clement in this epistle mentions the phœnix (his contemporary, the historian Tacitus, likewise alludes to the fabulous bird) as an illustration of the doctrine of the resurrection, as if it were a true fact in natural history, we are almost disposed to see in its rejection from being counted among the Canonical Books, a Providential interference. For had it been so admitted, what a

* Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.*, iii. c. 16) mentions that "he knew it was read in public in most churches both of old time and now." And Jerome adds that "in his time the reading of it had not ceased."

handle it would have afforded to sceptics in general to degrade the oracles of God. The influence, however, of the Epistle, so extensively read in churches, until the time of the fourth century, must have been very great. And this may justify our conclusion of Clement having been the agent, though probably the unconscious agent, of the grave departure from the doctrine of the Apostolic Church on the subject of the Lord's Supper.

A careful analysis of the little which Clement has said on the matter will enable us to judge how far this Father may be considered to have been the first to depart from the simplicity of the evangelical faith in relation to the Lord's Supper. His words which bear on the subject read as follows: "A sacrifice of praise will glorify me, and there is a way thereby which will show him the salvation of God. This is the way, beloved, in which we find our Saviour, even Jesus Christ, the High Priest of all our offerings, the Defender and Helper of our infirmity.... Since we look into the depths of Divine knowledge, it behoves us to do all things in order, which the Lord has commanded us to accomplish at stated times. He commanded that *the offerings* and public services be performed with care at the appointed hours. Where and by whom He desires these things to be done He Himself has fixed by His own supreme will, in order that all things being piously done according to His good pleasure may be acceptable to Him. They, then, who make their offerings at the appointed times are both acceptable and blessed: for inasmuch as they follow the laws of the Lord, they sin not. For to the high priest are assigned his own public ministrations, and to the priests their proper place is prescribed, as also to the Levites. The layman is bound by the laws which pertain to laymen" (chapters xxxv., xxxvi., xl).

The question to be considered is, what is the proper meaning to be attached to "the offerings and public services" mentioned by Clement? If the sense of "offerings" in the first four centuries of the Christian era be a guide to the meaning of Clement in the use of the term, it either signifies the Lord's Supper, or the gifts presented at that time to the clergy, which may have been placed on the table, and out of which the bread and wine required for the communion were often taken. But they can hardly be called "offerings" here, because such gifts could not be

said to be "performed or accomplished with care." We must, therefore, conclude that Clement refers to the Lord's Supper; and that he speaks of it as a thing "offered" to God, just as the sacrifices of old were "offered." But no such words are to be found in Holy Scripture, either in our Saviour's or St. Paul's instructions on the subject. St. Paul speaks of the "things which the Gentiles sacrifice;" but neither he nor his Master uses the terms "sacrifice" or "offer," in relation to the Lord's Supper. And we should remember that this is not an unimportant matter. It is the beginning of the very question at issue, viz., whether the Christian ordinance of the Lord's Supper is to be assimilated to the sacrificial rites of the Mosaic law. If this be so, then all the old terms—such as "altar," "priest," "temple," &c.—must be applied to the Lord's Supper. We do not mean to infer that Clement meant all this by using the term "offerings;" and, indeed, as Clement, in the chapter succeeding the one we have quoted above, speaks of "the offerings" as confined to "Jerusalem only," it appears as if he did not mean to regard the Lord's Supper as having anything to do with sacrifice, save the surrender of ourselves, both soul and body, unto God. Nevertheless, by using the term in the manner and in the connection in which he uses it here, without any Scripture warrant for so doing, he opens the door for the introduction of the whole body of Jewish terms and ideas in their application to the rites of the new and better covenant. As these terms do not occur in the Scripture record of the Lord's Supper, we must assume that the Holy Ghost never intended them to be so applied. But these terms, introduced by an uninspired teacher, one of great eminence in the early Church, and, in consequence, read everywhere in public, had the effect of preparing the way for what the pseudo-Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus of the following century added in the same direction. They prepared the way for Cyprian of the third century; and thus for the chief writers of the century following, by whom the rite of the Lord's Supper was boldly Judaised, even to the extent of making Christ's actual body in His "natural," *i.e.* His human nature, flesh and blood present on the altar, and given, taken, and eaten by the communicants, whether bad or good, in contradistinction to the true Catholic doctrine of Apostolic origin, as expressed in the formula: "given by God, not by the priest; taken by faith, and not

by the hand; eaten by the soul, and not by the mouth." And to bring the invention or speculation of unrestrained men to its climax, respecting the departure from the original faith of the Apostles on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, we shall find Jerome, one of the greatest writers of the fourth century next to Augustine, declaring that "the holy mind of the priest, who will have *to make* the body of Christ, should be free from wandering thoughts" (*Ep. ad Titum I.*). And, again, "The holy Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, deems no riches equal *to the Lord's body which he carries in a wicker basket*, and His blood in a glass cruet" (*Ep. ad Rusticum I.*). Thus we have an illustration of the force of the French proverb, *Il n'y a que le premier pas qui coûte.*

The forgeries, however, which were put forth as early as the end of the third century, or the beginning of the fourth, and which are now known under the general term of "the Clementines," afford a very instructive lesson as to the growth of error in everything pertaining to sacerdotal assumption in general, and to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in particular. The *Decretal Letters* profess to be written by Clement of Rome to the Apostle James of Jerusalem, to instruct him in matters concerning the Eucharist, which St. Paul had left in his hands for the benefit of the universal Church. The *Apostolical Constitutions* profess to come from all the Apostles through the same channel, and include an arrangement for the Communion Service by James, the brother of John, the son of Zebedee. The *Recognitions* contain a long story of Clement's travels with Simon Peter, and an account of the latter's contention at Rome with Simon Magus, which, in the thirteenth century, was the subject of one of the most elaborate fables of the Dark Ages, by Jacobus de Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa, under the title of *The Golden Legend*. The most influential of these pseudo-Clementine productions are the *Apostolical Constitutions*, whose title gives them a fictitious importance in the eyes of the unlearned. The first blow given to the supposed authenticity of these writings is that by Eusebius of Cæsarea, who, when writing early in the fifth century, recognises only one Epistle to the Corinthians as the genuine production of Clement of Rome. And respecting the date of these so-called *Apostolical Constitutions and Canons*, it is clear that they were not known, in the third century, by Firmilian, in his con-

tention with Cyprian; and we cannot be far astray in regarding them as the production of the end of that century, or the beginning of the next. They are naturally supposed to have been forged for the purpose of augmenting the growing prestige of Rome; notwithstanding that they are branded as "Apocryphal" by Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, in the fifth century, and Cardinal Humbert in the eleventh repeats the condemnation.

A specimen of false teaching on the subject of the Lord's Supper is seen in the Second Decretal Letter, which is supposed to be addressed by Clement of Rome to James, Bishop of Jerusalem, and speaks of the kind of belief which Christians ought to entertain respecting the sacrament as he had received it from Simon Peter, who is termed "the father of all the Apostles." Hence the forger says: "The sacraments of our divine secret things are entrusted to three orders, viz., the presbyter, the deacon, and the attendant,* who guard the relics of the fragments of the Lord's Body. As many whole burnt-offerings should be offered on the altar as may be enough for the people. But if any remain let it be carefully eaten by the clergy. But let not those who eat the remaining portion of the Lord's Body receive directly after common food, lest they should think that the food in them is commingled with the consecrated portion. If this be partaken of in the morning, let the ministers fast till noon; and if on the third or fourth hour, let them fast until the evening. Let the deacons and the lower attendants wash the old palls and veils near the holy place, and not throw them out of doors, lest it should unfortunately happen that some dust off the Lord's Body should fall on the ground from a cloth washed outside, and this should be a sin to him who is engaged in the work."

It will be seen that this forged Decretal not only supplies us with evidence of the rapid growth of superstition, as early as the third or fourth century, but also points to

* It is a significant fact that the forger of this Epistle should represent the "three orders—a presbyter, deacon, and attendant," called in the modern Roman Church "acolyte," in place of "bishop, presbyter, and deacon," thereby affording evidence that at the close of the first century, when Clement of Rome lived, there was no distinction of order between the bishop and presbyter. Consequently in Clement's sole genuine writing only two orders are specified, bishops and deacons, as in Scripture. Three separate orders were not known before the middle of the second century, the pseudo-Ignatian Epistles notwithstanding.

three distinct heresies which had then crept in amongst unfaithful Christians; and which, strange to say, have been revived in our own time amongst the Ritualistic party in the Protestant Church of England. 1. We have the rapid advance towards the doctrine of "Transubstantiation. 2. The necessity of what is called "Fasting Communion." 3. The duty of abstaining from food for a certain time after partaking of the Lord's Supper.

On the latter point, Dr. F. G. Lee, Vicar of All Saints, Lambeth, an advanced Ritualist, gives in his *Directorium Anglicanum* some "cautions against receiving the Lord's Supper unworthily," the nature of which will be understood by the following quotation: "The sixth cautel, or caution, is: *Before Mass*, the priest *must not wash his mouth or teeth*, but only his lips from without with his mouth closed, as he has need, lest perchance he should mingle the taste of water with his saliva. *After Mass*, he should beware of expectorations as much as possible, until he shall have eaten and drunken, lest by chance anything should have remained between his teeth, or his *fauces*, which, by expectorating, he might eject"* (p. 108).

The Ritualistic party have also published a manual, entitled *The Crown of Jesus*, which enables us to ascertain how long Dr. Lee and his friends are required to abstain from expectorating after having "said Mass," or as the faithful would call it, "partaking of the Lord's Supper," and reads as follows: "When you have received the sacred particle upon your tongue, try and swallow it as soon as you can. Remember that it is a defect not to pass *at least a quarter of an hour* in thanking Jesus Christ, who *remains within you* in the Holy Sacrament *for about that time, i.e.*, as long as the sacramental species remain."

On the subject of *Fasting Communion*, as it is practised by many of the bolder and more advanced Ritualists in the present day, it may be well to quote the testimony of a High-Church bishop, the late Bishop Wilberforce, who expressed his views in an address delivered to the rural deans of his diocese only a few days before his sudden death.

---

* The *Edinburgh Review* of April, 1880, has justly remarked of these "Cautels" or cautions respecting the Lord's Supper: "Some of these are of so loathsome, and some so puerile a character, that we may well be excused from exposing them to the full measure of scorn and ridicule which they are calculated to provoke."

"It is not in a light sense that I say *the new doctrine of Fasting Communion* is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes in a clearer spirit and less disturbed body and mind, able to give himself entirely to prayer and communion with his God, but on a miserable degraded notion that the consecrated elements will meet with other food in the stomach. *It is detestable materialism.* Philosophically it is a contradiction, because when the celebration is over you may hurry away to a meal, and the process about which you were so scrupulous immediately follows. The whole notion is simply disgusting. The Patristic quotations by which the custom is supported are misquotations. St. Chrysostom's saying on the subject applies to the mid-day meal, not to the light repast of our ordinary breakfast. It is put on the moral grounds that after a feast there will be fulness, and during a feast there will be jesting and talking, all which constitute a moral unfitness for so high a ceremonial. Then what a dangerous consequence results in non-communicating attendance. Pressed not even for physical reasons, it brings us back to the great abuse of coming to the sacrament to be spectators instead of partakers, and so we have the condition of things arising in our communion which already prevails in the Church of Rome. That this custom is creeping into our Church is not an accident, neither is it brought in for the purpose of making children better acquainted with the service. It is recommended under the idea that prayer is more acceptable at this time of the sacrifice; that you can get benefit from being within sight of the sacrificial sacrament when it is being administered. It is a substitution of a semi-materialistic presence for the actual presence of Christ in the soul of the faithful communicant. It is an abomination, this teaching of non-communicating attendance as a common habit. It is a corollary on the practice of *Fasting Communion.* If you cannot fast till mid-day, and must not communicate without fasting, then you are to be present and expect the benefit, though you do not comply with the conditions of the sacrament. *Thus the Roman theory is creeping in.* The sacrificing priest stands between your soul and your God, and makes atonement for you. Fasting till the mid-day communion is irritation of the nerves, unfitting you to partake of this holy office."

Such is a portion of the unfaithful teaching and practice which has led astray many members of the Reformed Church of England in the present day; and the words of Bishop Wilberforce, uttered on the brink of the grave, afford a very striking testimony in the way of reply to some of the errors which were creeping fast into the Church of the fourth century, as appears by the forged decretal falsely attributed to Clement of Rome quoted above.

To trace and so to prove the influence of these fictitious documents upon the belief and practice of the Christian Church, how they affected the decrees of subsequent Councils and the writings of successive Fathers, how they strengthened the hands of those who taught salvation by the sacraments and other superstitious rites, how they exalted the priesthood, which eventually came to occupy the place of the Pharisaic doctors of the Mosaic dispensation, so sternly condemned by our Saviour, has been ably and fairly accomplished by Hefele; and particularly in his investigation of Möhler's theory on the subject of the "pseudo-Isidore" decrees in the Encyclopædic Dictionary —both Hefele and Möhler, it should be remembered, belonging to the Roman Church. Those that followed up these figments in after ages, by liberally mingling truth and error, thought that in exalting the clergy and the rites and sacraments of the Church above every lay power, they were adopting the only means of contending successfully against dominant evil. An examination of Hildebrand's early life shows that he began with hopes and purposes of this kind in no narrow measure, and with no feeble desire; but what the result has been from the supposed Divine right and consequent unlimited supremacy of the clergy, the true history of the nominal Church, especially in any part of the dark ages, proves only too well.

There is little in the Apostolical Canons deserving of quotation in reference to the Lord's Supper beyond the significant terms which were gradually coming into use even in the ante-Nicene Church, such as "the offering," "the altar," "the sacrifice," "the roll of priests," &c., &c.,—save the last of these pseudo-Apostolical Canons (the 85th), which speaks of "the Apostolical Constitutions as addressed to you Bishops by me, Clement, in eight books, which ought not to be divulged to all on account of the mystical things contained in them; and the Acts of us the Apostles"! The way in which Clement, "the fellow labourer" of St. Paul, is here mentioned, fully proves the forged nature of these so-called "Apostolical Canons." And the fables which are recorded respecting the martyrdom of Clement further confirms our view. Thus Amphidian is represented as having been sent by the Emperor Trajan to the Crimæa, to execute the Imperial vengeance upon the holy martyr, when he gives the following order: "Let Clement be taken off into the midst of the sea, and

bind an anchor to his neck, that the Christians may not be able to worship him for a god." When this was done the Christians stood by on the sea shore watching and weeping. Then the fabulous record continues: "After this Cornelius and Phœbus, his disciples, said, 'Let us pray with one accord that the Lord may show to us *the relics of this martyr*.' While the people were praying the sea receded into its own bosom *for nearly three miles;* into which the Christians entered and found a habitation well prepared by God in the form of a temple of marble, and there on a bier of stone was laid the body of the holy Clement, the disciple of the Apostle Peter, and the anchor by which he was cast down into the sea close beside him. It was then revealed to the disciples that they should not remove the body of Clement, for at each anniversary on the day of his trial the sea would recede for seven days, making a dry passage for those who came to see; which to the praise of the Lord continues *unto this day*"!

We have dwelt thus long on the fabulous accretions which have gathered around the life and writings of Clement, the fellow labourer of St. Paul, because it was his innocent use of the word "offerings" on which the mighty superstructure of error was possibly built up, which culminated in the gigantic delusion of the thirteenth century known as "Transubstantiation," and the equally fallacious errors of nominal Protestants in the nineteenth century known by the misleading and newly-invented title of "the Real Objective Presence."

The first distinct evidence of a departure from the primitive practice—we do not say the primitive faith—respecting the Lord's Supper, was *the hour* of its administration. "For the first and second centuries," as Dean Stanley said in his Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on 1 Corinthians xi. 24, "the Lord's Supper was partaken of on Sunday evenings." The earliest writer who gives an account of the administration of that sacred rite is Justin Martyr, in his *First Apology*, which was written in the middle of the second century, or possibly as early as the year B.C. 140; but as he says nothing about the hour of its administration, we can only infer from his words that it was some time "on the day called Sunday," and judging from the practice of the Apostolic Church a century before, as well as the language of Tertullian half a century later, that it must have been in the evening. For

the words of Tertullian in his work, *De Coronâ*, c. 3, read as follows: "We partake of the Sacrament of the Eucharist as appointed by the Lord for all at the time of the evening meal, and likewise in the *antelucan* (before daylight) assemblies; and not from any other one's hands than the president's. We make offerings for the dead and for the birthdays on the anniversaries. We consider fasting unlawful on the Lord's Day, as also kneeling on that day to worship. We enjoy the same exception from the general rule of kneeling from the Passover to Pentecost; but we are painfully affected if any particles from our cup or the bread falleth to the ground." All this mixture of superstition and truth shows how rapidly the growth of error was creeping on in the Church.

There is no doubt that the hour of administration of the Lord's Supper has greatly varied in the Christian Church since the second century; nor can we wonder, since the Master has clearly left His true disciples full liberty to regulate the time of receiving this holy rite, as each church or congregation has thought most convenient and fit for the purpose. As late as the fourth century we find certain Christians in Africa retaining the practice of the primitive Christians at Troas, according to the historian Socrates, who says: "The Egyptians in the neighbourhood of Alexandria and the inhabitants of the Thebais hold their religious meetings on the Sabbath, and do not participate in the mysteries in the manner usual with the Christians in general; for after having eaten of ordinary food, making their oblations in the evening, they partake of the Lord's Supper." By which it appears, that while the majority of Christians had fallen from the practice of Evening Communions the Churches of Egypt and the Thebais had retained it.

We learn from the eighth sermon of Ambrose, on Psalm cxviii., that in his time (fourth century) the administration of the Lord's Supper, with the Milanese Christians, took place "at the end of the day, during a fast," *i.e.*, the time was retained as with the primitive Christians, though the Agapé had fallen into disuse, probably on account of its attendant evils, and a fast took the place of a feast. About half a century after Ambrose, Augustine speaks of an Evening Communion "on the Thursday before Easter, after the example of our Lord" (Epist. 118, ad Jan. c. 5). The Evening Communion, which retained

its ground longest in the Church, was that which took place on Christmas-eve, as the Synod assembled at Valentia, A.D. 1250, shows; one of its decrees being to this effect: "None shall celebrate mass (the Roman and modern Ritualistic substitute for the Lord's Supper) after mid-day, *except on Easter-eve*, nor by night, *except on Christmas-eve*." The Church of England and the various Nonconformist Churches throughout the three kingdoms have wisely abstained from limiting the Holy Communion to any special hours of the day. One ordinary time of administration is at the close of the first hour of evening, between one and two p.m., and has been so since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, we rejoice to see a return to the primitive practice of Evening Communion, on the part of many churches of the Establishment. Thus, *e.g.*, according to Mackeson's *Guide to the Churches of London*, whereas a few years ago Evening Communion was the rule in only 47, now there are upwards of 250 churches in the Metropolis alone where this godly and primitive practice is observed.

It is remarkable, however, to notice what angry passions this has given rise to on the part of the sacerdotal party in the Church of England. "In our eyes," says one, "Evening Communion is deadly sin." "I should consider it sacrilege," says another, "to have Evening Communion." While a third describes it as a "miserable profanation." And they endeavour to give force to their "hard speeches" in so remarkable a manner that it is deserving of record. The Rev. S. Boucher, Principal of a Ritualistic Training College at Carnarvon, where one might expect the rudiments of the Latin language would be fairly taught, has put forth a statement that Evening Communions are contrary to "antiquity," on the ground that Pliny says so in his celebrated Letter to Trajan. Mr. Boucher's rendering of Pliny's Letter is as follows: "At the beginning of the second century Pliny, writing from Asia to the Emperor Trajan, describes the Christians as a strange sort of people, who were accustomed to assemble very early in the morning, on a day appointed *for Eucharistic and sacramental worship* of Christ as God, and then to separate again at a later period of the day for the Agapé." It will hardly be credited, but it is a fact, that the words in italics are an interpolation of Mr. Boucher's own, as if supposing that it would pass muster with his not very learned followers.

What Pliny really did say was this: "The Christians were wont to meet together on a stated day, and sing, among themselves, a hymn *to Christ as God*, and bind themselves by an oath against the commission of any wickedness (*seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere*). When these things were done, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again *to a meal*." That meal being, as Mr. Boucher observes, truly enough, the Agapé, which *always*, as is well known, preceded, not succeeded, the Lord's Supper. So much for the attempt to show that the primitive Christians partook of the Lord's Supper in the morning. We observe with regret, but without surprise, that one of the organs of the Ritualistic party is so embittered against the Evangelical practice of Evening Communion, that it has thought it becoming a professedly Church newspaper to write in the following strain of those who are opposed to its views:

"It is simply dreadful to contemplate the fact that Low Churchmen do as they do about Evening Communions with a distinct polemical purpose. Again and again, that wretched print, *The Rock*, urges the introduction of Evening Communions everywhere, on the express ground of the value of the practice as a party weapon. *With almost fiendish delight* it records the setting up of *this abomination* in any church. Evening Communion has been made an offensive and profane badge of a party, and it behoves every Evangelical to put away *this accursed thing* from him" (*The Church Review*, March 7, 1879).

Another and a far more important matter respecting the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper, was the sense in which the primitive Christians understood our Lord's words on the original institution of the sacred ordinance, when He uttered the words, "This is My body," "this is My blood." Was He speaking in symbolical and figurative language or not? Dr. Pusey, in the Preface to his Oxford sermon on *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, asserts that they are to be understood literally, and consequently the figurative interpretation is out of court. Let us then see how this branch of the subject was understood by the great doctors and teachers of the ante-Nicene Church. Augustine lays down a very good rule, which is peculiarly pertinent to the right mode of interpreting Scripture, especially in relation to the subject before us. "If," says he, "the sentence contains a command, either

forbidding crime or vice, or enjoining acts of usefulness or benevolence, it is *not figurative*. If, however, it appears to command any crime or vice, *it is figurative*. As when Christ says, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' This seems to enjoin a crime or vice; *it is, therefore, a figure*, enjoining that we should have a share of the sufferings of our Lord, and that we should retain a sweet and profitable memory of the fact that His flesh was wounded and crucified for us."* Hence in another work Augustine sets forth the primitive view of interpreting our Lord's words respecting His flesh *figuratively*, as in his comment on the sixth chapter of St. John, he sums up the whole subject in this one short, emphatic sentence, "*Believe and thou hast eaten.*"†

Hence we find the early writers unanimous on the subject of interpreting our Lord's words in a figurative sense. Ignatius, or the writer of an Epistle attributed to him, says, "Wherefore, putting on meekness, renew yourself in *faith, which is the flesh of the Lord;* and in *love*, which is *the blood* of Christ Jesus."‡

Justin Martyr, writing against his Jewish opponent, asserts that "The bread of the Eucharist was *a figure*, which Christ the Lord commanded to be celebrated in memory of His passion."§

Clement of Alexandria declares, "*Faith* is our food. Our Lord, in the Gospel of St. John, has *by means of figures* set forth such food as this. For when He says, 'Eat My flesh and drink My blood,' He is evidently *allegorising* the drinkableness of faith."‖

Tertullian speaks with still greater distinctness on this point, for he writes, "The bread which Christ took and distributed to His disciples, He made His body by saying, 'This is My body,' *i.e., the figure of my body.*"¶

Origen, in reply to the doctrines of the Marcionites, writes: "If, as the Marcionites affirm, Christ had neither flesh nor blood, of what flesh, or body, or blood are the bread and the cup which He delivered, *the images?* By *these figures* He commended His memory to His disciples."** "We are said to drink the blood of Christ, not only by way

* *On Christian Doctrine*, iii. 16, § 24.
† *Tractate*, xxv. § 12.
‡ *Epist. ad Trall.*, c. 8.
§ *Dial. cum Trypho*, § 41.
‖ *Pædagog.* i., c. 6.
¶ *Adv. Marcion*, iv. c. 40.
** *Dial. Contr. Marcion*, c. 3.

of the sacraments, *but also when we receive His word*, wherein consisteth life, as He Himself says: 'The words which I have spoken are spirit and life.'"*

Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, at the commencement of the fourth century, says: "Christ gave to His disciples *the figures* of Divine economy, commanding the image of His own body to be made. The disciples of Christ received a command, according to the principles of the New Testament, to make a memorial of this sacrifice upon the table, *by the figures of His body* and saving blood." †

So much for the testimony of the ante-Nicene Church; and though, during the fourth century, through the unhappy step which the Emperor Constantine took to force a union between decaying heathenism and the deteriorated Christianity of that age, and which did more injury to the spirituality of Christ's kingdom than anything which had gone before, many of the well-known writers of the post-Nicene Church, though displaying some signs of growth in error on the subject of the Lord's Supper, yet hold with undeviating uniformity this important truth, that at the Lord's Supper, to use the words of Augustine, "Our Lord took and delivered to His disciples *the figures of His Body and Blood.*" ‡ And again, "The Lord hesitated not to say, 'This is My body,' when He gave *a sign of His body.*" So that for Dr. Pusey, or any other, to deny this evident fact, is a melancholy proof of the way in which strong partisanship is apt to obscure the spiritual vision of the most devoted of men, when determined to support an untenable theory: one that has been so firmly rejected by the Reformed Church of England, and by all the non-Episcopalian Churches throughout the world.

Dr. Pusey quotes from a printer's advertisement appended to the First Book of Homilies, in 1547, before the doctrine of Transubstantiation had been formally repudiated by the Church of England, which he thinks may tell in favour of his own views, and which enables him to hold, at the same time, the opposite doctrines of the Churches of England and Rome on the subject of the Lord's Supper. But it would have been more candid if he had reminded his readers of the authoritative teaching of the Church to which he professes to belong, as expressed in

* Origen, in Numb. c. 24. *Homil.* 16.
† *Demonst. Evangel.* Lib. i. c. ult.; Lib. viii. c. 1.
‡ Augustine, in Psalm iii.; and contr. *Adenais*, c. 12.

her Articles: "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner; and *the mean* whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *Faith*" (Art. 28). So in the Second Book of Homilies it is written: "As Ambrose saith, he is unworthy of the Lord that otherwise doth celebrate the Lord's Supper otherwise than it was delivered by Him. *We must then take heed lest of the memory, it be made a sacrifice.* What hath been the ruin of God's religion but the ignorance hereof, *i.e.*, profaning the Lord's Supper by the Corinthians? What hath been the cause of *this gross idolatry* but the ignorance thereof? Let us so understand the Lord's Supper that there be *no idolatry*.* Therefore, saith Cyprian, 'When we do these things, we need not to whet our teeth, but with sincere faith, we break and divide that holy bread.' It is well known that the meat we seek for in this Supper is *spiritual*, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection, and not earthly, an invisible meat, and not *bodily*" (Homily xxvii.). Hence the Church of England declares that "if any man by reason of sickness, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, or *if he do truly repent* him of his sins, and steadfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the cross for him, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he doth not eat the Sacrament with his mouth."†

Although the growth of superstition and error became exceedingly rapid after the amalgamation of Church and State, it was not until the ninth century that gross darkness had sufficiently covered the people to enable the leading spirits of the Church of Rome to take a further step towards developing the final dogma called "Transubstantiation," which was not made even an article of faith by the Papacy until upwards of three centuries

* The Ceylon newspapers three years ago reported an incident as having occurred at the administration of the Lord's Supper by one of the Ritualistic clergy imported by the Bishop of Colombo, who has recently acted so hostile a part towards the Church Missionary Society. A young clergyman of the name of Duthy remained so long *in a state of prostration* before the Lord's Table during the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the congregation rose *en masse*, and quitted the church, declaring that they "had not gone to church to worship Mr. Duthy's *boots*." We reluctantly quote this simply to show the state of feeling abroad as well as at home.

† Third Rubric of the Service for the Communion of the Sick.

later. The pseudo-Isidorian Decretals were first cited as authoritative A.D. 864 by Pope Nicholas against Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who at the Synod of Soissons in the year before had deposed Bishop Rothad without regarding his appeal to the Pope, and had also appointed his successor. But it had been foretold in Scripture that men should believe delusions, and this had now come to pass. The Pope came to the encounter fresh from his victory over the French king Lothair in the matter of Walrada; and now by aid of the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals he succeeded in establishing Papal supremacy over both secular and ecclesiastical authorities. This remained unshaken for two centuries, till the French king Philip Augustus called into active life his "States General," when by means of the great French ecclesiastical lawyers they delivered such a blow on this foundation of Papal usurpation, as made it rock to its centre, prepared the way for the doctrine of the religious independence of nations, and initiated that long struggle of which the Councils of Pisa and Constance and Basle were stages, and Luther and Zwingle the final and successful combatants. These forged decretals represent Clement, the fellow labourer of St. Paul, teaching, as we have already seen, that "the sacraments were entrusted to the clergy, who ought with fear and trembling to guard *the relics of the fragments of the Lord's Body* lest anything corrupt should be found in the sacred cup; and the palls and veils should be washed close to the sanctuary lest perchance some dust of the Lord's body unhappily fall from the linen if washed out of doors, and thus become sin to him that doth the work."

It was reserved for Bertram, or Ratram, the Monk of Corbey, who had flourished at the very time when Pope Nicholas I. was triumphing over the Archbishop of Rheims, to be the honoured instrument of opening the eyes of the leading Reformers respecting the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper; and thus effecting the greatest and happiest revolution in the Church since the day of Pentecost. Without entering minutely into the great controversy in which Bertram was engaged, for which we have no space, it will be sufficient to mention that, besides his works *On Predestination* against Gotteschalk; and four books on the strife between Photius, Patriarch of the Eastern Church, and Nicholas I., the Roman Pope, including the question of

the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, Bertram wrote his renowned treatise exclusively on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Very many of his statements respecting it are all that can be desired by the faithful of all ages. But it must be left to Christian men to consider whether some of his statements are not inconsistent both in letter and in spirit with others in the same book. And if it be so, as Dr. Hebert justly remarks, "it is no marvel. It is almost impossible for one Church, much less for a single divine, to stand up free at one effort from the encrusted errors of ages, to say nothing of the temptation to let a part of the truth drop in hope of getting the rest received." Yet it is tolerably certain that it was Ratram's treatise on the Lord's Supper, lent by Ridley to Cranmer, which produced so marked a change in the Archbishop's opinions on the doctrines of the Lord's Supper and Transubstantiation, and on many other points which approximate and lead to it.

Bertram's work, which eventually led to such important results in the history of the Church of Christ, was produced at the request of the French king in answer to the work of Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of Corbey. He advocated the Romish doctrine in all its completeness, with the exception of giving it a distinct name, which was reserved for Stephen, Bishop of Augustodunum, supposed to have been the first to introduce the term "TRANSUBSTANTIATION" about two centuries later. Paschasius is a notable instance of the substitution of mere assertion and repetition of assertion for argument, as is common on this subject, especially with every sacerdotalist, whether Roman or Anglican, in the present day.* If the mere assertion that our Master's words, "This is My body," at the original institution of the Lord's Supper, are to be taken in their strict literal sense and no other, and must mean that the substance of wheat is changed after consecration by an Episcopally-ordained minister, whether bad or good, could prove the doctrine of "Transubstantiation" of the Romanist, or that of "The Real Objective Presence" of the Ritualist—which are virtually one and the same, it

* It should be remembered that in the vernacular language of Palestine, which our Lord spoke at the institution of the rite, there is no word required in the idiomatic sentence, "This *is* My body," as is required in our own tongue. See a very excellent note by Dean Alford on Matt. xxvi. 26.

being only ecclesiastical logomachy that would make any distinction between them—the question would have been settled a thousand years ago. Common sense and Scripture at length proved the master. Men's minds—from the time of Wyclif in the fourteenth century, who taught that in the Lord's Supper Christ's body was there "figuratively," and that it was "heresy" to say that it was no longer "bread," down to the sixteenth century, when the martyrs Cranmer and others had their eyes opened to teach the primitive and Apostolic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and to lay down their lives in testimony of the truth—were gradually led to see how entirely the sacred ordinance had lost its original character, and to return to the primitive teaching of our Lord and His Apostles.

There was a current saying at the time of the Reformation that Latimer leaned on Cranmer, who in his turn leaned upon Ridley, who, as we have already seen, appears to have learnt from Ratram's valuable treatise on the Lord's Supper the truth which had been virtually lost to the Church of Christ for the preceding seven centuries. We will therefore mention very briefly the opinions held and taught by these three martyrs on the subject. Considering that 'they all had been reared in the deep darkness which had overspread Christendom for so many centuries, it is wonderful that they should have been enabled to state the truth as clearly as they did before being called upon to seal their witness with their blood. Thus Latimer asserted: "I am sure if God would have had a new kind of sacrificing priest at mass, then some of the Apostles would have made mention thereof in the New Testament; but *Christ spake never a word of sacrificing.* There is none other presence of Christ required than a *spiritual* presence. And this same presence may be suitably called a real presence, for it is a presence not feigned but true and faithful." Cranmer wrote: "The body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament; but lest any should mistake my words and think that I mean Christ is corporally present in the persons that duly receive Him, *I mean no such thing.* The Papists teach that Christ is in the visible signs; the truth is, He is corporally neither in the bread nor wine, but is corporally in Heaven, and *spiritually* in His lively members, which be His temples. *They* say that Christ is corporally under or

in the forms of bread and wine; *we* say that *Christ is not there*, neither corporally nor spiritually; but in them that *worthily* eat and drink the bread and wine."

Ridley declared: "Godly honour is only due unto God the Creator, and may not be done unto the creature without idolatry, and is not to be done unto the holy sacrament. I will declare what true presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper I hold and affirm with the words of God and the ancient Fathers. With Augustine, we eat life and drink life—that is to say, life, as Cyril expoundeth it, *spiritual flesh but not that which was crucified.*"

In opposition to this teaching on the part of our martyrs and reformers of the sixteenth century the Ritualistic clergy of the present day appear to teach a different doctrine on the subject of the Lord's Supper. Thus Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon* declares that "the Church of England believes the Eucharist is not a sign of an absent body, and those who partake of it receive *not merely the figure*, or shadow, or sign of Christ's body, but the reality itself. And as Christ's divine and human natures are inseparably united, so she believes that we receive in the Eucharist *not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, both God and man*" (pp. 23, 24); and in his edition of Scupoli's *Spiritual Combat*, published by Parker in 1873, Dr. Pusey says in speaking of the sacrament of the Eucharist: "This weapon is *the very flesh and blood joined to the soul and* divinity of Christ" (p. 134).

Dr. Littledale, one of the few really learned men among the Ritualists, in his tractate on the *Real Presence*, writes as follows: "In the Holy Communion, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are 'verily and indeed' *present on the altar*, under the forms of bread and wine. This presence depends on God's will, not on man's belief; and, therefore, bad and good people receive the very same thing in communicating. Further, as Christ is both God and man, and as these two natures are for ever joined in His own person, His Godhead must be wherever His body is; and, therefore, He is to be worshipped in His Sacrament. The body and blood present are *that same body and blood* which were conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, ascended into heaven. *This is the doctrine of the Real Presence.*"

Dr. Littledale is, we believe, an unbeneficed clergyman of the Protestant Church of Ireland, and therefore his opinions can have no weight or authority save what they may derive from their intrinsic value. But when the above quotation comes to be tested in the light of Scripture, Faith, or Reason, it would be difficult to find any passage of the same brevity, from the works of any writer of any age, containing a greater amount of error. The Church of England does not say that the body and blood of Christ are "verily and indeed present on the altar," as he represents, but "verily and indeed taken and *received by the faithful* in the Lord's Supper." Neither does she teach that "bad and good people receive the very same thing;" for when Archdeacon Denison endeavoured to maintain this same error, after a legal trial by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the unanimous concurrence of his learned assessors, he was condemned and deserved to be deprived of his promotions, for teaching doctrine "directly contrary and repugnant to the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth Articles of the Church of England." And Dr. Littledale's daring assertion that the bread, after consecration at the Lord's Supper, becomes "that same body which was born of Mary and suffered under Pilate," can only be described adequately in the language of the rubric at the end of the Communion Service of the Church of England, as "Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

Mr. Bennett, the Vicar of Frome, appears to go a step still further in his downward course, as he who upwards of forty years ago wrote that "our great Reformers *nearly restored* the Sacrament to that plain and simple ceremony of memorial and spiritual sacrifice which our blessed Lord intended, rather than a pompous pageant outraging common sense, as in the fables of Papal ignorance; there is demanded now no worship of the host, no falling down before the material element of our creating"—now writes, in his *Plea for Toleration*, after this manner: "The real, actual, and *visible presence* of our Lord upon the altars of our churches.... Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore the consecrated elements. The three great doctrines on which the Church has to take her stand are these: 1st. The real objective presence of our blessed Lord in the Eucharist. 2nd. The sacrifice offered by the priest. 3rd. The adoration due to the presence of our blessed Lord therein."

Mr. Bennett, by advice, omitted the words "visible presence" in the future editions of his *Plea for Toleration*, in order to escape the condemnation which was certain to be inflicted, and thus enabled the judges to "give him the benefit of the doubt that has been raised," notwithstanding that Mr. Bennett declared with cynical frankness that his "meaning in writing the original passages was *precisely* the same as that which is now conveyed by the words substituted."

Such being the views propounded by the Ritualistic party at the present day on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, we may understand the force of a remark by the late Bishop Thirlwall (whom we have already quoted largely on this subject) when he told his clergy, in one of his charges, that "the development, which has been proceeding before our eyes during the last ten years has culminated in an approximation to Romish doctrine and ritual so close as to render the remaining interval hardly perceptible to common observers. . . . They make no secret of their desire and intention, so far as lies in their power, to bring about a complete transformation of the Church of England into the likeness of the Church of Rome, in every particular short of immediate submission to the Pope."

We cannot conclude our review of Dr. Hebert's admirable and almost exhaustive work without referring to his own view of the subject itself, which he gives in a brief summary at the close of the second volume, and from which we make the following final extract:

"The writings of the Christian Fathers," says Dr. Hebert, "and of other leading followers in subsequent ages to the Apostolical, and even the extracts here made from them, will fully establish these three things: (1) That consubstantiation was held, virtually, by those who asserted that the substance of the bread remained after consecration, and (2) That transubstantiation was held virtually by those that affirmed that *only* the body of the Lord was there, under the sensible qualities of bread, and (3) That very slowly indeed was there any approximation to the third alternative, viz., that our Lord's natural body might be believed to be there in some other than either of the two ways above mentioned. This last definition may be termed the doctrine of the real presence, regarded as independent of the doctrines (1) and (2). It is therefore only needful to repeat that the Tridentine doctrine of transubstantiation was virtually held by those that denied that

the substance of the bread remains after consecration; and that the Lutheran doctrine of transubstantiation was virtually held by those that denied that the substance of the bread remains after consecration; and that the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation was virtually held by those that affirmed that after the consecration the bread remained. The refinements referred to in the extracts from Bellarmine and Thirlwall as to the different *modes* in which the body of Christ may be or is present, in heaven and in the Lord's Supper on earth, were certainly not anticipated when the name of transubstantiation was adopted, even in 1215, *i.e.*, when the Council of Innocent III. put forth its short decree regarding the opinions marked (2) in this note."—*Hebert*, ii. pp. 736, 737.

Art. II.—*Is Islám Progressive?*

The question which stands at the head of this article is one worthy of the earnest consideration of the statesman, as it is one of the deepest interest to the philanthropist and the theologian. The Queen has under her sway a larger number of Muslim subjects than any other ruler in the world. Still it is not so much on that account as because of the policy connected with the Eastern Question that this subject assumes so much importance in the present day. We are not about to discuss that policy; but we hold most strongly, that if it does not take into consideration the true nature of Islám, it is likely to go wrong and to prove a failure. If enlightened progress is possible in Muslim States, then to make alliances, conventions, and the like with them is the duty of the rulers of the British Empire; if it is not, then such a policy is unwise and unsound, for all such union is that of the living with the dead. If political forces are unable to galvanise what is decaying into health and vigour, then the true policy is to circumscribe the influence of what is so detrimental and corrupting. In any case it is the duty of all who in these days have political power and influence to acquire an intimate knowledge of the system which not only moulds the faith of so many millions of our fellow-subjects, but also determines the domestic and foreign policy of States with which we, as a nation, are in alliance.

To the philanthropist there can be no more interesting subject of study; for Islám has a peculiar power of extension among the lower races of the great human family. There can be no reasonable doubt as to its rapid extension in Africa and in parts of China and the islands of the East. It has spread very widely amongst the lower castes in Bengal, and according to some authorities it is so spreading on the coast of Malabar at the present day.* Are these

* The writer of this article was informed by an official who has lived there for many years that unless the missionaries speedily gathered them into the Christian Church, the whole of the lower classes would become Muhammadan.

races raised, and are they capable of rising, as Muslims, higher socially and morally, or does Islám, whilst it destroys some evils, fetter with a stronger chain other and equally bad influences? Are the evils of polygamy and fatalism, to which it accords a Divine sanction, as bad as evils from which it elevates lower races? Granting that its civilisation is higher, yet because it must maintain a low level is it a gain in the long run to a people who, had they never been caught in its deadening grasp, might, in the future, have risen higher than now apparently they ever can? Surely this subject is, in the interests of humanity, worthy of the deepest attention, as it calls for the closest study.

Then the fact that no nation once Muslim has ever become Christian, raises a point to which the Church of Christ should devote much attention. Especially is it incumbent on the directors of our great Missionary Societies, and on all who take an interest in missionary work, to face this fact boldly; and, first arriving at an intelligent knowledge of the system, consider whether, and in what way, the means employed are defective. As the case stands, Islám is a strong and apparently a permanent barrier to the onward march of the Christian Church in many lands. Why is this? The study of the system itself gives the best answer. To throw some light on this important subject is the object of these pages. We shall pass over the life of the Arabian Prophet. All who so desire can easily get all the information they require on this branch of the subject. What concerns us chiefly is the development of the system and the Islám of to-day, its leading principles and dogmas. It is of comparatively little importance whether, after studying the life and work of the Prophet, we consider him a self-deceived man or a deceiver. What is of real importance for us to know is the opinion of Muslims themselves, and the nature of the system founded on Muhammad's teaching. Has it changed? Can it change? This is the important question, an answer to which cannot be given unless we first understand the foundations, the first principles of Islám. To the consideration of these we must first turn our attention.

The Qurán is the great law book of Islám. The orthodox belief is that it is eternal in its nature, and that it was made known to Muhammad, as occasion required, by the angel Gabriel. "Say, whoso is the enemy of Gabriel—For he it is who by God's leave hath caused the Qurán to

descend on thy heart" (Súra ii. 91). "The Qurán is no other than a revelation revealed to him. One terrible in power (Shadíd-ul-Quá) taught it him" (Súra liii. 5). The expression "taught it him" is explained by the words: "When we have recited it then follow thou the recital, and verily afterwards it shall be ours to make it clear to thee" (Súra lxxv. 18). This shows that the Qurán is looked upon as an objective revelation. Thus the Arab historian, Ibn Khaldoun, says: "Of all the divine books the Qurán is the only one of which the text, words, and phrases have been communicated to a prophet by an audible voice." A modern writer,* speaking of the doubtful prospect of reform, says: "The theory of revelation would have to be modified. Muslims would have to give up their doctrine of the syllabic inspiration of the Qurán, and exercise their moral sense in distinguishing between the particular and the general, the temporary and the permanent." We doubt if this is possible now.

It is a fundamental dogma that the inspiration of the Qurán is entirely objective, and that no human influence pervades it. It deals with positive precepts rather than with principles. Its decrees are held binding not in the spirit merely but in the very letter, on all men, at all times, and under all circumstances. The various portions recited by the Prophet during the twenty-three years of his prophetical career were committed to writing, in detached fragments, by his followers, or treasured up in their memories. When he died the revelation ceased. There was then no distinct record of the whole, nothing to show what was of mere transitory importance, what of more permanent value. The wonderful power of memory which the Arabs possessed was, however, a very safe mode of preserving, for a time, the revelation given by the Prophet. Its supposed sacred character rendered its committal to memory a pleasing duty, whilst its recital in every act of worship necessitated an accurate acquaintance with it. Every Muslim learnt more or less of it, and those who knew the most were highly honoured and esteemed as the most noble of men. The man who could repeat it with the greatest correctness could claim the office of Imám, or leader, and so conduct the daily public prayers. Such men also sometimes received a larger share of the spoil taken in war.

* *Lane's Selections from the Qurán*, by Stanley Lane Poole, p. 95.

There seems to have been no definite order in which the various portions were arranged, for the book, as it now exists, is devoid of all historical or logical sequence. For a year after the death of the Prophet nothing was done in the way of compiling a book, but then the battle of Yemana took place, and many of the best Qurán reciters were slain. Omar became alarmed, and said to the Khalíf Abu Bekr: "I fear that the slaughter may again wax hot amongst the repeaters of the Qurán in other fields of battle, and that much may be lost therefrom. Now, therefore, my advice is, that thou shouldest give speedy orders for the collection of the Qurán." To this Abu Bekr assented, and, sending for Zeid, who had been an amanuensis of the Prophet, he said: "Thou art a young man and wise, against whom no one amongst us can cast an imputation, and thou wast wont to write down the inspired revelations of the Prophet of the Lord. Wherefore now search out the Qurán, and bring it all together." Zeid hesitated at first, but was at length persuaded to undertake the task. He then proceeded to gather the Qurán together from "date leaves, and tablets of white stone, and from the breasts of men." In course of time all was arranged in the order in which the Súras, or chapters, now stands. No chronological sequence was sought for; the longer Súras were placed first, and the shorter ones at the end of the book. This was the authorised text for some twenty years or more after the death of the Prophet. At length, owing either to different modes of recitation, or to differences of expression in the sources from which Zeid's recension was made, a variety of different readings crept into the copies in use. The faithful became alarmed. The Khalíf Osmán was persuaded to put a stop to such danger. He appointed Zeid, with three Koreishites, to go over the whole work again. A careful recension was made of the whole book, which was then assimilated to the Meccan dialect, the purest in Arabia. All copies of the old edition were called in and burned, by order of the Khalíf. New transcripts were made of the now authorised copy. As it is a fundamental tenet of Islám that the Qurán is incorruptible and absolutely free from error, no little difficulty has been felt in explaining the need of Osmán's new edition, and of the circumstances under which it took place. The fact of the various dialects having caused some slight changes in what must have been revealed in one, was explained by the following tradition: Abu Ibn

Káb, one of the followers of the Prophet, was much scandalised at hearing in the mosque one day several different modes of reciting the Qurán. He spoke to Muhammad about it. The Prophet said: "O Ibn Káb! intelligence was sent to me to read the Qurán in one dialect, and I was attentive to the Court of God, and said, 'Make easy the reading of the Qurán to my sects.' These instructions were sent to me a second time, saying, 'Read the Qurán in two dialects.' Then I turned myself to the Court of God, saying, 'Make easy the reading of the Qurán to my sects.' Then a voice was sent to me the third time, saying, 'Read the Qurán in seven dialects.'"

This tradition is also useful as authorising the seven ways of reading the Qurán which are extant to this day, for in spite of Osmán's case, one uniform mode of repeating the Qurán has not been preserved. Men of other lands could not acquire the pure intonation of Mecca, and now the seven readings, "haft qirá'at," are recognised. The various readings, amounting, it is said, to about five hundred, chiefly arise from a difference in the vowel points, and are of no great importance. The book in its present form may be accepted as a genuine reproduction of Abu Bekr's edition, and we may feel assured that we have before us the record of what Muhammad said. The book thus gathered together becomes one of the foundations of Islám. It was a common practice of the early Muslims, when speaking of the Prophet, to say, "His character is the Qurán." When people, curious to know details of the life of their beloved Prophet, asked Ayesha, one of his widows, about him, she used to reply: "Thou hast the Qurán; art thou not an Arab, and readest the Arabic tongue? Why dost thou ask me, for the Prophet's disposition is no other than the Qurán." This revelation is considered to have cancelled all previous ones, and to bear in its supposed matchless eloquence a miraculous proof of its divine origin. It is a book revered by many millions of the human race. Thousands of lads are daily learning it by heart, for he who can repeat the whole, though he may not understand one word, receives the honorific title of a "Háfiz." It is used in the daily prayers of every mosque in the Muslim world. It is studied in all the great centres of Musalmán learning with an earnestness and devotion which testify to the esteem in which it is held. The act of testifying to the "Unity of God" is one great

bond of union in Islám; next to that stands the Qurán. No matter from what race the convert may come, no matter what language he may speak, he must learn in Arabic and repeat by rote verses from the Qurán in his daily prayers. This book deals with hard and fast precepts. It lays down no principles for a progressive development.

> "Whilst as the world rolls on from age to age,
> And realms of thought expand,
> The letter stands without expanse or range,
> Stiff as a dead man's hand."

This is the first foundation of Islám. It is a very common error to suppose that it is the only one; an error which more than anything else has led persons away from the only position in which they could get a true idea of the great system of Islám.

The second foundation of Islám is the *sunnat*, a word signifying a rule, or canon. Commands of God given in the Qurán are called "*farz*" and "*wájib*." A command given by the Prophet, an opinion expressed by him, or an example set by him, is called *sunnat*. It is the belief that in all such commands, opinions, and actions, the Prophet was supernaturally guided, and so that he was free from error in all he said and did. Thus his *words* and *deeds* become the *sunnat*, or rule of faith for men. These commands, opinions, and actions are now known by the traditions handed down from the earliest ages. The doctrines and rules of practice deduced from these form the *sunnat*, obedience to which constitutes a *sunni*. From this it will be seen that the term *hadis*, or tradition, has, in Muslim theology, a special and technical meaning. Tradition to a Muslim means not the opinion of learned doctors of the law, but the record of the mind and will of God expressed, not in the Qurán, but through the words and acts of the Prophet. No sect of Muslims dispute this. The Wahhábís all accept the *sunnat*. The Shía'hs do not receive the six collections of traditions in which it is contained, but they have a separate collection of their own.* It is important to remember this fact, for it is not commonly known. To all sects the *sunnat*, or its equivalent, in the case of the Shía'h, is a basis of the faith.

This opinion is confirmed to the Muslim mind by such

* The Shía'h books of tradition are: *The Káfi*, *The Man-lá-yastahzirah-al-Faqih*, *The Tahzib*, *The Istibsár*, and the *Nahaj-ul-Balághat*.

verses of the Qurán as: "O true believers! obey God *and obey the apostle.*" "We have not sent any apostle but that *he might be obeyed* by the permission of God." From such passages as these the following doctrine is deduced—we quote from a Muslim work:—"It is plain that the Prophet (on whom and on whose descendants be the mercy and peace of God!) is free from sin in what he ordered to be done, and in what he prohibited, in all his words and acts; for, were it otherwise, how could obedience rendered to him be accounted as obedience paid to God?" The Prophet himself is reported to have said, "Obey me, that God may regard you as friends." From this statement the conclusion is drawn that "the love of God (to man) is conditional on man's obedience to the Prophet." The importance attached to the *sunnat* is not an after-growth in Islám. The Prophet himself said, "He who loves not my *sunnat* is not my follower." "He who revives my *sunnat* revives me." "He who holds fast to the *sunnat* will receive the reward of a hundred martyrs." The setting up of the *sunnat* as a rule of faith and practice accounts more than anything else for the immobility of the Musalmán world, for it must always be remembered that in Islám Church and State are one. The Arab proverb, "Al Mulk dín tawáini,"—Country and religion are twins—is the popular form of expressing the unity of Church and State. The rule of the one is the rule of the other. Progress in the latter can only take place when there is reform in the former. There are some curious stories which illustrate the importance the companions of the Prophet attached to the *sunnat.* "The Khalíf Omar looked toward the black stone at Mecca, and said: "By God, I know that thou art only a stone, and canst grant no benefit, canst do no harm. If I had not known that the Prophet kissed thee, I would not have done so; *but on account of that I do it.*"

Abdullah Ibn Omar was one day seen riding his camel round and round a certain place. When asked why he did so, he replied:—"I know not, only I have seen the Prophet do so here." Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, one of the four great Imáms, and the founder of the Hanbalí School of Interpretation, is said to have been appointed to his high office on account of the care with which he observed the *sunnat.* One day when sitting in an assembly, he alone of all present observed some formal custom authorised

by the practice of the Prophet. Gabriel at once appeared and informed him that now, and on account of his action, he was appointed an Imám. By such accounts as these the importance of the *sunnat* is kept before the mind of the faithful in Islám.

The third ground of the faith is called *ijmá'*, a word which means collecting, or assembling. Technically, it means the unanimous consent of the *Mujtahidín*, or what we understand by the expression, "the unanimous consent of the Fathers." *Mujtahid* is the name given to one who has risen to the highest rank in theological science. He, and he alone, can make an "*ijtihád*," or logical deduction from the Qurán and the traditions. Amongst the sunnís there have been no *Mujtahidín* since the close of the second century of the Hijrah, or flight from Mecca. As *Mujtahidín* the *Asháb*, or companions of the Prophet, stand in the first rank, their followers, the *Tábi'in*, and their followers' followers, the *Taba-i-Tábi'in*, also are recognised as persons of authority. The Wahhábís only admit the *ijmá'* of the Asháb; the Shía'hs claim to have *Mujtahidín* still. In a well-known theological work, *ijmá'* is thus defined: "*Ijmá'* is this, that it is not lawful to follow any other than the four Imáms." "In these days the Cazi (magistrate) must make no order, the Mufti (judge) give no fatva (legal decision) contrary to the opinion of the four Imáms." "To follow any other is not lawful." So far then as orthodox Islám is concerned, change is a thing not desired; whether possible or not we shall see later on. The Imáms referred to are the founders of the four orthodox schools of jurisprudence. They flourished in the second century of the Hijrah. So this basis of the faith was then fixed and settled, and to the law as then formulated all decisions now must conform.

It sometimes happens that some circumstances arise for which there is no guidance in the existing law. A principle called *qiás* then comes into operation. It means the analogical reasoning of the learned upon the Qurán, the *sunnat* and the *ijmá'*. It leaves, however, no room for enlightened progress, as any decision thus arrived at must be in conformity with the principles of the existing law. This produces uniformity after a fashion, but only because intellectual activity in higher pursuits ceases and moral stagnation follows. There is a wonderful likeness in the decay of all Muslim States, which seems to point to a com-

mon cause. All first principles are contained in the Qurán and the *sunnat*. Whatever does not agree with these must be swept away. They are above all criticism. All who come within the range of this system are bound down to political servitude, to intellectual bondage. The Wahhábís, however, reject *qiás* as a foundation of the faith, but they hold firmly to the *sunnat*. These remarks will show that to understand Islám it is necessary to do more than study the Qurán alone. We must realise that there is a vast body of canonical law based upon the *sunnat* and the *ijmá'*, and thus we learn that Islám is by no means the simple and the undogmatic system it is sometimes said to be.

It must not, however, be supposed that during all these twelve centuries there has been no revolt against this rigid system. The first great division in Islám was the breach between the Sunni and the Shía'h; but that was not a movement in favour of freedom of thought, but rather a dynastic quarrel. It is true that considerable difference in dogma has now arisen, but the Shía'h equally with the Sunni accepts the mechanical view of the Quránic inspiration, and the authority of the traditions of what the prophets said and did as a basis of the faith. It is later on that the first rationalistic movement commenced. Curiously enough this is coincident in time with the brightest period of Muhammadan glory, the period so lauded by panegyrists of the system. Whenever culture in its varied forms has been found high in a Musalmán State, it has been when orthodoxy from the Muslim standpoint was low. Baghdád, under the Khalífs Haroun-ar-Rashíd, Al-Mamoun, Al-Wathik (170—232 A.H.) of the Abbasside dynasty, shone with a splendour unequalled except by Cordova in her palmiest days. It was then that the Scholastic theologians (Mutakallimán) arose, who strove hard to introduce freedom of thought and research amongst Musalmáns, and to loosen the rigid bonds of the Islámic system. These earlier scholastics, or Mutazilites, as they are sometimes called, are distinct from the later scholastics, who entered far more into philosophical discussion than the Freethinkers of Al-Mamoun's time did. We shall deal with them hereafter. The movement now under discussion was a more distinctly religious one. These men took exception to some of the most cherished dogmas of the orthodox party. They denied alto-

gether the eternity of the Qurán, and thus wished to subject it to the usual laws of criticism—a practice considered by all good Muslims as utterly impious and wrong. Their chief argument was that if the Qurán was eternal, then there were two eternals, and that men would for ever hereafter be under the same obligation to obey the Quránic laws as they are now. The Khalíf Mamoun passed a decree in the 212 A.H., stating that all who asserted that the Qurán was eternal were heretics, and as such deserved punishment.

Repressive measures were employed, but failed. What had before been rather a speculative opinion became an important article of faith, in defence of which men suffered martyrdom. Their chief argument was drawn from the verse: "Verily our speech unto a thing, when we will the same, is that we only say to it, 'Be,' and it is" (Súra xxxvi. 82). Later on, when orthodoxy gained the day, a public disputation was held on the subject. As-Sháfa'i took the orthodox, and Hafs the Mutazilite side. Sháfa'i, quoting this verse, said, "Did not God create all things by the word '*be*?'" Hafs admitted the fact. "If then the Qurán was created, must not the word '*be*' have been created with it?" To this Hafs made no objection. "Then," said Sháfa'i "all things, according to you, were created by a created being, which is a gross inconsistency and manifest impiety." The audience were so convinced by As-Sháfa'i's reasoning that they put Hafs to death as a bad and wicked fellow. Thus the Freethinkers had to give up their lives for their opinions just as shortly before the orthodox had done for theirs. With the suppression of these men any possibility of a rational exegesis of the Qurán finding a place in Islám was put away. Another point of dispute was the subject of the attributes of God. The Mutazilites maintained that man had reason given to him by God, and that he was to exercise it in all matters. They denied altogether the existence of eternal attributes as distinct from the nature of God. To enter into a discussion upon these points would be wearisome. A brief account of it will be found in the introductory essay to Sale's Qurán. Many of the Mutazilites were inclined to push the claims of reason too far, but, in the main, they had correct views as to the relative positions of reason and faith. They also objected to the dogma of fatalism—a doctrine which has so sapped the energy of Muslim States and of individuals.

They held that man has freedom, that he is the master of his actions—both good and evil—and that he deserves rewards or punishment accordingly. They argued that as some acts of men, such as tyranny and polytheism, were bad, and that as, according to the orthodox view, all acts were created by God, it followed that to tyrannise and to ascribe plurality to the Deity was to render obedience to Him, which was manifestly absurd. They said that if God decrees evil, a prophet who is striving to do good is acting in opposition to God. In this, and many other ways, they strove against the fatalism which was already a dogma in Islám. We cannot now enter into an account of this controversy. The orthodox had one famous text which seemed to them to settle the matter: "Whoso willeth taketh the way of the Lord, *but will it ye shall not*, unless God will it" (Súra lxxvi. 30). The point which we wish to establish is, that this movement in the direction of freedom failed. The reason is not far to seek. These men were not influenced by any very high spiritual motives; they sought no light in an external revelation. Driven to a reaction by the rigid system they combated, they would have made reason alone their chief guide; for this there is no room in Islám. So they were crushed, and orthodoxy gained the day. Often they were mere disputants, though here and there a nobler spirit is to be found amongst them. They sought to regenerate Islám, but they had no Gospel, no tidings of glad joy to bring to men. Destitute of spiritual life in its highest sense, they could impart no lasting reform. It was, however, a great movement, and, at one time, threatened to change the whole nature of Islám; but the orthodox system was too rigid, too immobile to be permanently influenced by it. The Mutazilites passed away, and beyond the accounts of the controversies of their age, which are preserved chiefly in the writings of their opponents, no vestige of them remains. They tried to introduce the elements of progress, and totally failed.

This period of Muslim history, famed as that in which the effort to cast off the fetters of the rigid system which Islám was gradually tightening by the increased authority given to traditionalism, and to the refinements of the great canonists, was undoubtedly a period of, comparatively speaking, high civilisation. Baghdád, the capital of the Khalífate, was a populous, busy, well-governed city. This it owed not so much to the Khalífs as to the influ-

ence of the Persian family of the Barmecides. One of the ablest of these men, named Yahya, was Vizier to Haroun-ar-Rashíd, the hero of the *Arabian Nights*. The Vizier was an astute statesman. He was succeeded in office by his son Jaafir, an equally capable official. A man possessed of every accomplishment of the age, generous to a fault to all around him, well versed in all the niceties of the Muhammadan law, in every way a strong and noble man, he was the idol of the people of Baghdád, for whom and for whose city he did so much. But rumours went abroad that, in spite of his outward profession of Islám, Jaafir was thoroughly rationalistic. The orthodox Imáms, and the ecclesiastics generally, chafed under the growing influence of the Vizier, and that liberality of thought and sentiment which his patronage so widely diffused. How these men, in combination with the courtiers of the day, who hated the whole Barmecide family, on account of their Persian origin, wrought his downfall, is not our purpose now to relate. In a fit of anger the Khalíf ordered the execution of his Vizier. Thus did he who has been most wrongly called the good Haroun-ar-Rashíd destroy, as many a Khalíf has since done, the most capable man in his government. Haroun-ar-Rashíd's fame as a good man is one of the strange things in history. It is true that he was a patron of learning. "His sovereignty, temporal as well as spiritual, was acknowledged from the Mediterranean to the Indus, from the Northern Steppes to the Indian Ocean. He defeated the armies of Rome, captured the island of Cyprus, and compelled the Emperor Nicephorus to pay him tribute." His reign was the culminating point of Arab grandeur; but for all that he was a morose despot, a bloodthirsty tyrant, a man entirely given up to pleasures of a questionable kind. It has been said that the worst characteristics of such men as Philip II. of Spain, Francis I., and Henry VIII. were combined in him. His chief aim was to make Baghdád a city of voluptuous pleasure. Drunkenness and debauchery were common at Court. Plots and intrigues were ever at work. The morality of the higher classes was at its lowest ebb. Now and again the Khalíf, in a superstitious fit, awoke to a sense of fervid zeal. In one such fit he crowned all his errors by putting Jaafir to death. Such was the state of one of the greatest, if not the greatest, periods of Muslim rule; at a time, too, most favourable for any good which

Islám might possess, for exercising its influence. An idea of the range of subjects which were frequently and warmly discussed in those days will be seen from the following account of a meeting, presided over by Yahya, one of the four sons of Khalíd, the Barmecide. This learned man used to gather together the most celebrated controversialists of the age. On one occasion he addressed them as follows: "You have discussed at length upon the theory of concealment and of manifestation; upon pre-existence and creation; upon duration and stability; upon movement and quiescence; upon the union and separation (of the Divine substance); upon existence and non-existence; upon bodies and their accidents; upon the correctness or otherwise of the *Isnád*, or chain of authorities for the genuineness of traditions; upon the absence or the existence of attributes in God; upon potential and active forces; upon substance, quality, morality, and relation; upon life and annihilation. You have examined the question whether the Imám should proceed to his office by divine right, or by popular election. You have considered fully all metaphysical questions in their principles, and the deductions which flow from them. Occupy yourselves to-day in describing love, &c."*

Much has often been said in praise of the Arabian Philosophy, as if it really contributed something to the sum of human knowledge. The early Muslims look on all learning outside the Qurán and the Traditions as useless and vain. The Khalíf Mamoun (198—218 A.H.), a notorious Freethinker, gave a great impulse to philosophical researches. Greek philosophical works were translated into Arabic. The Greek author most patronised was Aristotle, partly because his empirical method accorded better with the positive tendencies of the Arab mind than the pure idealism of Plato, and partly because his system of logic was considered a useful auxiliary in the daily quarrels between the rival theological schools. The translators of the works of Aristotle, as indeed of all the Greek authors, were Syrian and Chaldæan Christians, especially the Nestorians, who, as physicians, were in high favour with the liberal khalífs of the Abbasside dynasty. In some cases the translation into Arabic was made from the

* Macoudi, *Les Prairies d'Or*. Texte et Traduction par Meynard, Vol. VI. p. 368.

Syriac, for in the time of the Emperor Justinian many Greek works had been translated into the latter language. The most celebrated translators were the Nestorian physician Honein Ben Ishak,* and his son Ishak (Isaac). In the tenth century Yahya Ben Adi and Isa Ben Zara translated some important works, and revised many of the earlier translations. It is to these men that the Muslims owe their chief acquaintance with Plato. The orthodox looked on askance, but could not stay the movement. The historian Makrizi says: "The doctrine of the Philosophers has worked amongst Muslims evils most fatal. It serves only to augment the errors of the heretics and to increase their impiety."† It came into contact with Musalmán dogmas on such subjects as the creation of the world, the special providence of God, and the nature of the Divine attributes. To a certain extent the Mutazilites were supported by their philosophical theories, but this only increased the disfavour with which the orthodox looked upon the study of philosophy. To be known as a student of it was tantamount to being branded as a heretic. Still it grew, and in self-defence men had to adopt philosophic methods. Finally, it developed into what is known as the later scholasticism, which was even more heterodox than the earlier. The earlier system which flourished at Baghdád was confined to matters of religious dogma; the later school occupied itself with the whole range of philosophic investigation. It is the men of this school who wrote upon philosophy. Over the earlier scholastics, or Mutazilites, orthodoxy gained the day, and, in the form known as the Ash'arian School, became again supreme. Saladin and his successors in Egypt were great supporters of this the orthodox school of thought. Thus the first great effort to introduce a spirit of freedom was crushed. We have already given the reason why it was so.

We now turn to a more distinctly philosophical movement. The period we are now about to enter on was one prolific of authors on grammar, rhetoric, logic, exegesis, traditions, and the various branches of philosophy, but the men who stand out most prominently as philosophers are considered heretics.‡ We now enter a little into detail.

* He died 873 A.D.

† *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*, par S. Munk, p. 315.

‡ It is scarcely correct to speak of the Arab philosophers, for, curiously enough, only one famous philosopher—Al-Kendi—was an Arab. Muslim philosophy would be a more correct term. The world owes little to the Arab.

Al-Kendi, in his work on the Unity of God, has strayed far away from Muslim dogma. Al-Farabi, an early philosopher, seems to have denied not only the rigid and formal Islámic view of inspiration, but any special objective inspiration at all. He held that intuition was a true inspiration, and that all who acquired intuitive knowledge were really prophets. This is the only mode of revelation he admits.

Ibn Sina, a man of Persian origin, was a philosopher of great note; but of him it is said that, in spite of the concessions he made to the religious ideas of his age, he could not find favour for his opinions, which ill accord with the principles of Islám.

Ibn Badja was one of the most famous Muslim philosophers of Spain. He is celebrated for his opposition to the mystical tendencies of the teaching of Al-Ghazzáli, and for maintaining that speculative science alone was capable of leading men to a true conception of his own proper nature. He was violently attacked by the orthodox divines, who declared that all philosophical teaching "was a calamity for religion, and an affliction to those who were in the good way."

Al-Ghazzáli (450—505 A.H.), a native of Khorassan, was one of the most famous divines Islám has ever had. He adopted the scholastic method. For a while he was President of the famous Nizamiah College at Baghdád. He travelled far and wide, and wrote many books to prove the superiority of Islám over all other creeds. The first result of his study of the writings of the heretics and of the philosophers was, that he fell into a state of scepticism with regard to religion and philosophy. From this state he emerged into Súfiism, or Mysticism, in which his restless spirit found satisfaction, and regained the calm it had lost. On Súfiism, however, he exerted no very notable influence; but the scepticism which he still retained as regards philosophy, rendered him a formidable opponent to those who were trying to bring Islám into accord with philosophical opinions. In the preface to his work, *The Destruction of the Philosopher*, he speaks "of those who arrogate to themselves a superior intelligence, and who, in their pride, mistaking the principles of religion, take, as a guide, the authority of certain great men instead of revealed religion." It is, however, and with some show of reason, supposed that Al-Ghazzáli did not really object to all that

he condemned; but that he wrote what he did to please the orthodox. Indeed, Moses of Narbonne distinctly states that Al-Ghazzáli, later on in life, wrote a book for private circulation amongst his philosophic friends, in which he withdrew many of the charges he had made against them. Be that as it may, it is acknowledged that he dealt a blow to Muslim philosophy from which it has never recovered.

Notwithstanding the attacks of Al-Ghazzáli, philosophy found an ardent defender in Ibn Rashíd, better known as Averhoes, a Spanish philosopher. This celebrated man was born in the year 520 A.H., or nearly the middle of the twelfth century of the Christian era. He was descended from a highly distinguished and learned family. He himself was one of the most learned men in the Muslim world, one of the best commentators of Aristotle, and a most prolific writer. Philosopher though he was, Averhoes claimed to pass for a good Muslim. He held that philosophical truths are the highest object of research, but that few men are able, by pure speculation, to arrive at a knowledge of them; and that, therefore, a Divine revelation through the medium of prophets was necessary for teaching men the eternal verities proclaimed alike by philosophy and religion. He held, it is true, that the orthodox had paid too much attention to the letter, and too little to the spirit of the revelation they accepted as true; and he also maintained that false interpretations had educed principles not really or rightly found in religion. His profession of faith in Islám, and a rigid adherence to the outward forms of worship, did not, however, prevent his being looked upon with suspicion. He was accused of encouraging the study of philosophy and the ancient sciences to the detriment of Islám. He was deprived of his honours and banished by the Khalíf to a place near Cordova. In his disgrace he had to suffer many insults from the orthodox. One day on entering the mosque to say the mid-day prayers he was forcibly expelled by the people. He died in seclusion 1198 A.D. Thus passed away in disgrace the last of the Muslim philosophers worthy of the name.* In Spain, in the twelfth century, as in Baghdád long before, a rigid and stern orthodoxy gained the day. There was much of very doubtful value in the speculations of the Muslim philo-

* "Après lui, nous ne trouvons plus chez les Arabes aucun philosophe éritablement digne de ce nom."—*Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*, 458.

sophers, but they were Muslims; and if they went too far in their attempt to rationalise religion, it was but a reaction against the hard literalism of the creed of Islám, and an attempt to cast off what, to them, seemed accretions added on to a simpler faith by the Traditionalists and the Canonical Legists of the previous centuries. They failed, because, like the earlier scholastics, they had no Gospel to proclaim to men, no tidings to give of a new life which could enable wearied humanity to bear the ills to which it was subject. Another strong reason was that the orthodoxy against which they strove was a logical development of the foundations of Islám, and these foundations are too deeply and too strongly laid for any power other than a spiritual one to uproot. Islám, as a religion, has no right to claim any of the glory which Muslim philosophers are supposed to have cast around it. The founders of Islám, the Arabs, have produced but one philosopher of note; the first impetus to the study was given by heretical or worldly khalífs, employing Christians at Baghdád to translate Greek books; whilst in Spain, where philosophy most flourished, it was largely due to contact with learned Jews. The true and natural development of Islam is to be seen where it is unaffected by foreign influence. Central Asia and Northern Africa furnish the best illustration of the progress Islám, left to itself, can make. When it had philosophers it persecuted them. Now and again a liberal-minded khalíf arose; but such a system as Islám survives the liberality of thought shown in one generation. From the twelfth century onward, it would be difficult to point to any Arab, or even Muslim, philosopher, whose work is of any value to the human race. So far, then, as regards this portion of the subject, we may conclude that Islám is not progressive.

There has been, from the earliest ages of Islám, a movement which exists to this day. It is a species of mysticism, known as Súfiism. It has been specially prevalent amongst the Persians. It is a reaction from the burden of a rigid law and a wearisome ritual. It has now existed a thousand years, and if it has the element of progress in it, if it is the salt in Islám, some fruit should now be seen. But what is Súfiism? The term is probably derived from the Arabic word "*súf*," wool; the material from which Eastern ascetics used to make their garments. The similarity to the Greek σοφός seems accidental. The system is closely

connected with that of the Vedanta school in Hinduism, and the idea underlying it is that the souls of men differ in degree, but not in kind, from the Divine Spirit, of which they are emanations, and to which they will ultimately return. The object is to acquire a perfect knowledge of God. Existence was made for man, and man for the knowledge of God. They say, "David inquired and said, 'O Lord! why hast thou created mankind?' God said, 'I am a hidden treasure, and I would fain become known.'" To gain that treasure, or rather the knowledge of it in all its mystery and glory, is the business of the Súfi. The search is likened to a journey: the perceptive sense is the traveller, the knowledge of God the goal, the extinction of self the road.

> "Plant one foot on the neck of self,
> The other in thy Friend's domain;
> In everything His presence see,
> For other vision is in vain."

Another Súfi poet has expressed the same idea in other words: "Art thou a friend of God? Speak not of self: for to speak of God and self is infidelity." When a man begins to have some inward desire after God he is called a *Tálib*, "seeker." If he prosecutes his studies according to Súfistic methods, he attaches himself to a spiritual director, or joins one of the many orders of Dervishes. Then he becomes a *Murid*, or one who inclines to the right way. After due preparation under his *Murshid*, or director, he is allowed to enter upon the road. He is now a *Sálik*, or traveller, whose business henceforth is "*Suluk*," that is, devotion to this one idea, the knowledge of God. The stages through which he must pass are—1. Service. Here he must serve God and obey the Law. 2. Love. It is supposed that now the Divine influence has so attracted his soul that he really loves God. 3. Seclusion. Love having expelled all earthly desires, he arrives at this stage, and passes his time in meditation on the deeper doctrines of Súfiism regarding the Divine Nature. 4. Knowledge. The meditation of the preceding stage, and the investigation of metaphysical theories concerning God, His nature, His attributes, and the like, make the traveller an *'Arif*, or knower. 5. Ecstasy. The mental excitement caused by such continual meditation on abstruse subjects produces a kind of frenzy, which is looked upon as a mark of Divine

illumination. It is known as *Hál*, the "State:" or *Wajd*, ecstasy. Arrival at this stage is highly valued. 6. *Hakikat*, or the truth. Now to the traveller is revealed the true nature of God. Thus he becomes fitted for the next, the highest stage in this life. 7. *Wasl*, or union with God. Thus a Súfi poet says:

> "There was a door to which I found no key;
> There was a veil, past which I could not see;
> Some little talk of *me* and *Thee*
> There seem'd, and then no more of *Thee* and *me*."

Death comes at length to the traveller, and admits him to the final stage of all. It is—8. *Faná*, or extinction. The seeker after all his search, the traveller after his wearisome journey passes behind the veil, and finds—nothing!

As the traveller proceeds along from stage to stage, the restraints of an objective revelation and an outward system are less and less heeded. What law can bind the soul in union with God, what outward system impose any trammels on one who in the "Ecstasy" has received from Him who is the Truth a true revelation of Himself? Moral laws and ceremonial observances have but an allegorical significance; creeds are fetters cunningly devised to enchain the enlightened soul; all that is objective in religion is a restraint and a hindrance. Pantheistic in its teaching, lax and Antinomian in its morality, Súfiism possesses no regenerative power in Islám. In spite of its dogmatic utterances about God, in spite of much that is sublime in its idea of the search after light and truth, it ends in the utter negation of all separate existence. This hopelessness now and again finds expression in many a beautiful passage in the Persian poets, the ablest of whom were Súfis. Thus:

> "Were it not folly, spider-like, to spin
> The thread of present life away, to win—
> What? for ourselves, who know not if we shall
> Breathe out the very breath we now breathe in."

Another, the founder of the Maulavi order of Dervishes, known to visitors to Constantinople as the "Whirling Dervishes," after describing a bootless search for God on earth and in heaven, says that he questioned the pen of fate, and turned his God-scanning eye in every direction, but all to no purpose, when—

"My glance I bent inward; within my own breast,
Lo, the vainly sought elsewhere, the Godhead confessed!
In the whirl of its transport my spirit was tossed,
Till each atom of separate being I lost."

This, then, is the outcome of the most distinctively spiritual movement that has ever taken place in Islám. It is a standing protest against the rigidity of the orthodox system, but it must fail, for in the words of Tennyson:

"That each who seems a separate whole
Should move his rounds, and fusing all
The skirts of self again, should fall
Remerging in the general soul,

"Is faith as vague as all unsweet:
Eternal form shall still divide
The eternal soul from all beside;
And I shall know Him when we meet."

In no department of human life does Súfiism confer any blessing. Persia, the home of all kinds of mystic teaching, is probably at this moment one of the worst governed countries in the world. The spirituality of Súfiism is professedly a protest against Materialism, but in reality it is a return to it. The Pantheism of the Súfis, the esoteric doctrine of Islám when expounded by the Dervishes as a moral doctrine, leads to the same conclusion as Materialism, viz., the negation of human liberty, the indifference to actions, and the legitimacy of all temporal enjoyments. In this system all is God except God Himself, for He thereby ceases to be God. The result of Súfiism has been the founding of a large number of religious orders, known as Dervishes. There are no less than thirty-six distinct orders in the Ottoman Empire. In Constantinople alone there are two hundred *Tekiéhs*, or monasteries, about fifty of which are endowed. The orthodox look upon them with disfavour, and the Ulema—the divines and lawyers of the East—are very jealous of their power. At this present time their attitude is one of dogged opposition to all change. How little hope there is of their ever working any reform in Islám will be seen from the following account of Súfi doctrine, which is generally accepted by the various Dervish orders:

"1. God only exists,—He is in all things, and all things are in Him.

"2. All visible and invisible beings are an emanation from Him, and are not really distinct from Him.

"3. Religions are matters of indifference; they serve, however, as a means of reaching to realities; some, for this purpose, are more advantageous than others, amongst which is the Musalmán religion, of which the doctrine of the Súfis is the philosophy.

"4. Paradise and Hell, and all the dogmas of positive religions, are only so many allegories, the spirit of which is known only to the Súfi.

"5. There does not really exist any difference between good and evil, for all is reduced to unity, and God is the real author of the acts of mankind.

"6. It is God who fixes the will of man, who is therefore not free in his actions.

"7. The soul existed before the body, and is within the latter as in a cage. Death, therefore, should be the object of the wishes of the Súfi, for it is then that he returns to the bosom of the Divinity from which he emanated.

"8. It is by this metempsychosis that souls which have not fulfilled their destination here below are purified.

"9. The principal occupation of the Súfi is meditation on the Unity; and progressive advancement, so as to gradually attain to spiritual perfection, and to 'die in God,' and whilst in this life to reach to a unification with God.

"10. Without '*Faiz Ulláh*,' the grace of God, no one can attain to this union; but God does not withhold His grace from those who seek it."

We are indebted to a very interesting work * on the Dervishes for this admirable summary. Any one at all acquainted with Persian poetry will recognise its accuracy. It is evident that though this mystical system has been retained in Islám for nearly twelve centuries, yet that it possesses no regenerative, no reforming power.

We now turn our attention to another brilliant period in the history of a Muslim State—a period pointed to with exultation by many European friends of Islám. Let us examine it. Islám in India has been affected by its contact with Hinduism; not in the modification of its dogmas, but in the adoption of Hindu customs and superstitions. The period to which admirers of Islám point with such pride is the reign of Akber. The Moghul Empire then reached its highest point. No one disputes that; but let us see how much of that was due to Islám. Akber was a man of the

* *The Dervishes*, by J. P. Brown. Trübner and Co.

most courageous spirit and a statesman of considerable ability. No emperor so tolerant ever sat upon the throne of Delhi. His mother was a Persian lady; and though he professed to be a Muslim, yet he sat loosely to the rigid laws of Islám, as most Persians do. Islám in India was, during the sixteenth century, in a feverish state of excitement. Shía'hs in large numbers were coming to India. The Ulema, the orthodox and authorised exponents of the law, were alarmed, and fulminated forth their excommunications. Fanatics began to preach a millennium, the return of Imám Mahdi, and the end of the world. Súfiism was rapidly spreading. Christianity had made its appearance at Goa. Abul Fazl, the son of a famous Súfi, became the Vizier and confidant of the Emperor. Akber was inquisitive. Meetings, similar to those we have described as held in Baghdád, were of frequent occurrence. Men of all creeds disputed publicly before the Emperor. The result was that Akber began to treat the Ulema with contempt, and finally destroyed their power, and took away their influence. The Shía'h doctrine of the Imámat seemed likely to give him more power than the Sunni or orthodox view about the Khalíf and the Khalífate: so he became a Shía'h, and proclaimed himself the Khalíf, or Pope and Cæsar of Islám; an act he could not have done as a Sunni.* He did not remain long in this stage. He learned something of the mysteries of Christianity, Brahminism, and Súfiism. On the whole, he was favourable to the Christian Fathers, who came from Goa, though he utterly rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. He allowed his son Murád to be baptised, he married a Christian wife, and directed Abul Fazl to translate the Gospels. He attended a Christian church, and permitted the cross to be carried about in the streets of his capital; but for all that, he would not himself become a Christian. Abul Fazl has left some record of his own opinions, which probably represent those of his royal master.

"O God, in every temple I see people seek Thee!
In every language I hear spoken, people praise Thee!
Polytheism and Islám feel after Thee!

* Strictly speaking the law of Islám requires that the Khalíf should be of the tribe of the Koreish, the tribe of which the Prophet belonged. The Turks have had the Khalífate transferred to them. The subject is too long to discuss here; but an Ottoman Sultan has no *legal* title to the office of Khalíf.

Each religion says, 'Thou art without equal.'
If it be a mosque, people murmur the holy prayer;
If it be a Christian church, people ring the bell from love to Thee.
Sometimes I frequent the Christian cloister, and sometimes the mosque.
It is Thou whom I search from temple to temple."

The final result was that Akber tried to found a new religion. "He thought to combine circumcision and baptism with the worship of the Supreme Spirit; to blend polygamy and the worship of Jesus with the belief in the transmigration of the soul." He now began to hate Islám. He destroyed mosques, and promoted Hindus to high offices in the State. A religion called the "Divine Faith" was established, of which Akber was the head, and from the members of which he received divine honours. Each novice received a symbol, on which were the words "Alláhu Akber," which may be the orthodox "*takbír*"—God is Great! or, if read the other way, "Akber is God." The word Akber means "great." Akber's fame as a ruler is well deserved, though his persecution of the Musalmáns cannot be defended; but from what has been said, it will be seen that Islám can take no credit to itself for this brilliant period of Moghul rule in India. But the question before us is, how far Akber's influence modified Islám, in the way of making it more liberal in thought and practice. It failed, and for the same reason as all other attempts failed. New wine cannot be put into old bottles. The foundations of Islám are such that no superstructure less rigid and formal can be erected on them. The eclectic religion of Akber was, after all, a matter of policy, rather than the natural feeling of his heart. There was in him no real regenerating power at work; but only the feverish restlessness so common to Persians, and to those of Persian extraction. The Muslims of India, to this day, regard him as a heretic, or at least what the French would call a *suspect*. No seeds of reform were sown in Islám during the long reign of nearly half a century of the most brilliant of all Musalmán rulers. The toleration for which his rule was so remarkable was only attained by forcibly suppressing the Ulema. So it was in spite of Islám, not by means of it, that Akber gained the fame which, from a political point of view, he deserves.

The next, and perhaps the most important, movement

in Islám is the rise of the Wahhábís. On many of the outward practices of Islám, this movement has had a very marked effect so far as its influence extends; whether the fundamental principles of the Muslim creed are touched or not we shall see later on. The movement dates from the beginning of the eighteenth century, or the close of the period we have just described as a period of unrest in Islám. There is nothing, however, to connect the rise of Wahhábíism with the eclecticism of Akber and his Vizier. The two movements are totally opposite to each other. Muhammad Ibn 'Abd-ul-Wahháb, the founder of this sect, was a native of Nejd, in Central Arabia. As a young man he travelled much, and was distressed in his mind when he saw how superstitious practices had engrafted themselves on to the simpler customs of the early Muslims. The luxurious modes of life, saint worship, pilgrimages to shrines, and other superstitious customs, were all an abomination to him. He began to preach against all this, and to teach what he believed to be in accordance with the doctrine and practice of the Prophet and his companions—men who hold in Islám the same position of authorities as the Apostles in the Christian Church. They do not, it is true, claim inspiration, but traditions of what the Prophet said and did recorded by them are authentic and authoritative in matters of religion and morals. By the end of the century Wahhábí doctrines had spread throughout Central Arabia. From the year 1803 till 1812 A.D. the Wahhábís held possession of the holy cities of Medina and Mecca, to the great horror of all the orthodox. In India it spread later on through the preaching of one Szed Ahmad. From time to time it has given trouble to the Government, for Wahhábís are often fanatics. It is, however, with the religious development, and not the political history, that we have now to deal, and so we pass on to consider the distinctive tenets of the Wahhábis. The point to which the Wahhábí pays most attention is the doctrine of the unity of God. This is the most prominent article of faith in all Muslim sects, but the Wahhábís guard it from depreciation by prohibiting practices common to all the others. Thus they consider it wrong to look upon Muhammad as an intercessor now for men. They believe that at the judgment he will intercede for his people; but this they call an "intercession by permission," and quote the following verse in support of their view:—"Who is he

that can intercede with Him but by His own permission?" (Súra ii. 256). They object to pilgrimages to shrines, to the use of charms, to consulting astrologers, to smoking, to wearing silk dresses or cloaks, to a rosary, and so on. Generally it may be said that Wahhábíism is a protest against superstitious practices and curious modes of life. So far it is good, but combined with this there is a spirit of the most intolerant fanaticism. Not only are Christians looked upon as polytheists, but all other Muslims are considered as almost equally bad. Wahhábíism would force men to be religious by driving them like sheep to say the public prayers; it would cast a gloom over all the social pleasures of life and make men profound hypocrites. Above all, its *raison d'être* is that it is a return to first principles. It is sometimes supposed that because Wahhábís oppose superstitious practices they are the liberal element in Islám. This is an error, for the Wahhábís admit as the bases of the faith (1) the Qurán, (2) the Sunnat, (3) the Ijmá', or unanimous consent of the companions of the Prophet. They reject any later Ijmá'. They accept the orthodox views on inspiration, eternity of the Qurán, inspired nature and authoritative value of tradition, fatalism, and the finality and superiority of the system thus formed. Muhammad, too, in all his words, in all his actions, is, in their opinion, an inspired teacher, a perfect guide to men. In Muslim theology God is viewed far more as a despot than as a righteous, loving Father. The Wahhábí emphasises this idea. Palgrave, who knows them better than any living man, says of their idea of God: "It is His singular satisfaction to let created beings continually feel that they are nothing else than His slaves, that they may the better acknowledge His superiority. He Himself, sterile in His inaccessible height, neither loving nor enjoying aught save His own and self-measured decree, without son, companion, or councillor, is no less barren for Himself than for His creatures, and His one barrenness and lone egoism in Himself is the cause and rule of His indifferent and unregarding despotism around." Wahhábíism has now flourished for a century and a half in Central Arabia, and what has it produced? The life of a traveller is not safe in those regions. Other Muslims even cannot live there in peace and security. In India Wahhábís have written controversial works, and now and again have stirred up bitter quarrels in Musalmán communities; but they

have not been able to modify any of the rigidity of the Islámic system. Even granting that their political bitterness and their scorn for other men and creeds could be abated by a long residence amongst other races, as in India, what would follow? Would Islám, through their influence, become progressive? Would a Wahhábí State, less isolated than Nejd is, acknowledge equality amongst its subjects and base its laws on the needs of men, the circumstances of the present and the experience of the past? Not at all. The glory of Wahhábíism is that it is a return to first principles. The Qurán and Sunnat must be the one sole rule of faith in religion, the one sole law to regulate the affairs of the family and the State; social, moral and political law could have no other foundation. What Wahhábíism does is this. It binds the fetters of Islám more tightly around the individual and the community. It gives no freedom whatever from the dictates of a legal system, of which the most favourable estimate that can be made is that it was an anachronism in the world's history. We believe it to be much worse, to be a system opposed to all progress, all reform. Wahhábíism, the latest great revival in Islám, is not a movement towards freedom of thought and life; but a revival pure and simple of the rigid character which Islám possessed in the earliest ages of its existence. In this movement we can safely say that Islám is not progressive.

There are only two points which yet remain to be noticed. Islám in India and Islám in Turkey are subject to influences found in no other countries. In India all Muslims, excluding those who reside in the Native States, are under British rule; and, except in purely religious matters and in questions relating to divorce, inheritance and such like domestic concerns, are under Anglo-Indian law. In the Native States the rulers are practically influenced by the Indian Government, and so throughout the whole land there is liberty of conscience. The English language is now eagerly studied by all who wish to obtain Government service. The universities are year by year increasing in influence; yet in South India, the part we are best acquainted with, the Muslims are all behind. Only one in every eighty-five of the Musalmán population is in any recognised Government or aided school. In all the higher examinations the Musulmáns are conspicuous by their absence. In the last twenty-two years only three Musul-

máns have taken a degree in the University of Madras. Political power has entirely slipped out of their hands. The nobles hold aloof, with all the pride and scorn of true-born Muslims, from Western culture; and the Moulvies, or priests, like to have it so. Amongst the few from the middle classes who are educated in English there is more liberality of thought and less fanaticism than amongst the others; but even on them Islám has a strong hold. Where it has loosened its grasp they fall off into infidelity. A few men are said to be forming a sect which the orthodox call "Nature." Thus if a boy who has been brought up in an English school becomes careless in his outward religious duties and is a "suspect," they say of him that he has become "nature," by which they mean that he has thrown off all regard for religious dogma and its restraints. It can scarcely as yet be called a movement, and if it should grow it will not affect Islám internally, they will simply be lost to it, and the departure of a few out of the 2,000,000 in the Madras Presidency will make no appreciable difference. But better far than any theorising on the subject is the demonstration from legal and authoritative documents that the principles of the second century of the Hijrah still rule Muslims who have been for several generations under the enlightened rule of the British Government.

It is a rule that the Namáz, or public prayers, and all verses of the Qurán recited in them, must be repeated in Arabic; even though, as is generally the case, the worshipper is ignorant of the meaning of the words he utters. A few months ago a man in Madras translated a portion of the Qurán and some prayers into Hindustani, the vernacular of the Musalmáns; the result was that all the principal theologians met together, condemned this conduct, and publicly in the chief mosque of the city excommunicated the offender. The *fatva* or decision is a curious document. We now give a translation of the chief points in it.

"QUESTION.

"O Ulema of the religion and muftis of the enlightened law, what is your opinion on this matter? A person has printed a Hindustan translation of the Arabic Qurán. He says that the translation is equal in style to the original. He has added rubrical directions regarding public prayer, and says that it is the will and command of God that in the prayers the worshippers

should use his translation of the Qurán. Though he himself understands Arabic, he says his prayers in Hindustani, and persuades others to do likewise. Now, what is the order of the law about such a person, and what is the decree in the case of those who follow him, or who circulate his opinions, or who consider him to be a religious man and a guide, or who consider the translation to which reference has been made to be the holy Qurán, or who teach it to their children? O learned men, state what is the law in such matters, and thus merit a good reward.

"ANSWER.

"After praising God and calling down blessings on the Prophet, be it known that the person referred to is an infidel, an atheist, and a wanderer from the truth. According to the Imáms Sháfa'i, Málik and Hanbal, it is illegal to use a translation of the Qurán when saying the Namáz (prayers), whether the worshipper is ignorant of Arabic or not. Moreover, from the Qurán itself the recital of it in Arabic is proved to be a Divine command (*farz*). The word Qurán means, too, an Arabic Qurán, for God speaks of it as a revelation in Arabic. The words, 'Recite so much of the Qurán as may be easy to you' (Súra lxiii. 20), prove the duty of reciting it; while the words, 'An Arabic Qurán, have we sent it down' (Súra xiii. 2), show that the Qurán to be used is an Arabic, not a Hindustani one. The person alluded to is an infidel, for he tries to make out that the Ulema of all preceding ages, who have instructed the people from the days of the Prophet till now to read Arabic in the Namáz, are sinners. The result of the use of translations as recommended by him, would be that a number of different translations of the Qurán would get into circulation, and thus the text, like that of the Christian Scriptures, would become corrupt. Our decision is that the usual salutations should not be made to this person. If he dies he must not be buried in a Musalmán cemetery. His marriages are void and his wives are at liberty. All who assist him are infidels. To send children to be taught by him, to purchase newspapers which advocate his views, and to read his translations, are unlawful acts. Our duty is to give information to Musalmáns, and God is the best Knower.

"Written by Abul Muhámid Sultán Mahmúd-ul-Hanafi, and signed by twenty-four other Moulvies.

"Madras, February 13th, 1880."

In North India some Musalmáns of the Shía'h sect have risen to eminence in the service of the British Government; others are barristers-at-law and are able and well-educated men. They have written books in English which seem to show that they consider, or rather wish their

readers to think that they consider Islám and Christianity to be near to each other. Thus: "Islám and Christianity both aim at the same results, the elevation of mankind; why, then, should the two be hostile to each other? Why should not the two harmonise? Islám has done no evil to the world, nor has Christianity. Both have conferred the greatest blessings on mankind. Why, then, should not the two, mixing the water of life treasured in their bosom, form the bright flowing river which would bear our race to the most glorious fields of humanity?"* It is difficult to discover "the water of life" amongst the Musalmán Arab slave-dealers of Africa, the wild Bedouins of Arabia, the men who delight in internecine wars in Central Asia, or amongst the Turks ruled, as they are, by the Khalíf of Islám, the viceregent of the Prophet, and ruled, too, as we shall presently show, according to the strictest interpretation by its authorised expounders of the law of Islám. Still, such fine writing and such apparently liberal sentiments are very attractive to those who know nothing of the inner working of Islám. It would not, however, be difficult to show that this liberality of opinion is expressed for the sake of the English reader. To the Muslims such men appear in a more orthodox attitude. An attempt is made in the work from which we have just quoted to show that ceremonial in prayer is considered of little value, and the following verse is quoted: "It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces in prayer towards the east or the west; but righteousness is of him who believeth in God" (Súra ii. 172). Another verse still stronger might have been quoted: "To God belongeth the east or west: therefore, whithersoever ye turn yourselves to prayer there is the face of God" (Súra ii. 109). All this is very good; but the fact that such liberty was disallowed by a verse which cancels or abrogates the preceding is carefully omitted. The verse in question is: "We have seen thee turning thy face toward heaven, but we will have thee turn to a Qibla which shall please thee, turn then thy face toward the Holy Temple (of Mecca), and wherever ye be, turn toward that part" (Súra ii. 139). Similar suppressions of facts could be adduced which tend to show how professedly liberal-minded Musalmáns ignorantly or wilfully lead their English readers astray. The favourable conception of Christianity

* *Life of Muhammad*, by Syed Amir Ali, p. 346.

expressed in the quotation we made from Amir Ali's work is not always maintained by that author. The following statement read in the light of history provokes a smile. Speaking of Christianity after the conversion of Constantine he says: "From the moment it obtained the mastery, it developed its true character of isolation and exclusiveness. Wherever Christianity prevailed, no other religion could be followed without molestation." Substitute the word Islám for Christianity, and the statement agrees with historical facts. Again, "The Moslems, on the other hand, required from others a simple guarantee of peace and amity, tribute in return for protection, or *perfect equality*."* How far the words we have italicised are true, let the Christian subjects of the Porte answer. What is it that makes the support of Turkey so unrighteous a thing, but the fact that the subject Christian population have not *perfect equality?*

However, apart from all this, it is conceded that there is in the minds of many Muslims in India more liberality of thought than there was formerly. There have been such periods in Islám before, but reform could never come. As the case stands now, when some principle such as the use of Arabic in the Namáz has to be tested, in spite of all the liberal surroundings of life in India, the leaders of the people judge not by the exigencies of the age, or the wants of men, but by laws laid down in a country where Arabic was the vernacular and by principles enunciated ten or eleven centuries ago under totally different circumstances of life. But the glory of Islám is it finality even to matters of detail. Hence the little there is of progress.

The events connected with Turkey are so recent that no enumeration of them is here needed. Moreover, we have not to do with the political situation, but with the question whether Islám in Turkey gives any hope of reform. From what was stated at the commencement of this article it will have been seen that the foundations of Islám are such that the superstructure of law and administration built upon them must partake of the same immobile character. It is the function of the Sultán as the Khalíf of Islám *to execute, not to alter*, that law. This is the theory and the logical consequence of abiding by the first principles of Islám. But do facts bear out this assertion? Let us see.

---

* *Life of Muhammad*, by Syed Amir Ali, p. 216.

About a year ago Khair-uddin Pasha wished to introduce into Turkey a government based upon the needs of modern society—a government of a representative character. What did the learned canonists and divines of Islám, the Ulema, say. We quote the fatva from the letter, dated July 29th, 1879, of the Constantinople correspondent of the *Times*. The fatva or decree on Khair-uddin's proposal reads as follows:—"The law of the Sheri does not authorise the Caliph (Khalíf) to place beside him a power superior to his own. The Caliph ought to reign alone and govern as master. The Vakeels should never possess any authority beyond that of representatives, always dependent and submissive. It would consequently be a transgression of the unalterable principles of the Sheri, which should be the guide of these actions of the Caliph, to transfer the supreme power of the Caliph to one Vakeel." This is the most important part of the fatva, and from it two very important principles may be deduced. First, the principles of the Sheri, or Divine law, are declared to be unalterable. Secondly, it must be the guide of *all the actions of the Khalíf*." Thus a law utterly unsuited for a country where various races and creeds must have political equality before there can be any real reform, is declared to be unalterable. The Sultán is declared to be bound in *all* his actions by this law, which never did and never can recognise the Christian subject as the political equal of the Muslim one. The key to the whole situation is contained in this fatva, a fatva delivered by the highest legal and ecclesiastical court in Islám. Any one who knows the first principles of Muhammadan law sees here the final word, and that word is—Islám is *not* progressive.

ART. III.—1. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion.* By J. CAIRD, D.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Glasgow. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1880.

2. *Scotch Sermons.* London: Macmillan. 1880.

3. *Encyclopædia Britannica.* Ninth Edition. Vol. III. Art. "Bible." By ROBERTSON SMITH, Professor of Hebrew in the Free Church College, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black. 1875. Vol. II. Art. "Hebrew Language and Literature." By R. SMITH. Edinburgh: Black. 1880.

4. *Salvation: Here and Hereafter.* By Rev. J. SERVICE, of Inch. London: Macmillan. 1878.

5. *Religious Life and Thought.* By Rev. W. HORNE, M.A., Examiner in Philosophy in the University of St. Andrew's. London: Williams and Norgate. 1880.

THE works whose titles we have placed at the head of this Paper are among the "signs of the times." They add to the many palpable and abounding evidences that in Scotland the retreat from Calvinism has become a stampede. The defection began long ago, and uttered its voice in many a moan of "Moderatism;" but during the last half-century the spread of science, the advance of wealth and culture, the disruption of Churches, the agency of Methodism, and the contact of Scotchmen with men in every part of the earth, have combined to weaken the theological system which once seemed so firm. Now its collapse seems so imminent that men literally overrun each other in their flight to other places of shelter. In the transition we fear that precious things may be lost, useful landmarks will be obliterated, and positions may be yielded in panic which could be easily sustained. But the operation which is progressing is full of instruction to men of all Churches; and a movement so fraught with importance to the most tremendous interests of belief and religion will be watched with intense concern by the eyes of all Christendom.

Professor Caird is one of the most distinguished leaders of the new party. Though he has not before largely committed himself to the publication of his views on Theology, he has generally been credited with strong sympathies for the "Broad" School. Occasional sermons or addresses were the only indications by which the outer world could judge of his originality and eloquence. His reputation for more than usual ability of thought and exposition was not confined, however, to the circle of his clerical and academical friends. His public deliverances had gained universal attention, from the Queen in her church at Crathie, to the humblest sermon-hearer in Edinburgh or Glasgow. But in these fragmentary publications or occasional appearances Dr. Caird had never been remarkable for any clear enunciations of dogmatic theology. His proclivities were evidently towards a rationalistic exposition of the Christian system. Not many, however, were prepared for the strong antagonism to the popular theology which appears in *Scotch Sermons*, nor for the singular subservience to a philosophical system which marks the "Introduction." In their repudiation of current theological opinions Dr. Caird and his coadjutors speak out even more plainly than did the authors of *Essays and Reviews* twenty years ago, though the main features and pretensions of the publications have a strong resemblance. That miracles are impossible, that prophecy is *vaticinatio post eventum*, that Scripture is only authoritative where true, and agreeable to "the verifying faculty;" that the doctrines of "covenants" between man and God, of the Atonement, and of justification by faith, are anthropomorphic and fictitious; reappear in these pages as they did in those of the famous "Seven;" and as in the former case, the Biblical scholarship, metaphysics, and the criticism are largely derived from German sources. But we do not wish ill-omened analogy to prejudice the latest phase of Scottish thought and religion. We desire in our notice to exhibit to our readers the actual position of the New School rather than to attempt a close criticism of all its professions and peculiarities.

The term "Philosophy of Religion" is not accepted by all without objections; and to these objections, which lie at the threshold of his subject, Dr. Caird first addresses himself. It will probably be considered that the most valuable parts of his work are those where he replies to the

Materialist and Positivist. Apart from mere argument, the poetry and glow of the writer's soul protest against the blank and vapid conclusions of the philosophy of despair. His philosophy has been adopted, not from powerful subjective tendencies alone, but with the hope of finding a sure refuge from the flood of Atheism which threatens to overwhelm everything in our day. His efforts for this purpose will doubtless induce the sincere and sympathetic respect of many who will not agree with his main theories.

It is by means of the affirmation that "all our knowledge is relative" that the Positivist denies any knowledge of God to be possible. This doctrine of the conditional nature of all human knowledge was the result of Kant's investigations on the subject, but he was not an Atheist; and it was developed by Sir William Hamilton and Dean Mansel, who were Christian men. We are not prepared to relinquish the position as that which involves the substantial truth on the point in question. It is doubtless open to many of the attacks which criticism has directed against it; and the Agnostic founds upon it his denial of all knowledge of God in man. Yet Mr. Herbert Spencer allows that the absolute must exist as necessary in logic, and as "a datum in consciousness." But we cannot affirm and deny the same thing. If we are compelled to postulate the existence of an "absolute" even when we speak of that which is "conditioned," it is useless to deny that we can know anything about it. We know, at least, that it exists. Mr. Spencer allows that religion should consist in "awe of the Unknowable." But the "Absolute" in this sense is a meaningless abstraction. The "Unthinkable," "Matter without Form," and that which is left when all conditions are eliminated, is the pure abstraction of Being; and Dr. Caird thinks that this is nothing at all. "Shall we bow down before this *Caput mortuum*, this logical phantom, as the Highest Reality?"

But, on other grounds, the Intuitionalist also objects to the intrusion of Philosophy into the domain of Religion. Because of the coldness of the logical understanding he has sought a foundation for faith in the higher reason; and now to begin to argue for religious ideas seems to be leaving higher ground for lower. Reflection and argument only give us notions instead of God. The understanding works by fixed categories which represent only separate objects of truth, and not the divine whole; while a finite analysis

can never exhaust an infinite content. To this Dr. Caird replies: That philosophy does not aim at making men religious; it presupposes religion; as æsthetics and ethics succeed art and conduct. Besides, Science gives up unity in order to gain higher unity. It gives up the whole of practical experience for analysis, division, and abstraction; but intelligence condones the steps of abstraction by which "the rude unities of popular observation are exchanged for the deeper unities of thought."

It may be urged further, by the advocates of the Intuitionalist theory, that as we can prove God by no principle higher than Himself, we cannot have any mediate or reasoned knowledge of Him; and the immediate idea of God must be the highest, and, indeed, sole conception of Him we are able to attain. But our author thinks that the same difficulty equally affects both ideas. The immediate idea, so called, supposes the finite subject, the Infinite object, and a third term implying the relation between them, and these include a process of thought. In further reply to this objection Dr. Caird unveils his central theory, and we will give his own words:

"Whilst the objection to a knowledge of God attained deductively, by any process of logical proof, is, in one point of view, a valid one, inasmuch as God is just the Being who cannot be deduced, who exists in and for Himself, and contains within Himself the reason of His own existence, yet this objection would no longer hold against a rational or mediate knowledge of God, in which the proof or process of mediation is, when closely viewed, *one which is contained within His own nature*. Now, religion is simply the return of the finite consciousness into union with the infinite, the reconciliation of the human spirit with the Divine; and a philosophy of religion is not the thoughts or reasonings of a finite observer as to the being and nature of God and our relations to Him, but simply a conscious development of the process which is given implicitly in religion and in religious feelings and acts—the process, viz., by which the finite spirit loses or abnegates its finitude and self-sufficiency, and finds it truer self in the life and being of God. God is not proved or known by anything foreign to His own being. He reveals Himself in thought, and to it. All true thought of God is itself Divine thought—thought, that is, which is not arbitrary and accidental, but in which the individual mind surrenders its narrow individualism and enters into the region of universal and absolute truth. If, therefore, rational or speculative knowledge is, in one point of view, man's knowledge of

God, it is in another God's knowledge of Himself."—*Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 51—53.

After this, we shall not be surprised that Dr. Caird is careful in his Preface to avow his dependence upon Germany, and especially to Hegel's *Philosophie der Religion*, "a work to which he has been more largely indebted than to any other book." It is evident that he has entered into the heart of Hegelianism. Its vast and confusing meditations have taken up their abode with him, and for the present he has "determined not to know anything among" men but this philosophy of idealism. The scheme which insists upon the identity of knowing and being; upon the union of the finite consciousness with the infinite; upon momenta or thought-impulses, and processes by which all things become what they are, explains everything to him. Though the disciples of Hegel soon threw off the mask of religion, and such as Michelet and Strauss are his recent representatives, our author, like his German predecessor, considers this theory to be necessary to Faith, and, indeed, the only theory by which Faith in these days can be defended. The zeal of the intuitionalist is often due to the opinion that his is the only alternative to the theories of empiricism and sensationalism.

"There is another and a truer theory of human knowledge according to which it is possible to give to our moral and religious ideas an independent authority, without reducing them to the level of blind and irrational prejudices. Even over what have been deemed our primary beliefs, it is possible to extend the domain of reason without depriving them, in one point of view, of their primary and fundamental character; it is possible to explain them rationally, without explaining them away. For the highest explanation and justification is given to any idea or element of thought when it is shown to be a necessary moment of the universal system, a member of that organic unity of thought, no part of which is or can be isolated or independent, or related to any other accidentally or arbitrarily, but wherein each idea has a place or function involved in its own nature and in its necessary relations to all other ideas and to the whole. . . . We may admit that there are notions, ideas, beliefs, which cannot be deduced syllogistically, which the logic of the understanding cannot justify, and yet maintain that by a profounder logic, which enters into the genesis and traces the secret rhythm and evolution of thought, they can be shown to rise out of and be affiliated to other ideas, and to form constituent elements in that living process of which all truth consists. And as the life of any

member of a living organism may be said to be proved by this, that it is an essential part of the system, that it is at once means and end, implying and implied in all the rest; so, of any moral and spiritual idea it is the only and all-sufficient justification—that which lends to it the highest necessity—that it can be shown to be a necessary moment of that organic whole, that eternal order and system of which universal truth consists, and which is only another name for Him who is at once the beginning and the end, the source and consummation of all thought and being."—*Ibid.*, pp. 61—63.

This extract contains the pith of that alternative system which Professor Caird prefers before either intuitionalism or empiricism. Its master-idea is the dominant which prevails throughout his utterances. With a faculty for exposition which amounts to something like genius he presents this one thought in an endless variety of aspects. Though he does not reach the splendour, nor affect the style-rhythm of Chalmers, one is yet reminded of the author of the *Astronomical Discourses*, and of the *Evidences*, by his idiomatic simplicity and vigour, and by the concatenation of all thoughts, facts, and illustrations upon one line of theory. His faith in the system is unhesitating and complete. The Hegelian key opens every door. The universe without, and consciousness within, stand revealed before it. Having gained an insight into "that profounder logic which enters into the genesis and traces the secret rhythm and evolution of thought," he can dispense with and defy the "logical understanding." Those of us who hold by the latter cannot help asking what, in this scheme, becomes of personality, of responsibility, and even of God. If He is but "an eternal order and system," which has been the accepted synonym of Deity from Fichte to Mr. M. Arnold, or "that organic whole of which universal truth consists," as Dr. Caird phrases it, where is there room for Personal Will; and without this, what is Religion? But for the present it will be better to suspend these inquiries until the exhibition of Dr. Caird's course of reasoning is more complete.

To those who object to a Philosophy of Religion, because we have a Revelation in Scripture, it is quite in accordance with the theory of our author to say that Religion and Revelation are correlative ideas, and that a God who ceases to reveal Himself ceases to be God. Indeed, it might be said that the Revelation is God, since the eternal

order and system is perpetually unfolding itself. Therefore, Revelation must always be in accord with Reason. Since Reason has to judge the contents and authority of Revelation we cannot set Reason against herself. "An authority proving by reason its right to teach irrationally is an impossible conception." Leibnitz and others have held it to be safe to hold views which are "above reason," provided that sufficient authority be forthcoming. But is there more than one kind of reason, and is not that our own? And since our reason and that of God must be the same, how can any ideas be properly said to be "above reason?"

As we have already intimated, the chief end of Dr. Caird's cogitations is to reply to Materialism. He insists that this theory is totally inadequate to explain the phenomena of mind. It supposes mind to be a function of matter, yet cannot take its first step without employing categories of thought. The empiricist talks of Matter, Law, and Force, as if they were real entities, on the level of sensuous things. Though experience is more than sensation, yet his axiom, "all knowledge is from experience," assumes that experience and sensation are identical. Experience is One, and Sensations are Many: Sensation is diversified, but Reason gives it Unity. The relation and co-ordination are from the self-conscious Ego. Mechanical causes can never explain the operations of mind. Vital, chemical, and physical relations are not to be resolved into one order. The purely chemical has never yet produced life; protoplasm analysed is not living but dead, and when living it presents new phenomena which involve a new factor. Though matter should contain potencies of life, yet life contains a new and higher conception. It involves "a richer movement" (the Hegelian momentum), containing at least three ideas. These are—First, Systematic Unity. A stone has inorganic unity—is "a concourse of atoms;" but the organised being has order, proportion, diversity, and function applied to an end. Secondly, while the inorganic has artificial unity the organic has a self-supporting development and unity: the parts are necessary to the whole, and the whole to the parts. The cause lies, indeed, in its effects—is indeed its own cause.

"We have here an object of thought to which the conception of physical causality is inapplicable, and for the interpretation of

which it is altogether inadequate. We have reached a class of phenomena which demand a new conception or category to embrace them; or, stated otherwise, we find here that thought which is in nature, which indeed nature is, and which alone makes science or a knowledge of nature possible, rising to a new stage in the process of its self-revelation; flashing out upon us, so to speak, a new and deeper expression of its presence and power."—Pp. 109, 110.

The third element in the conception of life which transcends the category of force is found in self-consciousness. Tindall and Huxley have imagined that the mechanical equivalent to thought may some time be found. Dr. Caird thinks the mystery of the connection between matter and mind to be both greater and less than these writers suppose. It is less: for since material phenomena can be known to mind, there is no impassable gulf between them; yet it is greater, for physical causation cannot explain it. He asserts that the indivisible unity of consciousness transcends all differences both external and internal. The whole consciousness is present in every thought. The analogy therefore between material forces and spiritual motives is fallacious. With this, of course, there collapses the differentia of Calvinism as elaborated by Jonathan Edwards. "The mind to be acted on in volition is already present in the motives that are supposed to act upon it" (p. 115).

Science, therefore, which is ever seeking unity, system, continuity in things, must not expect to find "the explanation of a highly complicated system in its lowest and meagrest factor." The true explanation, Dr. Caird proceeds to argue, must be found at the end rather than at the beginning. Matter precedes terrestrial life as the first note of the orchestra goes before the full symphony, and as the first touch of art prefigures the last work of genius. If the higher is found in the lower it is not as effect from cause. If the inorganic produce the organic, and if the organic produce thought, then each of these is more than it is usually supposed to be. But the disproof of the material position does not demonstrate the being of God. It is the progressive movement of compulsory thought which leads us from the lower categories to the higher, until we come to the highest unity which is human consciousness, and we are yet further driven beyond this to the Infinite. The mind is impelled by its own "dialectic"

(Hegelian) until it finds its goal in the universal and absolute on which all finite thought and being rest.

At this point Dr. Caird seems disposed to favour the views of those who, like the authors of *The Unseen Universe*, attribute Force and even Matter to a spiritual origin or substratum. He says that we cannot rest in the opinion that matter is absolutely different from mind. We discover "in all the objects and events of the outward world a being and life that is essentially akin to our own." The laws of nature are not foreign to mind, and love and all moral ideas express themselves in society as they are known to the individual intelligence. But—

"The perfect unity of the ideal and actual of universal and individual life is never reached by us; it is a goal that vanishes as we pursue it. We never are, but are only becoming that which it is possible for us to be. . . . Yet . . . in the fact that we can feel and know it to be our ideal inheritance, there is to us a revelation of the infinite and of our essential relation to it. For it is to be considered that the distinction between knowing and being, between the ideal and the actual, is one which is made by thought, and which therefore thought can transcend—nay, in the very act of making it, has already transcended. We have that in our nature, as conscious spiritual beings, which constitutes what we have termed a potential infinitude. In other words, when we examine into the real significance of the rational and spiritual nature and life of man, we find that it involves what is virtually the consciousness of God and of our essential relation to Him."—Pp. 125, 126.

While we admit that there is much that is suggestive and powerful in this course of thought, we cannot congratulate the Professor on his desertion of the paths of the "Philosophy of Common Sense" which have been so well tracked over the quagmires of metaphysics by his countrymen. The Caledonian shepherd knows the value of a path, however narrow, if it be firm, over the deceitful bog, and scarcely pities the adventurous traveller who, determined to take his own points, becomes a victim of the morass. "Unity" has been the ignis fatuus of the materialist and spiritualist in turn. We may believe that it exists, just as we believe that there is a square whose area is equal to that of a given circle; but the demonstration of it is beyond human art at present. Yet though men have ceased to labour at the quadration of the circle, or in the pursuit of perpetual motion, in Germany it has been con-

sidered the indispensable sign of mental advancement to hold a universe-system, if not to invent a new one; and we fear that a similar penchant is coming upon the scientists and thinkers of our own country. Formerly, the British philosopher was content to speculate upon the nature and origin of human knowledge, and its relation to the various faculties of the mind; but he never presumed to say how things existed in themselves, or how the Finite was associated with the Infinite. At length, however, the Teutonic method has gained a footing, and "Unity," even if only to be reached by the violence of Transcendentalism or of Agnosticism, the two great branches of what may be called wilful philosophy, must be attained. For, when it is said that the mind "can transcend the contradictions of the logical understanding," it is simply meant that it may, or may not, as it likes. If either course is taken there is an exercise of the will; and now this volitional element is entering into philosophic controversy to aggravate its confusion. One strong and almost typical variety of this wilful philosophy is that known as Pessimism, in which a man makes up his mind to be content with that explanation of the universe which can be found in its undoubted tendencies to ruin. The ancient materialist found unity in Fire, or Water, or Air, or Atoms, as the modern materialist thinks he has it in Matter or Force. The metaphysician has long sought it in ideas, substance, the real and the ideal; Fichte believed it was the absolute ego postulated in the finite ego; Schelling phrased it as the identity of Subject and Object; and Hegel more elaborately as the Thought-Process by which the aboriginal idea unfolded itself in the perpetual "dialectic" of finite forms. Beyond this conception Dr. Caird is evidently powerless to proceed. The German mist obstructs his vision on every side; and as a fog on the Northern moors hides every landmark from the traveller, so this obscuration merges all distinction of beginning and end, of Alpha and Omega. That which thinks, and that about which it thinks, is the same, yet neither of these is real; the thought which connects subject and object, the finite consciousness with the infinite consciousness, is the only reality. And "herein is wisdom," and unity.

While admitting the decided individuality of Professor Caird's method and style, it is impossible to forget the strong resemblance of his system to that of the late Pro-

fessor Ferrier. The latter, like himself, was greatly influenced by German metaphysics, and could not extricate himself from the theory of Schelling and Hegel. He charged the philosophers of his own country not only with asserting an unproved absoluteness in the distinction between matter and mind, but in anatomising "mind" itself into faculties and powers which had no real existence. Dr. Caird follows him in these reflections, and has evidently made Ferrier's central or radical principle his own. Knowledge does not consist in a subject which apprehends an object pure and simple, as the common-sense philosophy teaches. Ferrier says: "Along with whatever my intelligence knows, it must, as the ground or condition of its knowledge, have some cognisance of itself." This is his fundamental principle, as set forth in his *Institutes of Metaphysics*. This was the keystone of a theory upon which a system of universal knowledge might be raised; and was to him as valuable as Professor Caird's idea of the identity of knowing and being: if, indeed, they are not the same. What Ferrier gives as the true description of real existence might be a sentence on Dr. Caird's pages. "Absolute existence is the synthesis of the subject and object—the union of the universal and particular, the concretion of the ego and non-ego; in other words, the only true, and real, and independent existences are minds, together with that which they apprehend."

The alternative, then, which Dr. Caird, as Ferrier before him, proposes to put, in the place of sensational theories of knowledge and existence, is that of the transcendentalist who leaps over the chasm which "the logical understanding" makes in its conclusions. We must, at this point, leave reasoning and take to ourselves the wings of "speculative thought." In spite of Lord Bacon and Sir W. Hamilton, progress is no longer to be sacrificed to our faith in the laws of identity and contradiction. We must allow that a thing may be, and not be, at the same time; and that out of Negation comes Affirmation, and that the eternally stable is indeed that which is infinitely variable. Because we cannot resolve all forms of truth into one, we must assume that they are one, and call ourselves philosophers for doing so! Now, we should not object to this persuasion of the ultimate unity of all truth receiving the title of Faith. We do believe that all contradictions are harmonised, and all problems solved in the mind of God.

But we could scarcely honour this conception of unity as an intuitional perception, and much less by the designation of "philosophical." No true philosophy has ever transcended reason after this manner. The logical understanding is the test of all theories of speculation; and that all we have an idea of cannot be reduced to its methods, is but to say that our philosophy is finite and not infinite. It seems to us, therefore, little more than pretence and affectation for any to assume that they have reached the centre of absolute being and knowledge. Moreover, Dr. Caird, in his reply to the intuitionalist, insists that there is "only one reason," and that is human reason; but this has a quasi-Divine authority. If so, who has a right to "transcend" the conclusions of "the logical understanding?" Kant certainly developed, more clearly than it had been done before his time, the province of the "Pure Reason" (Vernunft); but he conceded no ideas to it which were not founded upon the conclusions of the understanding (Verstand). Under any circumstances, we cannot first assert for Reason an authority to judge even "Revelation," and then repudiate it as unsatisfactory and deceptive.

It is quite in accordance with his main theory that our author should disparage the popular arguments for the existence of God, and all anthropomorphic conceptions of the Divine Being. The Theist, he thinks, has missed his way in replying to the Materialist, by introducing the ideas of an "Almighty Creator" and an "All-wise Designer." This explanation "is pitched too low . . . and is essentially dualistic. Not only is the God who is conceived of as an external Creator or Contriver reduced to something finite, but the link between Him and the world is made a purely arbitrary one, and the world itself is left without any real unity" (p. 88). Again, he says: "You cannot begin with the existence of matter, and then pass by a leap to the existence of a spiritual, intelligent Being, conceived of as its External Cause or Contriver. Betwixt two things thus heterogeneous the category of causation establishes no necessary bond." But we know no one except the Hegelian who attempts this desperate leap from the material to the spiritual. He launches away from *terra firma* into vasty deeps of idealism, where common sense has no rest for the sole of her foot. Surely we do not violate "the categories of causation" when we say that the

marks of adaptation, arrangement, and power which the visible world contains, have their efficient origin in Him who precedes nature. This does not reduce the Creator to something finite, and is no leap in the dark. We must, indeed, think of God, if we think of Him at all, as the Infinite One, who changes not. Yet we are compelled also to think of Him as a person who acts at every moment of time according to the dictates of adequate wisdom. God is not the God of Reason only: He is also Lord of the imagination; and the anthropomorphic conception of Him is as necessary to religion as the idea of the Absolute. How to combine these two conceptions in one is the attempt and failure of many like Dr. Caird, and Ferrier, and Hegel, and many before their day. But neither of these conceptions is to be denied. It only caricatures the ordinary view of God's personal providence when Dr. Caird represents it as implying "a succession of violated elements with the gaps filled up by an arbitrary factor, or the perpetual recurrence of inextricable knots, with a *deus ex machina* brought in to cut them."

The "only alternative" from the anthropomorphic theory which attributes personal affections and will to God is that of fatalism. Dr. Caird does not therefore, after all, escape the bias of his native creed, which teaches that God is, and only can be, Necessity. The idea of free agency and contingency, as it is held in Arminian circles, never enters the head of one trained in Calvinism. No matter how far he recedes from the faith of his childhood in other respects, he never has any other conception of Deity than that of the absolute Will of Eternal Law, which never can forget itself. It is natural, therefore, that Dr. Caird should find more simplicity in the materialistic theory than in that of the popular theology. It gives some coherence and completeness to the universe, by resolving all things into atoms with their relations and operations. Biological energy has not yet been resolved into chemistry and mechanism, but the vital energies of plants and animals are shown clearly to be dependent upon light, and food, and air. Protoplasm, which is identical in all, is a combination of physical elements: and life evidently has its clear relations to molecular force and change. Even thought and emotion are correlated to molecular change. Now this view is simple, consistent, and "necessary," and requires no arbitrary interference of a Supernatural Power

either for creation or for providence. It excludes all thought of "an external and arbitrary Omnipotence." But, having arrived at this point, we ask, What is Religion? and, What do we know of God? If this be true, the Scripture Revelation cannot be true, for it presents the anthropomorphic conception on every page. The God of the Bible is a person who creates and destroys, who is pleased and displeased; He is eternal, yet living and present. It is clear that we must get rid of Scripture before we can effectually liberate ourselves from the thought of an "external omnipotence." Supposing this difficulty over; are we prepared to worship that which is left, when all ideas of personal affection and will are eliminated from the conception of Deity? Would not this be a *caput mortuum* quite as empty as the *Unknowable* of Mr. Herbert Spencer?

We fear, therefore, that Professor Caird's Hegelianism would lead as directly to Pantheistic conclusions as its German prototype. The scientific "speculative idea" of God excludes all personal attributes, and includes only the immanent and ideal elements of His being. He yields at once to the sceptical objection against the cosmological argument: that reasoning from the finite cannot bring us to the infinite; and that the infinite, if it could thus be reached, would be outside the finite world, and therefore would be limited by it. In his opinion the argument entirely fails as a logical demonstration. The teleological argument "is pitched too low," because it assumes that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and that the firmament showeth His handiwork." "The notion of a Designer is far from absolute wisdom." He who made the things also must have made the materials, and therefore is the Author of that very intractableness which "design" or "contrivance" is supposed to overcome. Then, "the Providence which sustains the mechanism is outside of it, and therefore limited by it." It is clear, therefore, that Dr. Caird considers his philosophy to be some explanation of the relation of the infinite to the finite. Yet the difficulty inherent in this matter is the source of all the antinomies and apparent contradictions which appear in the ordinary reasoning on the connection between God and His works. But our author "transcends" these logical difficulties by his theory that God is but *Natura naturans:* he renounces the personality to preserve the infinity of God. In other words, he sacrifices religion to philosophy,

and yet philosophy cannot long survive the suppression of that which our author confesses to have a prime position among the "necessary ideas" of the human mind.

But further, this theory of "the philosophy of religion" contains in itself the essential vice of all Pantheism in that it renders God dependent on the universe for His own completeness. He is no more the self-existent, independent, All-perfect Being whom we have worshipped, but the substratum of that which exists; which, however, only finds its true life and meaning in the temporal and finite forms of the passing universe. He says:

"We can distinguish the centre of a circle from the circumference, the north from the south pole of a magnet, the one end of a stick from the other; but by no effort of abstraction can we, in any of these cases, think one of the correlatives as an object existing by itself in absolute isolation from the other—conceive, *i.e.*, of a centre existing in pure individuality without relation to a circumference, of a north pole which has in it no implication of a south, of a stick with only one end" (p. 23). "The true infinite is that which implies, or in the very idea of its nature contains or embraces, the existence of the finite" (p. 208). "The principle that solves the difference between Nature and Finite Mind is, that their isolated reality and exclusiveness is a figment, and that the organic life of reason is the truth or reality of both."—P. 240.

The "principle" upon which Dr. Caird makes so much to depend, seems to be neither more or less than Spinoza's Fundamental Substance. But throughout this reasoning, as indeed is the case with the Hegelian argument generally, there is no sufficient distinction between things in themselves, and our ideas of them. In the above quotation, "the true infinite" may refer either to the existence, which is thus described, or to our idea of it. However, no sense of this ambiguity hinders our author from the application of his theory, as the following paragraphs will show. He continues:

"The principle which, as we have thus seen, enables us to apprehend Nature and the Finite Mind, at once in their difference and their unity, we may now apply to the solution of the higher problem of Religion, or of the relation of the Finite Mind to God. Here, too, it will be seen that the understanding, which clings to the hard independent identity of either side, inasmuch as it starts from essentially dualistic conditions, renders any true solution impossible. If the law of contradiction is carried to its logical results, the only alternative in which the mind can rest is either

Pantheism, which denies spiritual reality and life to man, or Anthropomorphism, which makes religion a mere subjective fiction and God the self-imposed illusion of the worshipper's own mind. A true solution can be reached only by apprehending the Divine and the Human, the Infinite and the Finite, as the moments or members, of an organic whole, in which both exist at once in their distinction and their unity."—P. 241.

"The Infinite of Religion cannot be a mere self-identical Being, but one which contains, in its very nature, organic relation to the Finite; or, rather, it is that organic whole which is the unity of the Infinite and the Finite."—P. 256.

From these extracts it will be clear that our author's attempt to steer clear both of the Scylla and of the Charybdis of the "logical understanding" has not been successful. He has parted with Anthropomorphism, but has floated into the latitudes of Pantheism. According to his system the finite is necessary to the infinite, and nature must be co-eternal with God. That is, strictly speaking, there is no finite; nor, indeed, any infinite; for that the infinite should depend upon the finite is absurd. If, as he says, the Infinite and the Finite, God and Nature, Mind and Matter are as one pole of a magnet is to the other, then the one certainly is necessary to the other, and each exists by the same necessary, self-existent principle. This certainly eliminates the idea of Creation, as also of Design and "Contrivance" from Nature; but it subtracts so much from the popular theology that there is nothing left for religion and faith. We should venture to suggest to Dr. Caird to make another application of his illustration of the magnet with two poles, and the stick with its two ends. Instead of making the Finite the necessary complement of the Infinite, and the finite consciousness of the infinite consciousness, let him combine the two separate conclusions of the logical understanding which he calls Pantheism and Anthropomorphism. Properly understood we believe they do not deserve to be called by these titles, but in some senses they have these characters. They are the two insoluble simplicities which we obtain by our reasoning about a Divine Being. Let these continue to be then our last judgments on the question. We believe that they are not essentially contradictory, any more than we believe that positive electricity differs from negative, but we cannot unify them. Neither is the assertion of their unity by Dr. Caird, or Hegel, or any one else to be called "philosophy."

Let these then be the opposite poles of the magnet, the two ends of the stick. This will be safer than to deny that the two are two, or to affirm that they are more of one than of the other.

Nevertheless, although the Professor dismisses the arguments from Creation—its order, its adaptations, and its ends—as logical failures, yet he will allow them a place in the progress by which we come to the knowledge of God. How two or three blacks can make a white, or how to "transcend" a ladder of which every step is rotten, he does not show us, and we despair of ever knowing. But we may refer again to his principle that reason has in it something Divine in defence of these despised arguments. He allows and insists that the mind which we observe in Nature is the same as that which we find in ourselves. Where then is the absurdity of the conclusion that Nature has issued from an intelligent Cause? But our author has some sympathy with the ontological proof of the Divine existence; "the thought of God in the mind demonstrates His being." Kant asserted against this position of Anselm and Descartes that "the thought of anything does not prove its existence;" but Dr. Caird betakes himself again to the refuge of Hegelian identity. "The unity of thought and being, of subject and object, of self and the world opposed to it is implied in every act of thought. . . . We might even say that, strictly speaking, it is not we that think, but the universal reason that thinks in us." If this be so, we do not see why we should not claim a sort of infallibility for the human mind, which would then give a certain dignity to Anthropomorphism among other religious conceptions. And if some advocate of the dogma of 1870 should base his defence of that astonishing theory upon this philosophic speculation we should not be much surprised. If the Infinite Intelligence has been slowly but surely working itself out to the day through the imperfect forms of the past, what is so likely as that it should reach its maximum in him who is the head of the largest Church in Christendom? Given the identity of Divine and human intelligence, and there is more to be said for the theologians of the Curia than some of us have supposed. Although perhaps, some one will say that in this case every man may be his own infallible pontiff.

But we attempt no further description or criticism of Dr. Caird's "Introduction," as the companion volume,

entitled *Scotch Sermons*, requires our attention. Its preface informs us that "this volume has originated in the wish to gather together a few specimens of a style of teaching which increasingly prevails amongst the clergy of the Scottish Church." The Sermons are generally philosophical in spirit and carefully elaborated in style, being intended to demonstrate the advanced opinions and culture of one section, at least, of the clergy of the Established Church. This denomination is not wholly secure in its national relations. The Free Church and other Nonconformists have acquired a large influence among the middle and lower classes of the country, and the Episcopalian interest grows rapidly among the higher families; so that the Establishment needs all the support which its most cultured and eloquent sons can render it at this time. But we fear that the publication of these sermons, with whatever of good intention, is a great mistake. They were designed to exhibit "a profounder apprehension of the essential ideas of Christianity, and a method of presenting them in harmony with the results of critical and scientific research." The sincerity of their endeavours to come into harmony with the science of the nineteenth century cannot be questioned; we only wish they had been less eager to repudiate the Christian theology of the first century.

The first sermon is by Dr. Caird on "Corporate Immortality." Our readers will not confound this with *corporal* immortality, for the preacher does not often venture within the region in which such ideas as that of a bodily resurrection circulate. He tells us that the patriarchs who "died in faith, not having received the promises," had the persuasion that though their individual lives were failures, the career of the race would be a success.

"Is human life at the best but a splendid failure? Is the promise which our nature contains never fulfilled? The common answer, as we all know, to such questions is that which finds in the notion of the 'immortality of the soul' a solution of the difficulty. But whatever truth there is in this notion—it was obviously not this which was before the writer of the text."—*Scotch Sermons*, p. 4.

He goes on to say, that as a stone has little glory in itself, but more in being part of a temple; and as it is the perfection of an organ to be part of a living whole, so each man's perfection is found in his relation to the race. "He

who lives nobly and wisely rises above the narrow life of sense, to identify himself with that which is universal and infinite, and is sharer in a life of humanity that is never arrested and shall never die." After this we cannot be surprised that the figure of the "Colossal Man," which was transferred from the pages of Lessing to those of the *Essays and Reviews*, should reappear on those of its Scottish representative; nor that Dr. Caird should do him full justice. In the application of Hegelianism to pulpit use, no better opportunity could serve than that which brought up the "Education of the Human Race," and the relation of primitive, simple generations to those which are later and more complex. A topic similarly convenient is found for the second sermon, which is on "Union with God." Since there is but one aboriginal "Nature," and this is primal in God, evolved in the forms of the finite universe and reproduced in human thought and experience, therefore we become one with God when our thought and will harmonise with His. The infinite consciousness revealed itself perfectly in Jesus, because He was thus "One with the Father;" and as it is allowed to realise itself in us, so shall we attain the same unity. Of this unity, it is urged that the highest type is that of the organism; for organic unity, with its relation of whole and parts, is higher than inorganic. We suppose that Dr. Caird uses the reference to the organism as an illustration; we cannot think that he would literally resolve the universe, with the Deity, the Finite, and Man, as related factors or elements, into an "organic unity." We scarcely think he intends to come so near to the Pantheism of the last century.

> "All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
> Whose body Nature is, and God the soul."

After such an introduction as that which Dr. Caird's sermons furnish to this volume, readers may expect philosophical speculation in it, and possibly some practical teaching; but few will expect much theological or Scriptural exposition. This expectation will not be confounded. The next sermon in the series is by Dr. Cunningham, of Crieff, on "Homespun Religion," and being simple and practical, and a defence of the position that religion may be exercised in everyday duties, is not unworthy of its name. But this is followed by a discourse contributed by Dr. Fergus, of Strathblane, on the conversation between

our Lord and Nicodemus, in which the imperfect doctrinal statement and the unsatisfactory exposition of the book plainly exhibit themselves. Interpreters have been divided on the question of the connecting link between the first remark of Nicodemus, when he came to Christ, and our Lord's reply. Dr. Fergus's account of the matter is this: "The question implicitly before the mind of the speakers is, What is the true criterion of a revelation from God? Nicodemus based his belief upon the external fact of a miracle; our Lord taught him that he must build on a surer foundation." But this ingenious theory fails to supply the "missing link." Nowhere did Jesus disparage the evidence of miracles, and in the fourth Gospel specially insists upon its value. The fact was that Jesus denied the competency of Nicodemus and his class to judge of His claims. They thought themselves the only qualified persons to decide in such a case. He replied that without spiritual renewal they could neither see nor enter into the kingdom which He was about to introduce. Perhaps many things in this volume might be adduced in illustration of the great law which the Teacher of Galilee propounded to Nicodemus. At any rate, the following sentences may demonstrate the originality of Dr. Fergus. He says:

"Within the Church itself we recognise an historical process by which the tendency makes itself felt to distinguish between what is essential in Christianity and what is of passing value. If we worship an infallible book, and conceive of revelation as the publication, once for all, of a definite scheme of dogma, we shall naturally cling to the past, and forget that there is anything Divine in the world to-day. The Apostolic age will alone seem sacred, and a secular era date from its close. . . Of the effect of the process of sifting we have a good example in the doctrine of miracle. . . It has fallen into the background and lost its apologetic value. . . . Now to make belief in Christ depend in any degree upon the fact that He wrought miracles is to build upon the sand. It is to go back to the old Jewish belief of Nicodemus in the text, and to incur the implied rebuke in our Lord's answer to him. . . . Bibliolatry, refusing to distinguish between Christianity in itself and the New Testament its historical record, assumes that Christianity was necessarily purest near its source, and that lower down we may only look for sullied waters. The very opposite is the fact. Near the source the turbid stream of Judaism poured into the pure current of our Saviour's teaching, and the mingled waters were dark and troubled. It is only as we descend

that the foreign matter then held in solution is gradually precipitated, and the river of the water of life flows on more clear.... And the process is not yet complete."

We have already heard from Dr. Fergus himself what are some of the things which the ecclesiastical stream has "precipitated" in its progress; these are Bibliolatry, the evidence of miracles, &c. But if we turn to the sermon by the Rev. W. McFarlan, of Lenzie, we shall learn that the same fate has happened to not a few other ancient theological matters. He says:

"Many religious teachers admit that the dogmas of scholastic theology must be abandoned or greatly modified. The sections of that theology which treat of sin and salvation, they regard as specially untenable. These sections comprehend the following dogmas: (1) the descent of man from the Adam of the Book of Genesis; (2) the fall of that Adam from a state of original righteousness by eating the forbidden fruit; (3) the imputation of Adam's guilt to all posterity; (4) the consequent death of all men in sin; (5) the redemption in Christ of an election according to grace; (6) the quickening in the elect of a new life (*a*) at their baptism Catholics affirm, (*b*) at their conversion most Protestants allege; (7) the eternal punishment and perdition of those who remain unregenerate. These sections of the traditional theology of Christendom —originally elaborated by Augustine, amended and developed by the schoolmen of the Middle Ages, adopted wholesale by the Puritans—dominated the Christian intellect for centuries. They have ceased to dominate it."—P. 220.

We will add to this what Dr. Macintosh says on the Atonement and on Forgiveness:

"By His death on the cross, Christ may be said, in a figurative sense indeed, to have expiated our sins, or to have purchased their remission; it being important to observe that the figures vary. But what He did, in the strict and literal sense, was to reveal to us the infinite placability of the Divine Nature.... We define forgiveness to be the persistence of Divine love in spite of our sins." —Pp. 177, 181.

We need no further witness of the disintegration and dissolution of Calvinism. That it was among "the things which should not be shaken," we never believed. But unfortunately, in its dissolution, the Gospel also is in danger of being lost. Their writers seem to have no idea of an Evangelical system without the forms in which their

fathers have so firmly trusted. These sermons reveal an utter weariness with mere orthodoxy, with the bald Evangelicalism which despises good works, with the theory of human nature which denies that a saving Spirit is given to every man. They insist that justification is nothing without regeneration, that election is nothing without holiness, and protest in the name of morality against a doctrine of "salvation" which gives a bad man the hopes of heaven because he is "elected," and shuts out the man who diligently pursues the path of moral goodness. But these protestations are made now as if for the first time: as if no one had been qualified to denounce these theological absurdities before the "science" and "Biblical criticism" of the latter days made it imperative. We are afraid that these writers have never read the works of John Fletcher, which no less an authority than Dr. Döllinger declares to be "the most important theological productions which issued from Protestantism in the latter part of the eighteenth century." They do not recognise the fact that Methodism is escaping the shock of modern Rationalism to a very large extent, because it separated from Calvinism a century since. They have not permitted themselves to be sufficiently unprejudiced to learn from Wesley and his followers that "good works" are an essential part of the Gospel as well as "faith;" and to vindicate the one they repudiate the other. We cannot but honour any fair attempt to harmonise the teaching of Scripture with philosophy and true taste. The Gospel sent out to every creature must accommodate itself to the thought and speech of the passing age; but the translation of sacred sayings will need revision and renewal, from time to time. Divine and everlasting things must be expressed in terms which are "popular, flexible, and vanishing," in order that the things themselves may find access to ordinary minds. But, in time, these conceptions and expressions which belong to the human and material spheres, the rather that they have powerfully represented the truth for a season, become grotesque and effete. The advance of culture, within the Church and without it, continually modifies theological terminology, as it does every other department of speech. None can complain, therefore, of any honest effort to reduce the ordinary teaching of Christianity into harmony with reason and science. But the method of *Scotch Sermons* is too ambitious and too unscrupulous.

It depreciates so much the Biblical revelation that loyalty to it is put out of the question; and instead of the Gospel of "righteousness, sanctification, and redemption" in Christ, it produces "another gospel," of "the persistence of God's love," and the "Law of Moral Continuity."

Professor Knight, of St. Andrew's, distinguished himself many years ago by "advanced" views on the subject of prayer; and we are not astonished that he can now advocate the doctrine of development in its fullest sense. "Think," he says in his sermon on "The Continuity and Development of Religion," "of our forefathers, in the grey morning of the world's religion, engaged at their tree and serpent worship.... The savage who first called upon his fellows to worship the tree, as a symbol of the mystery of growth, was really a prophet of religious ideas, quite as truly as, though much less articulately than, the founders of maturer faiths. If you consider the blank, animal life out of which the former arose, in the long process of development, you will see how great was the advance which such a primitive worshipper made. The sense of mystery in individual objects, such as the tree or serpent, yielded by degrees to the wider and grander feeling of a mystery in Nature as a whole..... We have all seen, through a glass darkly, the glory of the Infinite; but between our purely animal ancestors, and the savage who was first subdued by the glory of the sky and the mystery of life, there was an interval as great as that which separates the latter from ourselves..... In all, there has been inspiration, at sundry times and in diverse manners, continuous, incessant, universal." In these few sentences we have a sketch of the new Genesis of Christianity, Judaism, and other "maturer faiths." But Dr. Knight does not tell us where he finds evidence of the transition between "purely animal ancestors" and the savage who worships a serpent or a tree. He says the distance between the animal and the savage is as great as that between the savage and us; we say that it is infinitely greater. And whereas there is little evidence that the nature-worshipping savage has ever developed a "maturer faith," without extraneous help or inspiration, there is absolutely none that the "purely animal" nature has risen to the idea of worship, even of a tree. Here Dr. Knight is certainly not treading the paths of knowledge but of faith; and it is useless to pretend that his scheme is a displacement of an

exploded faith by sound science. In another sermon on "Conservation and Change," Dr. Knight makes an appeal for the "Establishment;" and we shall be interested to observe how the Darwinism which he avows, the Hegelianism of Professor Caird, and the unhesitating Socinianism of Mr. M'Farlan and Dr. Macintosh, can serve the cause of the "Auld Kirk."

But it is not only in the National Church that the conflict between the old opinions and the new is proceeding. The "case" of Professor Robertson Smith has been in litigation before Presbytery and Assembly for nearly three years; and though it appeared to come to an unexpected and sensational conclusion in his acquittal before the Assembly of the Free Church in May last, no one supposes it will end there. It undoubtedly was a great honour to so young a man as Professor Smith to be elected to the Chair of Hebrew in the Free Church College, Aberdeen; and it speaks much for his reputed attainments, that the editor and publishers of the new edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* should request him to furnish the principal articles on Old-Testament criticism for their new publication. However, *hinc illæ lachrymæ*. Professor Smith has largely accepted the criticism of De Wette, Kuenen, and Ewald. He says: "The Deuteronomic law is familar to Jeremiah, the younger contemporary of Josiah, but is referred to by no prophet of earlier date..... Beyond doubt the book is a prophetic, legislative programme; and if the author put his work in the mouth of Moses instead of giving it, with Ezekiel, a directly prophetic form, he did so not in pious fraud, but simply because his object was not to give a new law, but to expound and develop Mosaic principles in relation to new needs. And as ancient writers are not accustomed to distinguish historical data from historical deductions, he naturally presents his views in dramatic form in the mouth of Moses." He leaves it an open question whether the Levitical or the Deuteronomic legislation was the earlier. The Book of Ecclesiastes presents the later philosophy of the Hebrews long after the Exile. Of course the later portion of the book of Isaiah xl.—xlvi. is due to an anonymous author,—"the great Unnamed," who belongs to the period of the Exile. The Book of Daniel may belong to the days of the early Persian empire, or to the period of the Maccabees. It remains to be seen whether these views can be reconciled with that veneration for the Scripture

records which the Church of Chalmers and Candlish has ever professed. In his article on the "Bible," Professor Smith advances views on the New Testament which are generally conservative in their tendency; but in a volume of the *Encyclopædia*, published within a month after the session of the Assembly, he brings forward further theories on the construction of Old-Testament literature, in the article on "Hebrew Language and Literature," which more largely commit him to the rationalistic position.

If we turn to the United Presbyterian Church, which comprises several sects of Secessionists, Erskinites, and what were once considered to be the "Irreconcilables" of the Calvinists, and its "Covenant" following, we find that within the last three years their attempts at comprehension have rendered a modification of the old standards necessary, and all the reductions and concessions have involved a sacrifice of some feature once considered indispensable to the identity of Presbyterian doctrine. Election is defined to be such that it does not preclude the offer of salvation to every man; and Scripture inspiration is not to be so held as to interfere with a full recognition of the human qualities and relations of the writers. These modifications, however, gave the Synod its authority to deal somewhat vigorously with the Rev. D. Macrae, of Greenock, who had boldly protested against the doctrine of everlasting punishment. The concessions yielded, however, did not grant the right to discard the ancient faith upon this question; and as Mr. Macrae, with controversial boldness and almost bitterness, asserted and defended his own views, which hover between those of universal restoration and those of immortality only to true believers, he was dismissed from his charge, and has since accepted a call to a separate congregation in Dundee. We ought to have given also more than a passing notice to the growing group of Churches known as the "Evangelical Union," and which owes its existence to the expulsion from the Presbyterian fellowship of Dr. John Morrison, the author of able and well-known Commentaries on St. Matthew, the Romans, and other parts of the New Testament. This community is distinctively Arminian, so far as the "general redemption" of mankind is concerned; but it has not succeeded in freeing itself from some of the most inveterate of the foibles of Calvinism. Desirous of making the way of salvation more simple than it had ever been

made before, even the duty of repentance is suspended, and the "faith" which saves is only a bare belief in the veracity of the Gospel history.

The extending impatience with the older forms of religious dogmatism appears in full vigour in the discourses by the Rev. J. Service, who is a minister of the Establishment at Inch. He is a somewhat profound and suggestive thinker, whose treatment of any subject is not without interest and instruction. But the "Salvation" of which he speaks is not the gratuitous and heavenly intervention for man of which the past or the current Evangelicalism loves to speak. It is rather the work of man, rightly directed, to better his own position, by the aid of those moral laws which human science has been able to discover. Mr. Horne, of Dundee, deals with much tenderness with the popular orthodoxy, even while he entirely disclaims it. His philosophy seems to dream of a latter-day republic wherein the Christian world will make the Sermon on the Mount the code of life, and Christ's spirit and example will superinduce a kingdom of heaven on earth. The preacher's reflections upon the hollowness of much profession of Christianity are often striking; and the moral tendency of his discussions is always admirable. But he does not face the question how the multitude shall be brought to honour Christ when the theory of redemption is exploded, and when the great dogmas of orthodoxy are laid aside. The modern history of his country is not without splendid names which have represented truly Christlike lives; but the secret of the careers of Chalmers, M'Cheyne, and Duff was in their faith in those very things which Mr. Horne numbers among decayed superstitions. A future day will declare whether Rationalism can produce nobler history—personal and social—than the contemned and certainly not faultless theology of the past. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

ART. IV.—*Discourses and Addresses on Religion and Philosophy.* By the Rev. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D. Conference Office. 1880.

BEFORE dealing with the subject suggested by the first part of Dr. Rigg's work, it may be well to give a very brief outline of the scope and method of these *Discourses*. The work is divided, by its author, into four parts,—the first of which alone, as he remarks in his preface, corresponds exactly to the title. It is made up of three addresses on Theism, Pantheism, and other aspects of present unbelief among leaders in Science and Philosophy. The second and third parts of the volume deal with Christian doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, while the fourth discusses the relation of religious belief to national education, and, in particular, the position occupied by Wesleyan Methodism in our educational controversies and conflicts. Reserving the subjects discussed in the first part for later consideration, we may give, in a few sentences, an outline of the main positions of our author. In connection with matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, Dr. Rigg's views are, taken broadly, what may be termed Evangelical. This term is not used in any technical or sectarian sense, but is intended to cover the position held by the teachers in all Churches who regard the New Testament, honestly interpreted, as being the standard of Christian doctrine and practice. He contends earnestly for spiritual life in man as a *present* and *conscious* possession—as an inward power ever asserting itself in victory over sin, and in a growing likeness to Christ, on the part of all in whom it really abides. This life is received through faith, "the vital sensibility and activity of the soul in the process of regeneration;" is nourished by the Word of God, the works of God, and the discipline of life, with the other means of grace. Wherever there is life, a common life in men, they must hold spiritual fellowship with each other, and this fellowship is the germ of the Church (or social) life. The Church is a living organism, self-sustaining in the Divine life, and with gifts Divinely given, by which it builds itself up. Tried by this, or any truly Scriptural and Apostolic standard, Wesleyan Methodism is a *true Church of Christ*,

and its ministry a truly Apostolic agency for the building up of Church life, and the conversion of souls. Dr. Rigg's "Scenes and Studies from the Earlier Ministry of our Lord" are short but suggestive, giving the results of independent thought, and much reverent "searching" of the Scriptures. We would refer especially to his remarks on the early faith of the first disciples,—a faith which, according to our author, is analogous to the trust of children of tender years, who have been brought up in Christian homes, and who learn to love the *Person* long before they can understand the *doctrines* of Christ; to the view he takes of the miracle recorded in the fifth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel; to the "Study" on the "woman that was a sinner," in which there is a very good analysis of Pharisaism, whether ancient or modern, and much insight into the workings of the human heart. There are many other points to which we should have liked to draw attention, but these we must leave to the reader of the *Discourses*. Dr. Rigg has done good service to the cause of Evangelical religion and Christian unity by his views of truth. The more these truly Scriptural ideas of Church life and polity are accepted, the more will the brotherhood of all believers be promoted. Let those who please build up their world-systems and frame their elaborate articles of agreement; for our part, we shall believe that the true and wise seekers after the unity of Christendom are those who, like our author, bring us back to the fundamental conceptions of truth, life, and organisation contained in the New Testament.

And now we come to the real subject before us—a subject suggested by Dr. Rigg's three Discourses on Theism, Pantheism, and the other "isms," so fiercely striving for the mastery. What is the present position of this conflict between faith and unbelief? Is scepticism on the increase amongst us? Is the intelligence of England and of Europe really drifting away from the Gospel of Christ? Must those who claim to have an open eye for all beauty, and a deep reverence for all forms of truth, really confess that the glory is departing from faith? It is difficult for any one to give such an answer to these questions as shall commend itself to the intelligence of others. There are so many standpoints from which the subject may be viewed, and so many conflicting estimates of the actual state of things, that different answers may appear to have

an equal claim to our respect. Dr. Rigg takes a very favourable, not to say an optimistic view; according to him, "At this moment the relations of Christian faith to philosophy and science are better settled, and, at the same time, more satisfactory than for some years past." * His appeal is to the calm judgment of history; to the positive proofs of the existence and "fruitful energy" of Christian faith as proved by its works; to the ethical standards of our time, and to the actual state of our moral life. Such an appeal, supported by such evidence, demands and will receive confidence. Nor do we mean to dispute the case presented; but we shall do well not to underrate the quantity and quality of the unbelief of our time, for, as Dr. Rigg suggests, "false security would be a fatal mistake." Our author reminds us that the sceptics of Bishop Butler's day thought they had put Christianity altogether out of court; that the men of whom Berkeley speaks in his philosophic writings were nearly as advanced as the materialists of our age. This is true and important; it shows how easy it is for those who live, move, and have their being in a movement, to exaggerate its extent and influence. Unquestionably many of our "New Masters" exaggerate the influence of their philosophies and their cold negations. Darwin's works are, after all, read by the few. Mr. Spencer, the apostle of evolution, cannot compete with the latest work of fiction, and Professor Huxley must give place, even in educated circles, to the latest fashion or folly. True also, that "evidential" and "apologetic" literature is demanded by thousands; that there has never been a time when so many really earnest and able works on Biblical interpretation, on spiritual religion and the philosophy of faith, have been issued from the press; that in many quarters there is much noble self-denying zeal for God and truth. All this we thankfully acknowledge; but we shall err grievously, in our judgment, if we think the conflict over, or the verdict already given on the side of faith. From different quarters there come testimonies so uniform and so strong, proofs so clear and so convincing, that it behoves all who have the interests of the Gospel at heart to be watchful and ready for still further strife.

Some years ago, a gifted man wrote a series of articles

* *Discourses*, p. 64.

in one of our leading Reviews, under the title of "Rocks Ahead, or the Warnings of Cassandra."* At that time England was rich and prosperous, and disposed to reject all warnings; hence Mr. Greg's very thoughtful papers received but scant attention. When the days of trial came, men found that Cassandra had been wiser than they, and now there are many who, looking back, see that the "rocks ahead" were real. Mr. Greg's third "rock" was the one with which we are dealing—the alleged divorce between the highest intelligence and religion of the country. According to Mr. Greg, there is such a divorce, not only in England but all over Europe. In Germany, the largest portion of the intelligent classes has changed its ideas about the nature of Christianity; in Italy, men, and even women, scornfully reject the Gospel; in France there is a very large amount of infidelity and religious indifference; in Belgium, the freethinkers have found that *they* cannot resist Ultramontanism, and now they are, we believe, actually encouraging the *old faith;* but here, too, there is a very wide-spread scepticism. At home, according to Mr. Greg, the working classes, the more intelligent of them, are turning their backs on Christianity, and the leaders of thought have already left the old faith. We are bound to give heed to such a warning. Mr. Greg is not a timid Gospeller, but one whose creed must appear to Evangelical Christians meagre and rationalistic enough, and therefore if *he* complains of the want of *faith*, how much more those who demand so much more! Moreover, his estimate is confirmed by other observers. Professor Christlieb, of Bonn, a distinguished apologist, gives quite as gloomy an account of the state of religion in Germany.† Professor Bain, of Aberdeen, himself a leader in philosophical scepticism, tells us that since the suppression of Pagan Philosophy Christianity has never been more attacked than now, and he clearly thinks these attacks are not yet calling forth anything like the ancient vindication from modern Christians.‡ Professor Flint, who has shown himself familiar alike with European philosophy and anti-theistic theories, is a man not likely to be misled in such matters, yet he tells us, in his latest work, that "No man

* See *Contemporary Review*, May, June, and August, 1874.

† See *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, by Theodore Christlieb, D.D. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh.

‡ See *Mind*, for January, 1880, p. 87.

who examines the signs of the times can fail to see much tending to show that Atheism may possibly come to have its day of fatal supremacy. What chiefly threatens us is Atheism in the form of Agnosticism, Positivism, Secularism, Materialism, &c., and it does so *directly* and seriously. The most influential authorities in science and philosophy, and a host of most popular representatives of literature, are strenuously propagating it. It has, in our large centres of population, missionaries who, I fear, are better qualified for their work than many of those whom our Churches send forth to advocate to the same classes the claims of Christianity."* Much the same view is held by Bishop Ellicott, in a recent charge, and in his able introduction to the *New-Testament Commentary*, a work which, by the way, is itself one of the best antidotes to modern scepticism. Professor Wace, in his *Boyle Lectures;* Mr. Row, in his *Bampton Lecture;* Mr. Eustace R. Conder, in his *Congregational Lecture on Theism*, to which Dr. Rigg professes his obligation; Canon Farrar, Mr. Ed. White, in his *Life in Christ*, and a host of able writers, all take the same side. Without being in any sense alarmists, for no true believer in the Divine origin and authority of Christianity need feel alarmed, or even uncertain as to the issue, all these, and many other authorities, assure us that unbelief is a present and a powerful influence in the land, and that there is much need for watchfulness and readiness for conflict. Mr. Holt Hutton, in the second edition of his *Theological Essays*, speaks of the growth of scepticism among the leaders of thought, and although he believes that this is a "temporary result of some wider and larger change in the intellectual tendencies of the day," yet he thinks that the "temper of English thought," so far as there has been change, during the time between the first and second editions of his work, has changed rather in the "direction of shaking men's faith in the deepest assumptions both of the theistic and Christian creed."†

We are sometimes told that numbers do not mean influence, and that it is folly to take mere loudness of voice for intensity of conviction. This is true and just; yet we must not allow ourselves to be blind to what is going on before our eyes. Up to the present time, it cannot be said that

* *Anti-theistic Theories*, pp. 37, 38.

† *Essays Theological and Literary*, Vol. I. Introduction, p. viii. The whole volume will amply repay thoughtful perusal.

unbelief has had the greatest men, either in science or philosophy, on its side. Professor Tait of Edinburgh, himself a son of science, and no mean defender of the faith, reminds loud-speaking advocates of infidelity, when they claim to speak in the name of science, that there is no truth known to science of which Newton, Faraday, Clerk-Maxwell, Joule, and Thomson are ignorant.* All these truly scientific men have "bent their spacious brows" in reverence before the Gospel. It is much to be feared, however, that the next generation may not be able to boast such splendid names. In our day many distinguished discoverers and expounders are offering worship of the "silent sort" at the altars of the Unknown and Unknowable, and loudly proclaiming that man neither does, nor can, know anything about the Power behind all phenomena.

We are also reminded that the unbelief of our time is no longer the mocking scepticism of former days, nor the Atheism which says "No God," because it would escape from the restraints of morality. This is true, and for this we may be devoutly thankful. It is proof that the *moral* argument has triumphed, and that the conscience of man is more alive than before. The eloquent Lecky lingers with evident delight over the first centuries of Christianity, and reverences the power that made the believers of that age so spiritually strong: he gives an estimate of the life and work of Wesley that speaks well for his judgment and spiritual insight.† The author of *Supernatural Religion* closes his last volume with the comforting reflection that although the supernatural has melted away in the crucible of modern criticism, there remains still the *character of Christ!* Truly an important admission this; showing that not only Roman soldiers, governors, and the philosophers of Pagan days, but even men of our age, children of modern enlightenment, must confess that "never man spake like this Man," and that His name is still "above every name." All this, however gratifying, must not blind us to the fact that these worshippers are yet in some things far from the kingdom of God. They erect new altars for worship, new standards of morals, and they undermine all our faith in the reality of that

* See *Flint's Anti-theistic Theories*, Appendix, p. 485.

† See Lecky's *History of European Morals*; also his *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. II.

which they profess to admire; reality we mean in any substantial and *objective* sense of the term. The great father of the critical philosophy left to his disciples, morally at least, the ideas of God, freedom, and immortality;* but these men offer us a religion within us which has no relation to a Being without us, a *freedom* which is meaningless, and which they confess to be but an illusion, and an immortality which is simply—whatever truth we may have spoken and whatever good we may have done. If modern unbelief had more of the tones of Mephistopheles,† and less of the solemnity and unction of the prophet, we should better understand its real character.

We have, in the latest work of Mr. Herbert Spencer, a striking illustration of the march of intellect in a certain direction. In 1850, Mr. Spencer published his *Social Statics;* in 1879, his *Data of Ethics.* In the former work there is a chapter on "The Divine Idea and the Conditions of its Realisation." On one page of the work may be found several references to "the Deity," "the Divine will," the "Divine side" of the truth, as contrasted with the human side, &c. We shall look in vain for such ideas or such expressions in his last work. The Deity has become the Inscrutable, the Unknown, or Unknowable Power, of which all we know are but the fainter or more vivid manifestations; the Divine will is now represented by the registered experiences of the race, viewed as an objective law for the individual.

This, it may be urged, only shows that thought is more definite, and that the ideas before implicitly held, are now explicitly and articulately expressed. Be it so; it shows, also, that a change has passed over the language of our time, and that influences are now at work undermining the faith of the Church of Christ.

These changes are chiefly felt by the leaders of thought, and as yet only by a certain portion of these; and this is one of the dangers before us, "the rocks ahead." A large number of the best intellects, perhaps, of the Church of Christ have "fought their doubts and gathered strength," have been by the struggle led into a purer atmosphere and a steadier light, and can now afford to watch without

---

* See Caird's discussion of the Kantian Theology, *Critical Account of Kant's Philosophy*, chap. xviii.

† "I am the spirit that evermore denies."—*Faust.*

alarm, and with deepest pity, the efforts of intellectual heroes to destroy that of which they, alas, know nothing. This is true, as yet, *only of the few*. A large number of popular leaders and teachers, if we may judge from their utterances, have not yet begun to realise that there is any conflict or any real difficulty.*

Meanwhile, the thought, the popular thought, is being leavened by the new theories, and writers in our newspapers, in popular magazines, as well as in the higher reviews, are speaking the language of this new philosophy.

Let any one critically put this to the test, and it will, we believe, be found that, unconsciously perhaps, yet none the less really, most of our younger writers speak in the language of the Evolutionists.

Nor are there wanting other signs of the growth of a spirit of unbelief. It is said that 90 per cent. of the working classes have no connection at all with the Church of Christ—no outward relation to any denomination. Even if we consider this an exaggerated estimate, we must all admit that an enormous number never enter any place of worship; and we believe the same may be said of other classes as well. Take along with this the low political morality,—too painfully manifest in many parts of the country,—the absence of a high moral standard among the leaders of different parties in the State, and the presence of gross abuses among their followers; add to this the commercial morals,† bewailed by honourable men in all quarters, and it must be confessed that unbelief, both intellectual and practical,—and the one is never long without the other in any country,—is, alas, too powerful. Whether, as Professor Flint suggests, Atheism may have its day of supremacy or not, we must admit that at present it exercises a most baneful influence on Christian thought and work. We live, move, and have our being in an atmosphere charged with most subtle doubt, an atmosphere most unfavourable to heroic faith and high Christian life.

A distinguished statesman‡ recently advised the young theologians of Glasgow University to adopt a more critical method towards unbelief; to ask it, in short, what answers it had to give to man's deepest questions. Most

* That there are difficulties, see Rigg's *Discourses*, pp. 32, 33, 34.
† See "The Morals of Trade." Spencer's *Essays*, Vol. II.
‡ The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, in his address as Lord Rector.

wise and most valuable advice. There are many difficulties in connection with the Christian theory of life, but, as Canon Westcott reminds us,* Christianity did not *create* these difficulties. Granted at once that Christian Theism does not solve all our problems, we gain nothing by its rejection; nay more, if, as Theists, we have terrible enigmas, as Agnostics we have all those enigmas, and another which is ten thousand times more enigmatic than all the rest.

Dr. Rigg speaks of our "common foe, the terrible blight of Agnostic unbelief," now so popular in so many quarters. Atheism, pure and simple, will never be a very popular creed, for most men dare not live under its insolent shadow; pure Theism has no attractions for thinkers who are disposed to reject Christianity, for with it they have most of the fundamental difficulties of Christianity, without the help which comes from the character, teaching, and resurrection of Christ.† Pantheism, with its personifications, seems to us, as it appears to Dr. Rigg, to be simply Atheism in another guise; as for the "religion of humanity"—despite the attractions it possessed for the late Mr. Mill, and notwithstanding the earnestness of some of its modern apostles—we cannot believe that it will commend itself to the minds of a race so practical and realistic as our own. Much of its influence will be found, on analysis, to be due to the language used by its votaries, and misunderstood by many who listen to them. A simple-minded Christian might easily mistake its immortality for the ideal of the Christian heaven;‡ and this being so, there is doubtless an undercurrent of sympathy and influence hardly understood, connecting the thought, so expressed, with the life of those who have been trained under Christian influences (as all in this country have been more or less), and thus unconsciously to themselves leading many to accept this doctrine. Be this as it may, Christianity has nothing to fear from Positivism on its religious side. Whatever of truth there is in this system is already embodied in the Gospel, and if we are to yield ourselves up to the inspiration of a noble life, surely,

---

* *The Gospel of the Resurrection*. p. 14. Second Edition.

† "Pure Theism is unable to form a living religion," Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 9. See also Flint's *Theism*, Sect. X.

‡ As for example, George Eliot's lines commencing thus, "O may I join the choir invisible," &c.

sceptics being witnesses, the life of Jesus is the true ideal for man. Even Mr. Mill is obliged to confess that the highest ideal a modern can form of the true and the good is best realised by living so that Christ would approve.* The best, and indeed the only effective, answer to the arguments of those who commend to us the "religion of Humanity," is to remind them that Christ is the author and finisher of their faith, so far as it is true; to show them in our daily life and thought, and in our relations to mankind, the spirit of Jesus.

It is not so easy a matter to dispose of Agnosticism, the great anti-theistic creed of our age. It comes to us fortified with so many admissions of Christian philosophers, and armed at so many points with the facts of consciousness, and the apparent authority of science, that we find it hard to meet.

The critical method may help us here, and this weapon is being most skilfully employed by many distinguished Christian thinkers and apologists. The Agnostic appears at times bold as a very giant, at other times he speaks with accents of the deepest humility, and appeals to us in the name of reverence for the Unknown Power. To refute him we must undermine his whole theory of knowledge, and show that if his premises are correct, universal scepticism is the only conclusion. Mr. Spencer blankly tells us that *Theism* is unthinkable, and that the human mind cannot even think out, not to say rationally accept, this theory. But he himself would seek the reconciliation of science and religion in the recognition of a *Power* behind all phenomena, and of which all forces, motions, persons, and acts are but the multiform manifestation. He grants to us no knowledge of what this Power is, of its essential attributes or character. He can, or thinks he can, easily prove that all attempts to dogmatise about this high theme, or to assert that the Power is this or that, are equally foolish and futile. He denies that *personality* can be predicated of this Power, and thinks its mode of existence may be as far *above* what we call personality, as personality is above some of the very lowest forms of sentient life. In spite of all this, Mr. Spencer insists that there *is such a Power*, although who or what we must not say. He can even speak of *higher* and *lower* conceptions of

* Mill's *Three Essays on Religion*, p. 255.

this Power. But these terms are of course relative, and are ultimately measured by our own nature, and its relations to other sentient life. No Theist pretends to understand all that may be involved in his Theism. Grant him a *knowledge* of a Power behind all, and in some true sense the *cause* of all, and it follows that personality in some sense must be predicated of that Power.* Mr. Spencer and others, Christians like Mansel and Hamilton not excepted, surely make too much of what they call the relativity of knowledge. As Mr. Conder well remarks,† knowledge out of all relation to a knowing mind would be no knowledge, and the *thing in itself* we must really regard as the fetish of Agnostics and other philosophers.

No Christian Theist denies the relativity of knowledge; no Christian claims to know God fully—but all Christians do claim to have a knowledge of God, feeble and imperfect, no doubt, but still, so far as it goes, worthy of the name. If the premises of the Agnostic are accepted, we do not see how man is ever to get *beyond himself*, or indeed how he is to arrive at a *consciousness of his own existence*. As Berkeley long ago pointed out, we may be said to know God, just as really as we know our fellow man.‡ But this aspect of Agnosticism we may well leave, on the one hand to practised metaphysicans, and on the other to the common sense and healthy instincts of mankind. As a matter of fact a knowledge of God does exist and can be thought. Physicists tell us there is something called *energy*, as real and as *objective* as matter, not seen indeed in itself, but known by and in its effects. They define it "the power of doing work." The knowledge of God is a living, real and *energetic* knowledge. It has *done work* in the human mind and in human life. Some of the grandest and greatest poets, philosophers, thinkers, and workers in the world, have found this to be the most real and the most powerful of all energies within them, and by means of its inspiration they have been great, and done great things in the world. As

* Personality is the *highest* type of life of which man has any knowledge. How then can he help attributing the highest rather than the lowest attribute to the Power of which this Personality must be a manifestation? See Martineau's most able articles in the *Contemporary Review*, February and March, 1876.

† See Conder's *Basis of Faith*, chap. iv.; a chapter which has not received the attention it merits from philosophers.

‡ See Berkeley's *Divine Visual Language*, Fraser's *Berkeley*, p. 199, *et seq.* See also Fairbairn's *Studies*, "Theism and Scientific Speculation," p. 103.

Professor Blackie reminds the sceptic, "all the great originators of philosophic schools and the founders of our Churches have been Theists—Moses, David, and Solomon; Pythagoras and Anaxagoras; Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno; St. Paul and St. Peter; Mahomet, St. Bernard, Thomas Aquinas, Dante, Kepler, Copernicus, Shakespeare, Luther, Spinoza, Bacon, Leibnitz, Newton, Locke, Des Cartes, Kant, Hegel. Against such an array of great witnesses of sound human reason, it is only the narrowness of local conceit, or the madness of partisanship, that could plant such names as David Hume (if David Hume did indeed believe in his own bepuzzlements), Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill."*

Tell us that Theism is unthinkable: whence then the moral energy the thought of God gave to these and other great men? On the principle that *ex nihilo nihil fit*, we must admit its thinkableness.

Leaving metaphysics, the Agnostic comes to us armed with the discoveries of modern science, and as the expounder of what is called "evolution." He ridicules the idea of design. Paley and his watch no longer have any place in his theory of life. The universe has not been created by a manlike Artificer, it has come to be what it is by evolution. Names are not things, and therefore we must not let the Agnostic impose upon us by mere tricks of language. Dr. Rigg, like other wise Christian thinkers of our time, does not deny "evolution," nor does he seek a cheap popularity by declamation against Darwin and the Darwinian theory. Whatever may ultimately be thought of the theories of "evolution," the "survival of the fittest," and the like, Christians do well not to take sides violently in this controversy. As Dr. Fairbairn has well shown, the popular theory of creation is itself a creation of science, not the offspring of Divine revelation.† As Mr. Row remarks in his Bampton Lecture, the Hebrew idea of God's relation to the universe is not that of watchmaker to the watch at all.‡ The "design argument" is in no way bound up with any *particular theory* of the origin of things, and Christianity

---

* *Natural History of Atheism*, by Professor J. S. Blackie. Daldy, Isbister and Co.

† See Fairbairn's *Studies*, &c. "Theism and Scientific Speculation."

‡ *Bampton Lecture*, p. 464, note. See also Fairbairn's *Studies*, &c., p. 78. "Hebrew Monotheism did not know, therefore did not spring out of the notion of creation by 'the technic' of a manlike artificer."

can therefore well afford to leave physicists and metaphysicians to settle such matters. At one time it was thought that the inspiration of the Bible and the truth of Christianity were bound up with a certain theory of astronomy. Theologians contended, as for dear life, for the notion that the earth is a kind of flat box, and, no doubt, the folly of their reasonings had much to do with the rejection of the Gospel by the scientists of that age. In our own day there were men bold enough to argue against the introduction of chloroform in medicine on the ground of certain verses in the Book of Genesis, and it was only when Sir J. Y. Simpson ridiculed their arguments that they saw their absurdity.* In the face of all these lessons, surely we may say, in vain is the net of the evolutionists spread in the sight of any theologian. Darwin himself, if judged by his words in the *Origin of Species*, and *Descent of Man*, must be regarded as a Theist. His theory of life has done much, no doubt, to undermine Theism, but *theistic* nevertheless his conception of things must be regarded. Mr. Spencer is a determined anti-Theist, but this is because he pushes evolution into regions which Darwin has left unexplored. The great naturalist, at whose feet in matters belonging to natural history Dr. Rigg is willing to sit,† whose candour and whose truth-loving spirit and evident willingness to be corrected may well be imitated by Christian apologists, starts with one or more germs of life, with God, matter, and certain laws impressed by the Creator upon matter, and from this point, and after having posited germs, power, and laws, seeks to show how all things came to be what and as they are. Whether Darwin has succeeded or failed, let us be just to him; this surely is the dictate of that Christianity which we seek to spread in the world.

As to the evolution hypothesis itself, it becomes us to speak moderately. One form of it, as Mr. Conder, Dr. Rigg, and others admit, is quite consistent with Theism.‡ Darwin's evolution, whether true or false, is simply the *process*, so to say, of creation. Natural selection, says Dr. Rigg, "is but a name and not a power. It describes the

* See *Warfare of Science*, by White, King and Co. Sir J. Simpson reminded the divines of the "deep sleep" that God caused to fall upon Adam!!

† *Discourses*, p. 50.

‡ See *Basis of Faith*, Lecture V.; Row's *Bampton Lecture*, p. 462, note; Flint's *Theism*; Janet's *Final Causes* (T. and T. Clark, trans.); also Fairbairn's *Studies*, &c.

order and mode according to which Providence works; it is not itself a force—a working energy."* "PROCESS," says Mr. Conder, "is not CAUSE; evolution, supposing it to give a true history of the process, sheds no ray of light on the cause, even in the scientific sense of the word 'cause;' *g.d.*, the existence of the earliest antecedent in the whole series. . . . The final statement of this theory, to which Mr. Spencer conducts his readers as the crowning summit of philosophy, —its highest achievement in the work of unifying knowledge, is nothing but a wide verbal generalisation, containing no idea, explaining no mystery, and supplying no fruitful principle from which to reason."†

According to the subtle and learned Janet, "the hypothesis of evolution may lead in effect to a conception of *finality* which only differs from that commonly formed by being grander."‡ This was also the view of the late Canon Kingsley.

Huxley affirms that the evolution theory has been made good, but in this affirmation he cannot count on the support of all competent men of science.§ If, however, all evolution is but *process*, theologians need not much trouble themselves, and if it is other and more than *process*, it is neither proved, nor indeed can it be proved.

Professor Stanley Jevons may be regarded as to some extent an evolutionist, yet he frankly admits that the doctrine of evolution gives "a complete explanation of no single living form. . . . The origin of everything that exists is wrapped up in the past history of the universe. At some one or more points in past time there must have been *arbitrary determinations* which led to the production of things as they are." Again, he "cannot for a moment admit that the theory of evolution will alter our theological views." He believes "that the eye of man manifests design," that it "has gradually developed, . . . but that the ultimate result must have been contained in the aggregate of the causes, and these causes, so far as we can see, were subject to the arbitrary choice of the Creator."‖

---

* *Discourses*, p. 51.

† *Basis of Faith*, p. 448, &c.

‡ "Final Causes." "Evolution." See *Origin of Species*, p. 422, Sixth Edition; also *Life of C. Kingsley*, Vol. II. p. 171. 247, &c.

§ See *American Addresses*; also article "Evolution" in the New Edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica*, by Huxley. But see Mr. Sully's portion of same article.

‖ *Principles of Science*, Vol. II. (conclusion).

The authors of *The Unseen Universe*, distinguished men of science, and holding moreover that it is our duty to try to account for all we see, and to push the unknown as far back as possible, discuss the theory of development, and their conclusion is that "scientifically it cannot be said to do away with the idea of a Final-Cause. It may, perhaps, eventually be possible by means of an hypothesis of evolution to account for the great variety of living forms, on the supposition of a single primordial germ to begin with; but the difficulty still remains how to account for the germ."* And this surely is the "rock ahead" on which all evolutionists must make shipwreck unless they admit the essential principle of Theism. Whence this germ or cell? Whence its promise and potency?

Dr. Rigg reminds us that between the protoplasm of the dog, the chick, and the man, no practised physiologist can detect any difference,† yet each is evolved after its kind; each one must therefore have either within it or without it that *which accounts for the form, shape, and character* it ultimately assumes. *Behind* or *within* the primary cell, there must be some power controlling and guiding its evolution, selecting its conditions, and determining the ultimate result. Are we not driven, with the authors of *The Unseen Universe* to affirm "not an under-life resident in the atom, but rather to adopt the words of a recent writer, a Divine over-life in which we live, move and have our being?"‡

Thus we find that the ablest and sincerest scientific thinkers of our time agree with simple men and women in repudiating the idea that the history (even if accurate, which is disputed) of a process can ever be regarded as the explanation and ultimate theory of its origin and meaning. By the very construction of our minds, as Mr. Martineau has most conclusively shown, we must go beyond the event and the process to its origin and efficient cause.§

---

* *The Unseen Universe*, by Professors Stewart and Tait. Macmillan and Co.

† *Discourses*, pp. 48-9. See also *As Regards Protoplasm*, by Hutchison Stirling, author of *Secret of Hegel*, &c., a most crushing reply to Huxley's *Physical Basis of Life*, full of subtle reasoning, and giving a splendid defence of DESIGN.

‡ *The Unseen Universe*.

§ See Martineau's *Modern Materialism*. Even Darwin himself (see *Descent of Man*, p. 613, Second Edition), speaks of the "grand sequence of events, which our minds refuse to accept as the result of blind chance. The understanding revolts at such a conclusion," &c.

Even within the area of physical science the evolutionists will not long hold absolute sway; how much more when they attempt to explain the origin and evolution of man's moral and spiritual nature. Spencer's "Data of Ethics," and his "Sociology," will not add much to his philosophic reputation. His theory of the origin of man's religious beliefs will not bear serious examination, and his "conscience" lacks all that enables conscience to assert its sway and to make "cowards of us all." Dr. Rigg hints, more than once, that Spencer's day is over, and that more highly trained intellects will not be fascinated as have been their less favoured ancestors. We believe there is truth in this view. Mr. Spencer's splendid audacity of generalisation, and his richness of scientific illustration and knowledge, must not longer conceal from us the fact, that these high-sounding phrases do not explain everything. The modern method,—its physiological approach to mental and moral philosophy,—after all, is not itself a philosophy of life. Some of the development theories of morals and religion are about as philosophic as was the boy's resolution not any longer to care for his mother's weeping, because Faraday had explained the chemical composition of a tear! Suppose we could measure the rate of transmission of nerve-force, or explain the physical concomitants of moral feeling, do we thereby get any nearer the thought expressed, or the mysterious connection between matter and mind?* Darwin tries indeed to show that morality, &c., in a kind of rudimentary state, exists among lower animals, but he admits that without positive teaching man would never have learned to forgive an enemy.† He speaks too of the influence, in these higher regions, of the love and fear of God, and of the "ennobling" belief in a God loving righteousness and hating evil. To Atheism, Pantheism, and Agnosticism *good* and *evil* must ever be words empty of all their real meaning—their meaning, that is, as attested by universal language. The primary cell or germ of the moral sense must perplex the evolutionist quite as much as the primordial atom, with its latent powers and tendencies. Carlyle tells us that Frederick the Great could never believe in the Atheist's creed. "To him as to all of us, it was flatly inconceivable that intellect and moral emotion could have

*, See Calderwood's *Mind and Brain* for an estimate of the worth of the new methods.

† *Descent of Man*, p. 113, note.

been put into him by an *Entity*, that had none of its own!"* Mazzini looks upon the denial of God as a kind of mental disease or moral defect, and this, we believe, will yet be the verdict of science, truly so called. Our "new masters" explain our moral terms by first emptying them of their contents, and the real "Data of Ethics" they relegate to the region of the unreal or the unknowable!

We have spoken of the ethics of Evolution, but a still greater problem confronts the evolutionist. How will he account for the transcendent power and the *original* position occupied in history by Jesus the Christ? Some of our leading evolutionists ignore this problem altogether, but certainly this is not a scientific method of treatment. Mr. Mill has tried to deal with it, and neither his friends nor his foes consider that his reputation has gained by the effort.† His methods of criticism are as arbitrary as are those of the most bigoted sectarian. He ridicules the idea of the reporters misreporting Christ's teaching. *He was far too much above them for that.* He regards the actual life of Jesus as higher than the highest ideal that even nineteenth-century men can form of what life should be, and yet he will not worship Christ, nor will he allow that we have proper testimony to the supernatural. Mr. Mill has said too much or too little. He has not gone to the bottom of his subject, as was his wont in other matters of historical or moral interest. What of the Resurrection of Jesus? An historical fact as fully attested as any within the range of ancient history.‡ How are we to account for such a Being appearing at such a time, and under such conditions, among a people certainly not the possessors of *universal* excellence? The evolutionist, above all others, professes to *account* for what we see and know. How does he leave this *character* unaccounted for? More and more, Christians must take their stand here, and justify the whole facts of the spiritual life, and explain all that is peculiar in spiritual history from this centre. This is the strong argument of Mr. Row, in his very able and suggestive Bampton Lecture. Here we are on firm ground, and if only we know how to use our

* See Cook's *Monday Lecture*, Part VII. p. 168. If the reader can forget the mannerisms of Mr. Cook he will find very able criticisms at times, and definitions that will really help the understanding.

† *Essays on Religion.*

‡ Cook's *Monday Lecture*, Part VI., "The Spiritual Body." See Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 133. Also an article by Westcott, on "Critical Scepticism," in *Expositor*, March, 1875.

weapons, no assault of unbelief can ever touch this, the real stronghold of spiritual and revealed religion. The apologist will do well to begin here, and, working from this, to explain alike the past, the present, and the future of Christianity.

Agnostics like Spencer look forward with something like jubilation to the future; they speak in tones of triumph and hope, that are utterly unjustifiable if we read life's meaning from their standpoint. Indeed, as every one must surely see, Theism, and above all Christian Theism, alone has any right to be hopeful. Not that Theism solves all man's deep problems, or relieves him from the burdens of life. But Theism teaches us to believe in the *Omnipotence of truth and goodness*. It leads us to see *moral discipline* in what to an Agnostic can only mean physical pain, or intolerable evil, and it, especially under its Christian aspects, leads us to see how, to the good, all life's evils may prove helps rather than hindrances. It is quite true that Christianity does not remove all mystery, but it teaches us our ignorance and enables us to trust our life and our future in the hands, not of an inscrutable power, but of the God and Father of Jesus Christ. The Agnostic preaches humility, but how different is his lowliness of mind from the spirit of Jesus! "Let us be humble, for we and all things are but atoms and forces at the command of a Power of which all that is known is that nothing can be known." "Let us be humble, says the Christian, because we and all things are in the hands and under the control of a Power whose highest manifestation is Jesus Christ, a Power *known* as infinite wisdom and eternal love." Professor Jevons reminds us that, since we "cannot succeed in avoiding contradiction in our notions of elementary geometry, how can we expect that the ultimate purposes of existence shall present themselves to us with perfect clearness? I can see nothing to forbid the notion that in a higher state of intelligence much that is now obscure may become clear.... Let us," he concludes, "be faithful to our scientific method, and investigate also *those instincts of the human mind, by which man is led to work as if the approval of a Higher Being were the aim of life.*"*

We started with the warning that, for the Christian faith, perilous times may yet be in store. It will be seen from the view taken of the forces and agencies working against

* Closing] words of his *Principles of Science*. See also similar idea in *Unseen Universe*.

us, that we have no fear of the result. Those who believe honestly and earnestly in the Divine authority of Christ's Word know that alarm is irrational. If we believe in the Revelation of Truth there given to us, we can possess our souls with patience, and find our strength in "quietness and confidence." At the same time we know the danger to many from these storms, and therefore we ought to prepare our young men and women for the conflict. Fortunately the materials for such a preparation have never been so plentiful. From the religious press work after work is being issued, adapted to all classes, all ages, and all stages of culture. The best preparation will be to teach them the Holy Scriptures; not merely to reverence these as an august authority, but, above all, to understand them as a living record of Divine revelation and as a true lamp to their feet and light upon their path. There is a latent suspicion, pretty widespread we fear, that believers in revelation are, after all, afraid of the results of a fair fight with history and science and logical methods. Let us disabuse all of this fear by greater boldness and outspokenness, and by a greater readiness to meet all honest doubts, not with the voice of authority, but the wise and sympathetic help that comes from real knowledge. Nor must we give way to the narrow and ignorant prejudice that all the age needs is the simple proclamation of the simple story of the cross. This it does need, and thousands of earnest souls are meeting the want. It needs this and more. Dr. Rigg, in the *Discourses* to which we have called attention, well shows how Berkeley, Butler, Paley, Wesley, and Whitefield all worked together to destroy the proud unbelief of the last century. This must be so again if we are in our day, and according to the gifts given to us, to do their work. There must be adaptation of means to end if we are to expect success. If we believe that the Gospel of Christ is not only the power of God, but also the *philosophy* of God, let us say so, confronting the scientific Atheism as well as the moral depravity of our time, and applying to each the appropriate remedy; we must, by tongue and pen, by press and platform, meet this need of the age, and show that Christianity is no cunningly devised myth, but a sober history of high spiritual manifestations. We must assert more and more that man has a spiritual nature, and that nothing can satisfy its wants but the truth and life revealed in Jesus Christ. "We refuse to accept the offer of a scientific solution of the great problem of

man's life because that problem does not lie within the domain of science, but belongs to a higher region, and is to be dealt with in the exercise of a capacity of our being higher than that which science engages. . . . There is but one path to God. Jesus says, 'I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me.'" *

Nor are there wanting hopeful signs in connection with even the negations of our anti-theistic thinkers. They are admitting the moral argument, as we have seen. They are not able to get rid of the character of Christ, nor can they explain His unique position in history. They are ever complaining of the want of Christlike devotion to humanity, and in consequence are offering us a "religion of humanity." Surely we shall not be vanquished on this ground. If the soul of man can be stirred to its depths by any emotion, that emotion is the love of Christ; if the fountain of the great deep of man's life can be broken up by any power, that power is the power of Christ; if holiness—not in any mere ascetic sense, but as the very health and purity of the soul—can be secured by any means at the command of man, the Church has the secret, and may bring about the result; if the service of humanity can be linked with man's dearest hopes and made part of his highest earthly joy, then Christ alone can enable us to minister fully to the wants and woes and necessities of men. This then is our hope: we must go back to the first ideal that appeals so powerfully to the imagination of Lecky; we must somehow show to the sceptics of our time that the Gospel still works its ancient wonders, inspires men with its old enthusiasm, and purifies life with the purity they profess to respect in its early ages.

It is but a simple act of justice to say, in conclusion, that if all believers, preachers, and apologists were to imitate the method and spirit of Dr. Rigg's *Discourses and Studies*, they would deserve, and probably receive, the respect of the intellectual unbelief which writes and speaks at times so scornfully of our apologetic science.

"God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and steady hands."

---

* *Thoughts on Revelation, with Special Reference to the Present Time*, by J. McLeod Campbell, D.D., p. 141. A most thoughtful, spiritual, and therefore helpful book. See also *Reason and Revelation*, by W. Horne, M.A. King and Co. A very suggestive work for *discriminating* readers.

ART. V.—1. *The Life of Goethe.* By S. H. LEWES. Revised according to the Latest Document, 1875. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

2. *Goethe.* By A. HAYWARD. (A Biographical Sketch.) In the "Foreign Classics for English Readers" Series. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and Sons.

THE appearance of such works as Mr. Hayward's *Goethe* in the series of *Foreign Classics for English Readers*, edited by Mrs. Oliphant, undoubtedly proves that the intellectual horizon of the general reader has widened considerably of late. It does not, therefore, follow that there is amongst us more real appreciation of art, more of liberal sympathy with diverse styles of art and casts of genius, than there used to be. Intellectual restlessness may grow at the expense of intellectual strength. Knowledge about poets, about philosophers, about artists, is not the same thing as knowledge of poetry, philosophy, art. Mr. Hayward has not attempted a critical study of his author's genius; he has endeavoured to put together, as concisely as might be, such facts, biographical and bibliographical, relating to Goethe, as are likely to be of most interest to a reader either altogether unacquainted with him, or acquainted with him only as he appears through the medium of a translation.

In this task he must be held to have succeeded. He has produced a work which is popular without being sketchy, learned without being dull. Towards the end of the book, however, there is a chapter on *Faust* which would far better have been omitted. The greater part consists of quotations from the author's prose translation of the poem, interspersed with criticism of the most uncritical sort. Take, *e.g.*, such sentences as these. "The concluding scene, 'The Dungeon,' is quite perfect in its way. Nothing can go beyond it in pathos and truth to nature. Ophelia alone can compare with Gretchen in her last hour of trial."

It may be presumed that all comparison implies some similarity in the things compared. But what similarity is

there to form a basis of comparison between the case of Ophelia and the case of Margaret? On the contrary, in point alike of character and circumstance, what contrast could be more complete? Ophelia's character has been described by Goethe in memorable words: "Ihr ganzes Wesen schwebt in reifer süsser Sinnlichkeit."* Ophelia is chiefly distinguished by a peculiar sweetness and tenderness of disposition. In her are no great possibilities either of the saint or of the sinner. Margaret, on the other hand, is a highly complex character, by no means intelligible to one who reads and runs. Mr. Lewes (*Life of Goethe*) refers to Margaret as "the German ideal of female loveliness and simplicity." Elsewhere Mr. Lewes says of Margaret, "Shakespeare himself has drawn no such portrait as that of Margaret, no such peculiar union of passion, simplicity, loveliness, and witchery." This word simplicity is hard to understand as applied to Margaret. For simplicity, in the ordinary sense of the term, Margaret is assuredly nowise pre-eminent. Considering her age, she displays quite as much vanity, archness, and coquetry as might reasonably be expected of her. Though she repels Faust's first advances with a brusqueness which is quite as piquant as her look of modesty and virtue, yet in the very next scene she is discovered musing who might have been the gentleman that accosted her as she left the cathedral.

> "I'd something give, could I but say
> Who was that gentleman to-day.
> Surely a gallant man was he,
> And of a noble family;
> So much could I in his face behold,—
> And he wouldn't else have been so bold."

The attention she resented at the time, is not without its flattering unction in the after-thought. In this frame of mind she is not disposed to treat with cold indifference the tokens of regard which Faust soon afterwards leaves in her room, and the meeting in the garden follows as a matter of course. In that interview, Margaret displays the most perfect mastery of the delicate art of coquetry. By the prettiest affectation of inability to understand what Faust can see to charm him in one so lowly as herself, she

---

* *Wilhelm Meister*, Book IV. cap. 14.

affords him the opportunity for which he is in wait, to make and to state with his lips a passionate declaration of love. By the naïve story of the monotonous course of her life at home with her too exacting mother, she excites in Faust, at once, sympathy and admiration.

"*Mar.*—Think but a moment's space on me!
To think on you, I have all times and places.
Faust.—No doubt you're much alone?
Mar.—Yes; for our household small has grown,
Yet must be cared for, you will own.
We have no maid: I do the knitting, sewing, sweeping,
The cooking, early work and late in fact;
And mother in her notions of housekeeping
Is so exact."

And what a sweet cunning does not Margaret show in the plucking of that flower, and in the pulling of it to pieces leaf by leaf, with the alternate whisper, "He loves me," "He loves me not," until with the last leaf she pauses on the "He loves me."

Margaret is by no means so simple a child as some of her sympathising friends and admirers would fain make her out to be. In another respect Mr. Lewes fails to do justice to Margaret's character. He entirely ignores the deep spirituality which is the basis of it. "It is love alone," he says, "which raises her above her lowly station, and it is only in passion that she is so exalted." Doubtless all passionate love, even though lavished on the least worthy object, is of itself an exaltation of the nature. The all-absorbing passion which can deny Faust nothing may be sublime in its intensity; but is it quite true that it is only in that passion that Margaret is exalted? We think not. Margaret is emphatically the *schöne seele*. Such Mephistopheles pronounces her to be upon her first appearance on the scene. As such she reveals herself in the summer-house scene, where she questions Faust as to his faith in God. And the same trait is brought out as the action advances, in even clearer and stronger relief against the dark background of sin and woe by those memorable scenes at the shrine of the Mater Dolorosa, in the cathedral, and in the dungeon. It is in virtue of this spirituality of nature alone that Margaret is a meet subject of the highest tragedy. Were she merely the simple and passionate girl who falls a victim to the lust of

the human animal, she would be in all truth a tragic character enough, but by no means the unutterably tragic character that she in fact is. Without her religious depth Margaret would have been as nearly as possible a German Hetty Sorel, and Hetty Sorel lacks that elevation of character which the highest tragedy demands in its heroes and heroines.

There is no character in Shakespeare that can be compared with Margaret, least of all Ophelia. The pathos of Ophelia's fate is—like Ophelia herself—simple, gentle, tender. Innocent of all guile, she perishes through no fault of her own, unless it be a fault to have "loved not wisely, but too well." Severed by the impregnable walls of untoward circumstance from the object of her love, she falls into the sweetest of madnesses, and dies the least terrible of deaths. What a contrast to the scene in the dungeon. What an infinite distance between the childlike innocence of Ophelia's gentle melancholy, and the stifling sense of guilt and shame that sobs through every convulsive utterance of Margaret's heavily-laden soul.

Yet Mr. Hayward says in his robust way, "Ophelia alone can compare with Gretchen in her last hour of trial." Surely there is some difference between compassionate sympathy with a guilty soul racked by remorse and tender regret for innocence and beauty untimely cut off. For final verdict on the poem, Mr. Hayward is content to refer his readers to Coleridge. He says on p. 204: "The habit, perhaps inevitable, of receiving the first impressions of a drama or dramatic poem from the plot, is particularly unfavourable to *Faust*, for the scenes hang loosely together, and unity of action is altogether wanting. As regards the main defect, it would be difficult to dispute the matured judgment of Coleridge; speaking of the poem in 1833:

"'There is neither causation nor progression in the Faust: he is a ready-made conjuror from the very beginning. The *incredulus odi* is felt from the first line. The sensuality and the thirst after knowledge are unconnected with each other. Mephistopheles and Margaret are excellent, but Faust himself is dull and meaningless. The scene in Auerbach's cellar is one of the best, perhaps the very best; that on the Brocken is also very fine, and all the songs are beautiful. But there is no whole in the poem; the scenes are mere magic-lantern pictures; and a large part of the work is to me very flat. The German is very pure and fine.'"

Though Coleridge's reputation for critical judgment is by no means to-day what it was fifty years ago, it is still, probably, greater than it deserves to be. The qualities most essential to a critic, catholicity, patience, self-control, Coleridge did not possess. Unable to subdue his own eccentricity, he was liable to dogmatise about art, forgetting that the kingdom of criticism, like the kingdoms of nature and grace, can be entered only by those who come as little children. A little more of the critical spirit might have led Coleridge to form a very different judgment of *Faust* from that which Mr. Hayward, after the lapse of nearly half a century, rather grandiloquently describes as the "matured judgment of Coleridge" which "it would be difficult to dispute."

The words "*incredulus odi*," at once recall the picture of the freethinker, as it used to be painted by the orthodox of the last century. The robust unbeliever, who curses God with *sang-froid*, hating God only less than he hates the godly, and needing "only to indulge his sense and appetites to be as happy as a brute"—that is the type of man naturally suggested by the words "*incredulus odi*." A type so simple, so commonplace, so repulsive, it was not worth Goethe's while to depict. Faust, like Margaret, is interesting because of his spiritual depth and earnestness. At the close of the first scene, Faust reveals the depth of his early religious impressions, in words which will bear quoting, as they certainly could neither have been in Coleridge's mind as he "matured" his judgment, nor in Mr. Hayward's as he endorsed that judgment. It will be remembered that Faust is represented at the close of the first scene as in the act of raising a cup of poison to his lips, when he is startled by the sound of the angels' Easter hymn; he then puts down the cup and breaks into the following soliloquy. We quote from Mr. Taylor's version:

"Why here in dust entice me with your spell,
Ye gentle powerful sounds of heaven?
Peal rather there, where tender spirits dwell.
Your messages I hear, but faith has not been given.
The dearest child of Faith is miracle.
I venture not to soar to yonder regions
Whence the glad tidings hither float;
And yet from childhood up, familiar with the note,
To Life it now renews the old allegiance.

Once Heavenly Love sent down a burning kiss
Upon my brow in Sabbath silence holy,
And filled with mystic presage, chimed the church bell slowly,
And prayer dissolved me in a fervent bliss."

There is more to the same purpose, but enough has been quoted already. No trace here of the hearty antipathy to all things spiritual, which finds expression in the words, "*incredulus odi.*" Faust is in truth of far too mystical, and even superstitious a turn of mind, to be really incredulous, or to be without a creed of some sort or another, for long together. The hard saying that "God is dead" is no sooner uttered than it is retracted, or if for a time the consciousness of God perishes, the vacant place is straightway filled by some monstrous form of the supernatural. The very atmosphere he breathes seems to be heavy with the supernatural. Though he describes himself as "having neither doubt nor scruple, fearing neither hell nor devil," he seems never to doubt the existence of spirits, or the possibility of communication with them. Profoundly sensible of the greatness and the littleness of man, he is nourished, to quote Mephistopheles, on no earthly meat and drink. To him, a spirit made in the image of the Godhead, the flesh is but as a "muddy vesture of decay," a mortal coil which he would fain "shuffle off." His ambitious soul is possessed by the yearning to rise "above the smoke and stir of this dim spot which men call earth." As he says to Wagner, two souls dwell in his breast, drawing different ways, like the two chariot horses in Plato's simile.

"Two souls, alas! reside within my breast,
And each withdraws from and repels its brother.
One with tenacious organs holds in love
And clinging lust the world in its embraces;
The other strongly sweeps this dust above
Into the high ancestral spaces."

Such, then, is Faust—the flesh ever lusting against the spirit, and the spirit divided against itself—a strange complex inconsistent character, but surely by no means "dull and meaningless."

If Faust is really such as we have described, one thing at least is certain about him. He is no "conjuror," ready made or in the making. As applied, not to Goethe's Faust, but to Marlowe's Dr. Faustus, the expression

"ready-made conjuror" would not have been so shocking, for in truth there is not a little of the conjuror in the composition of that resolute dealer in the black art, who "stoutly abjures all godliness, and prays devoutly to the prince of Hell." But Faust does nothing which could be described as conjuring in any sense of that term until the second part of the poem. Then, indeed, he, or rather Mephistopheles in his interest, does some miracle-working. But it is to be hoped that the possession and use of preternatural powers do not of themselves constitute a man a conjuror. In the first part he occupies rather the position of the conjured upon, than of the conjuror. In that prologue in heaven, which, with scant justice, has been described as a parody of the Book of Job, Mephistopheles is represented as obtaining from the Lord a grant of permission to try Faust. And this character of the tempter is maintained throughout by Mephistopheles. We must suppose that that despair of truth and cynical contempt of knowledge from which Faust seeks refuge in the study of magic, are no genuine outcome of Faust's true nature, but an inspiration from that same "spirit of contradiction" who afterwards reveals himself as the destroying spirit of universal negation.

> "I am the spirit that denies!
> And justly so: for all things from the Void
> Called forth, deserve to be destroyed:
> 'Twere better, then, were nought created.
> Thus, all which you as sin have rated—
> Destruction,—aught with evil blent—
> That is my proper element."

And so, though Faust is represented in the first scene as in the act of "calling spirits from the vasty deep," so far from being the "ready-made conjuror," he is manifestly quite a novice in the art of magic. It is his first attempt, so to speak, at actual practice. When the earth-spirit answers his call, he can with difficulty force himself to look upon it. It is only gradually that he gathers strength enough to face it with the proud words,

> "Thee—form of flame—shall I then fear?
> Yes, I am Faust: I am thy peer."

Though he has succeeded in raising the spirit, he is powerless to control it. It passes as suddenly as it had appeared. In the actual enunciation of the mystic word

which summons the spirit, Faust rather yields to a supernatural influence than determines himself by his own free will. On the student, whose whole being has been only knowing, an utter despair of truth has descended like a pall of darkness that may be felt. Of such despair is engendered desperation. He is ready to cry out with Ajax*—

> *πολῆσον δ' αἴθρην δὸς δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι*
> *ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον.*

So he betakes himself to the study of magic, and as he reads he feels that the light is coming. He is startled by a new sense of god-like power. "Am I a god?" he exclaims; "it grows too light to me." He becomes sensible of a supernatural *ὁρμή*, which he could not resist if he would—would not if he could.

> "I feel thee draw my life, absorb, exhaust me;
> Thou must! thou must! and though my life it cost me."

He obeys, and pronounces the mystic symbol which is followed by the apparition of the earth-spirit.

It is because Coleridge's view of Faust's character was inadequate to that character as Goethe meant it to be understood that he failed to discern any connection between the thirst of knowledge and the sensuality. On this question the character of Wagner, intended, without doubt, to serve as a foil to Faust's, is very instructive. As Faust's *famulus*, Wagner appears in the first part as the eager student whose intellectual enthusiasm is proof against the blighting influence of his master's cynicism. He is a man of one interest, but that is all-absorbing. Like the genuine scholar that he is, he loves books, not the contents of them merely, but the books themselves, outside and inside, from cover to cover. His description of the delighted consciousness of the scholar as he passes "from book to book, from leaf to leaf," is truly noble, and as in imagination he sees himself in the act of unrolling for the first time a fine old manuscript, the vision fairly

> "Dissolves him into ecstasies,
> And brings all heaven before his eyes."

After the second scene of the first part we lose sight of Wagner until he reappears in the second part in the laboratory which once was Faust's, a doctor with an established position and a daring speculator. The fine

* *Iliad*, Book XVII. cap. 646-7.

humour which represents him intent on his great work of constructing a man according to principles of chemical combination invests Wagner with a certain undeniable sublimity, though it be but of the sort distinguished as the mock sublime. For the result of his labours, when it appears, is in the highest degree creditable and encouraging. Homunculus is no monstrous Frankenstein, but a young gentleman of disposition the most gentle, manners the most polished, a spirit as great as Gargantua's, and a wit far more lively and precocious—altogether a *bel esprit*, to whom Wagner may well be proud of having played the midwife.

Since Faust parted from him we must suppose that he has pursued "the even tenor of his way," moving always towards the same goal, the fire of his intellectual enthusiasm burning ever with the same equable intensity.

To a nature so one-sided, Faust's highly complex character, in which mysticism jostles scepticism, and the insatiate passion to know alternates with a cynical contempt of knowledge, must always be an insoluble riddle. Had Wagner taken us into his confidence, he would probably have told us that his former master's mind, powerful as it was, was yet not quite sound, and if he watched Faust's career as he "stormed through his life," eagerly clutching every pleasure as it presented itself, he might be supposed to say to himself, "*Homo vagus et inconstans.*"

The difference between Faust and Wagner is just this. The mainspring of Wagner's being is intellectual curiosity. Faust, on the contrary, is one of those idealisers of whose nature worship is the grand law. As the boy who would fain be a saint, as the student whose god is knowledge, as the passionate lover of Margaret, as the enthusiast for ideal beauty as typified in Helen, as the servant of humanity and pioneer of civilisation, in all variety of changing circumstance and manifold experience, Faust is still the same ardent being for whom not to have an object to reverence and adore is to find "his occupation gone." In such unhappy case, his idol shattered, his "occupation gone," is Faust when he sets out with Mephistopheles as his "guide, philosopher, and friend" to study life. As no man can live for ever on the contemplation of his own dissatisfaction, so to Faust there has come the imperious yearning to seek satisfaction where there seems to be most hope of finding it, in objects and interests beyond himself.

He will turn his back for ever on the "barren heath" of speculation. He will go out—

"In die welt weit
Aus der Einsamkeit."

He will sit no longer a careless half-spectator of the great tragi-comedy of the world. He longs to share the "tears and laughter." He will stretch his soul to take in the full compass of the world and of humanity. "Not the fruit of experience, but experience itself," is his object; experience various, stimulating, exciting, calling into play by turns all the faculties of many-sided human nature. He will be active, unresting. "Nur rastlos bethätigt sich der Mann." With the whole world before him in which to take his pleasure and range at will, his interest would never flag. There will be no room left in his soul for *ennui* or the "whisperings of the lonely music" of speculation. The mystic has turned positivist, the student has become the man of action, the "spectator of all time and all being" has cast from him the thought of past and future. Henceforth he will live only in the present.

We are now on the threshold of that famous scene which Coleridge considers one of the best—perhaps the best—in the poem, the scene in Auerbach's keller at Leipzig. It is difficult to see how this judgment is to be defended.

Despite a realism so intense as to be positively painful, the entire scene is open to the charge of unreality. Frosch, Siebel, Altmayer, and Brander, are not living men; they are puppets, mere external shows of men, simulating the gestures of men to perfection, but unsubstantial as a dream. There is no genuine humour in their merriment, nor, when they quarrel, is their anger real. They are felt from first to last to be not so much human beings as part of the phenomena of human nature. As such, Mephistopheles introduces them to Faust's notice.

"Before all else I bring thee hither
Where boon companions meet together,
To let thee see how smooth life runs away.
Here for the folk each day's a holiday;
With little toil, and ease to suit them,
They whirl in narrow circling trails,
Like kittens playing with their tails;
And if no headache persecute them,
So long the host may credit give,
They merrily and careless live."

The shadow of this cynicism is cast over the whole scene. The reader cannot escape from it. Whether he will or no he is forced to take the cue from Mephistopheles and laugh *at* the revellers, not *with* them, and, even so, he has not enough sympathy with them to laugh heartily at their expense.

The trick which Mephistopheles plays upon them when he gives them flame to drink in lieu of wine is, of all conceivable practical jokes, the most cruel, and, by consequence, the least humorous. The only piece of real humour in the entire scene is the song of Mephistopheles, and that is of so dry a sort as hardly to move a muscle.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Goethe is not quite at his ease in the company of the jolly fellows assembled in Auerbach's keller. Nor, if "the child is father to the man," ought it to surprise us that Goethe, whose precocious boyhood was nourished in almost monastic seclusion on the literature of five languages, should have wanted that broad humour, which instinctively apprehending in the least "cultured" humanity that "one touch of nature which makes the whole world kin," places its possessor in spiritual *rapport* with all mankind. Shakespeare's liberal sympathy could always find something on which to sustain itself in human nature, however degraded. Nothing human so common or unclean but he would detect in it something more than common, something that was not unclean. But Goethe's sympathy failed him conspicuously in presence of the coarse and vulgar aspects of human nature. One can hardly fancy him reading with genuine appreciation the tavern scenes in the two parts of *Henry IV.*, or *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, or some of the scenes in *Measure for Measure*, and it might be doubted whether the vagabond pedlar Autolycus was not outside the pale of his imaginative sympathy. The most interesting and best drawn characters in his great work—Philina, Mignon, and the harper—are one and all distinguished by a certain skin-deep refinement. They belong to that ill-defined region popularly styled Bohemia, the province of adventurers in literature and art, actors, *et hoc genus omne*.

As to the final objection which Mr. Hayward quotes from Coleridge against the poem, viz., that it has no unity, we shall assent or dissent according to the sense in which we understand unity and the want of it. That *Faust* has no plot in the technical sense of the term is undeniable.

This Goethe himself confessed.* Moreover, in no single work has Goethe given evidence of a genius for the construction of plots. The plot of *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre* is of the loosest description, while the *Wanderjahre* is a mere collection of episodes. *Werther* has, properly speaking, no plot. Nor is plot by any means the strong point in Goethe's tragedies. Much less is plot to be expected in *Faust*. For *Faust*, though containing tragedy of the most tragic sort, is properly no tragedy, nor even, as some have supposed, an allegory, but a spiritual epic in dramatic form, a sort of dramatic theodicy. Whatever may be thought of the respective merits of the two parts as compared with one another, they are eternally wedded together for good or evil. It is impossible to treat either part as a separate whole in itself, without damage to both parts. From this point of view, the absurdity of judging *Faust* according to the ordinary laws which govern dramatic art becomes evident at once. *Faust* has no plot. But has it, therefore, no unity? The unity of plot is an artificial unity; extreme attention to plot is no sign of health in art, rather of disease.

> "Nature is made better by no mean,
> But nature makes that mean. So o'er that art
> Which you say adds to nature, is an art
> That nature makes."

Faust is a genuine product of the human spirit in its condition of greatest freedom. It is the revelation of a life's thought and experience, and as such it has a higher unity than that of plot—a spiritual unity. It would, indeed, be perilous to attempt an exposition of the idea of *Faust*. Sound criticism will have as little as it may to do with the idea. When Goethe was asked as to the idea of *Faust*, he was at a loss to answer the question.

"It was in short (he said to Eckermann) not in my line as a poet to strive to embody anything abstract. I received in my mind impressions, and those of a sensual, animated, charming, varied, hundredfold kind, just as a lively imagination presented them; and I had as a poet nothing more to do than artistically to round off and elaborate such views and impressions, and by means of a lively representation so to bring them forward that others might receive the same impression in hearing or reading my representation of them."—Eckermann's *Conversations*, Sunday, May 6, 1827.

* Vide Eckermann's *Conversations of Goethe*.—Date, Sunday, Feb. 13, 1831.

In the *Wahlverwandschaften* alone, of his more considerable works, was Goethe conscious of having laboured to set forth a pervading idea:

"This novel (he says) has thus become comprehensible to the understanding; but I will not say that it is therefore better. I am rather of the opinion that the more incommensurable, the more incomprehensible to the understanding a poetic production is, so much the better it is."—*Ibid.*, Sunday, May 6, 1827.

When one hears of fresh attempts (like that recent one of Herr Kyle) to expound the inner meaning of *Faust*, one cannot but be filled with amazement at the hardihood of interpreting commentators, who in the face of Goethe's own naïve repudiation of any intention to teach in *Faust* any special lesson, or indeed, to teach at all, persist in discovering in his most innocent utterances a subtle allegory or a profound idea.

Yet, though there is in *Faust* no one idea "lying at the foundation of the whole and of every scene" which can be called with truth the idea of the poem, we may perhaps in one idea recognise a main thread which runs through the whole poem, and gives it a certain unity. That idea is love. Plato, in the Phædrus and Symposium, has treated Ἔρως from more than one point of view, but more particularly in the Symposium, as a mighty δαίμων of manifold nature, and a harsh master; σκληρὸς καὶ αὐχμηρὸς . . . . ἀεὶ ἐνδειᾳ σύνοικος, manifesting himself now in a madness of lust that drives out reason, again in the burning thirst of knowledge which only the pure forms of ideal truth and beauty can satisfy. Ἔρως in this large sense may be said to be the true subject of Goethe's poem. Faust plays so many parts in the course of his stormy career, that his identity might well become a matter of doubt, did not this one characteristic always remain; he is always the same Faust in that he is always the slave of Ἔρως. When we first see him in the vaulted Gothic cell, he has felt the burning sting implanted by the δαίμων who inhabits the debatable ground between knowledge and ignorance, and who will neither rest himself nor let another rest. In the depths of his consciousness of needy ignorance, knowledge, as soon as gained, is as nothing, or as the water in the pitchers of the Danaids. Ἔρως is his master; Ἔρως, the needy son of Need and

* Vide *Platonis Symposium*, pp. 203-4.

Invention, and those who serve Ἔρως, know well that the slave is not above his master. So the first part played by Faust is that of one φιλοσοφῶν μετ' ἔρωτος. When listening to the counsel of Mephistopheles, he throws away speculation when he gives up the attempt to read the riddle of life, and resolves to learn by practical experience what life is; he has in some sense become a new man, but he has not therefore got a new master. The δαίμων Ἔρως is still lord of his destinies, the same Ἔρως, but with a difference in the manifestation. The all-absorbing passion which fed itself on knowledge has so grown by what it fed on, that from mere lack of adequate intellectual nourishment it must seek food elsewhere or die. The passion to know has transformed itself into the passion to live and to enjoy. But here again Ἔρως is a hard master, and the pursuit of enjoyment proves just as painful, just as futile, as the pursuit of truth seemed to be:

> "O dass dem Menschen nichts vollkommnes wird
> Empfind ich nun."

The sensual passion has hardly burned itself out when it is succeeded by an intellectual enthusiasm for the ideal of perfect beauty as revealed in Greek literature and art, symbolised under the search for Helen in the bowels of the earth. And when the interest in ideal beauty has grown faint—as it is a law of Faust's being that all interests sooner or later must grow faint and give place to others—he awakens to a sudden interest in the real, the practical, the material. That kingdom of man which certain of our philosophers or quasi-philosophers are never weary of proclaiming to be at hand, that earthly kingdom where the Son of Man is to sit enthroned, nature no longer even a vanquished foe, but an obedient and a willing servant—this ideal of the undisputed mastery of things by man becomes Faust's last absorbing passion. What he can do to bring the great age nearer, that he determines that with all his might he will do. In this his new character of servant of humanity he does not indeed achieve satisfaction; but as he sees in imagination a vision of his work complete, and generations of men already entered into the fruits of it, he thinks that could he but know that dream to be a reality, then indeed he might have rest from his labours, and be satisfied. So thinking, he expires.

It is the fashion to speak disparagingly of the second

part of *Faust* as compared with the first. Mr. Lewes says, "If we think it (the first part) deficient in taste, we never reproach it with want of power. The reverse is the case with this second part." Mr. Hayward, speaking of Goethe's well-known preference for the second part, cites as a parallel case the old story of the exaggerated value which Milton set upon *Paradise Regained*.

In estimating the worth of such criticism, much will depend on what we mean by power and the want of power. The first part of *Faust* belongs to the period of Goethe's life usually distinguished as that of "sturm und drang." It was not indeed completed until that period had terminated. But it was thirty years in growing to be what it ultimately became, and in it are held in solution ("aufgehoben," as a German would say) the experiences of those thirty years during which Goethe too was growing to be what he ultimately became. Hence the poem is marked by an intensity which verges at times on the sensational. There is no danger of underrating its power; the temptation would rather be to overrate it. The second part, as it belongs to quite a different period, bears quite a different stamp. The first part was wrought out red-hot, as it were, between iron and iron. The second part is like the vision which rises before the eyes of a waking dreamer to whom life itself has become such stuff as dreams are made of.

The note of serenity is struck in the opening scene, which discovers Faust lying at break of day in a sort of Alpine "valley of Avalon," if the expression be not a contradiction in terms, whither we must suppose him to have been transported by Mephistopheles to heal him of his grievous wound, to the sound of Æolian harps and the voice of fairies, Ariel acting as Coryphæus to these ministering spirits. The birth of this new day—new for Faust in a very special sense—is described as never sunrise was described before or since. Shakespeare has more than once in his pregnant fashion compressed a picture into a few lines, as *e.g.*:

> "Full many a glorious morning have I seen
> Flatter the mountain tops with sovran eye,
> Kissing with golden face the meadows green,
> Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchemy."

Or even into a couplet:

> "Night's candles are burnt out, and jocund day
> Stands tip-toe on the misty mountain tops."

And there are these five matchless lines of Shelley's:

> "What! alive and so bold, O earth!
> Art thou not over bold?
> What! leapest thou forth as of old,
> In the light of thy morning mirth,
> The last of the flock of the starry fold."

But we shall look in vain to find a parallel to this sunrise of Goethe's. The habit itself of studying nature for artistic purposes is indeed only of yesterday. The two poets, Wordsworth and Keats, who in different ways have been most successful in the artistic treatment of nature, have given us nothing upon the sunrise which we could place for purposes of comparison alongside of this study of Goethe's. Here, perhaps, is Goethe's manner of rendering nature exhibited at its best. The description is detailed without being diffuse, rich without being overladen, and combines at once many points of view. Ariel catches the sound of the sun's chariot while it is yet some way off, the rolling of the wheels, and the noise of the horses' hoofs, and gives warning to his fairy band to hide themselves behind the rocks and in the depths of the thickets, lest the din should stun them. One calls to mind at once those sublime words of Lorenzo in the *Merchant of Venice*. Perhaps they were in Goethe's mind as he wrote this speech of Ariel's:

> "There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st,
> But in his motion like an angel sings,
> Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims,—
> Such harmony is in immortal souls;
> But whilst this muddy vesture of decay
> Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

Faust's duller senses feel but the quickening influence of the kindly warmth. As he uncloses his eyes he sees the flowers awakening around him, the light mist lingering in the hollows of the mountains, and the mild sunshine creeping down from the peak into the dale.

Thus it is that, in passing from the first part to the second, the reader is sensible of a certain shock, like one who suddenly exchanges tempest for calm, and is apt at first to think the second part somewhat tame by contrast with the first. So Mr. Lewes says: "The defect of this poem does not lie in its occult meanings, but in the poverty of poetic life those meanings are made to animate."

No more unqualified condemnation could be conceived. To read any allegory for the sake of understanding it as an allegory, would probably be a waste of time. That an allegory need not be read as such is its greatest charm. We are at liberty to attend to the inner meaning just as much, just as little, as we please, and meanwhile lose ourselves in the maze of fancy. Mr. Lewes, however, denies categorically that there is poetry (saving a trifle here and there hardly worth the mentioning) in the second part of *Faust*. "There is no direct appeal to the emotions, there is no intrinsic beauty in the symbols." Mr. Lewes finds the poem devoid of human interest. "The kiss of Gretchen is worth a thousand allegories." Would Mr. Lewes, then, have had Goethe give us in the second part another love episode such as concluded the first part? Goethe thought that his hero had had enough of the love of woman for one lifetime; so he sends him forth again into the world to gain new experiences, and feel the stirrings of other passions than the love which is fed on kisses.

We see Faust next at court. Mephistopheles doubtless supposes that an imperial court is the last place to encourage in Faust those lofty aspirations and intense emotions which have already cost him so dear.

The scenes in which the court experiences of Faust and Mephistopheles are described have a brilliancy quite unique. There is a peculiar polish, and sometimes an Heinesque point and naïveté in the dialogue which we do not expect from Goethe; while the picture of the indolent young emperor who demands amusement while his empire is falling to pieces about him has such vraisemblance and vivid reality, as explains why certain subtle German critics should have fancied a reference to the state of France before the Revolution. The exchequer is empty; the soldiers clamour for pay. Justice is sold to the highest bidder. But *n'importe*. It is carnival time. The emperor is in no mood for cares of State. Mephistopheles seizes his opportunity. He engages to reform the administration and amuse the court at the same time. He gains the imperial ear, and explains his financial views, which turn out to be of the "soft money" type. By way of earnest and pledge of good faith he provides a carnival pageant for the amusement of the court, a masque idealised from the Neapolitan carnival, ancient mythology, modern symbolism, Harz giants, gnomes, and political economy—a bizarre medley

coloured with an almost Oriental warmth of tint, and doubtless intended by Goethe to serve as a foil to the Lenten severity of the classic Walpurgis-night which follows in the next act.

Faust, tiring soon of court life, informs Mephistopheles of his intention to go and seek Helen, wherever she may be found. His mind is made up; his only difficulty is that he does not know where he should seek her. On that point Mephistopheles can enlighten him. He is to seek her where time and space are not, in that dark region tenanted by the Mothers. He puts into his hand the magic key which is to unlock this region, with some directions about the use of it, and dismisses him. On this famous myth of the Mothers the interpreters have done their worst. Yet happily it has resisted as yet all efforts to explain it. When Eckermann questioned Goethe as to its inner meaning, "he, in his usual manner, wrapped himself up in mystery as he looked on me with wide open eyes, and repeated the words:

> 'Die Mütter die Mütter 's klingt so wunderlich,
> The Mother, the Mothers, nay it sounds so strange.'

When Goethe himself gives up the problem, it would be well if the critics would follow his example. The myth is a fine one, recalling that gloomier vein of thought which runs through Greek mythology, appearing now in the legend of the Graiæ, now in the dark legends of Dionysus Zagreus, or the mystic rites of the cave of Trophonius.

Faust finds the Mothers, and returns in safety, bringing Helen and Paris with him, whom he exhibits on the stage to the assembled court. The spectators are by no means appreciative. The most part are languidly critical. Such enthusiasm as there is, is stupid and *mal à propos*. Propriety, moreover, is felt to be outraged by the free demeanour of Helen in stealing up to the sleeping Paris, and waking him with a kiss. The kiss wakes not Paris only, but Faust's jealousy, and, as Helen and Paris show unmistakable signs of moving off together, he endeavours to retain them by physical force and magic spell. The result is an explosion, Helen and Paris vanish, and Faust is left prostrate and insensible on the stage. Such is the result of Faust's first quest of Helen.

Than the scenes which open the second act there are none in the poem more happily conceived or worthily

executed. Full of the brightest wit and the most delicate humour, bold, vigorous, vivid, they leave behind them in the memory a sense of youthful, almost audacious power.

Mephistopheles has conveyed Faust senseless into that same old, high-vaulted, Gothic cell, in which we first made his acquaintance, with the intention of consulting Wagner, Faust's quondam Famulus, who has now stepped into his master's shoes as doctor and professor, and holds rank amongst the learned of the learned. Wagner has not, however, forgotten his old master. He still cherishes the hope that he may one day return. The room where he was wont to labour remains untenanted save by crickets, moths, and other vermin, just as it was on that memorable day when Faust fled from it. Only there are more cobwebs, and the dust lies thicker on the books and instruments; the perfect stillness is oppressive. Faust's doctor's gown still hangs by the wall. Mephistopheles loses no time in getting into it. As he does so the vermin it has harboured for years flutter out to salute the Lord of Flies. He pulls the bell. The clanging brings the Famulus up the creaking stairs, quaking and trembling in every limb, and seeing visions, cracking roof, and lightning and rain. The door flies open of its own accord, and he enters, staring aghast at what seems to his disordered imagination a giant in Faust's gown. Mephistopheles reassures him by pronouncing his name, Nicodemus; in reply to which the still trembling Famulus falters an Oremus, which Mephistopheles puts by, and proceeds to business. He bids the Famulus go and tell Wagner that one who brings news about Faust would speak with him. Nicodemus departs, and Mephistopheles seats himself. Scarcely has he done so when an old acquaintance makes his appearance—that same scholar to whom, when he was last here, he gave a lecture on methods and subjects of studies. The scholar is now a bachelor, and full of the latest ideas. He soon shows Mephistopheles that he has taken his instruction to heart. He manifests the sublimest contempt for all things old, old men included. This he lets Mephistopheles see plainly enough, intimating that as the "life is in the blood," it would be the wisest course to make an end of all who have passed middle life. Thus he rants on, till it occurs to him that he might do better than lecture an old pedant as good as dead already, and so exit.

By way of comment on the text of the bachelor Wagner

is discovered in the next scene bending in an ecstasy of expectation over the phial in which Homunculus is just entering life. At this awful moment Mephistopheles knocks and enters. When he hears how Wagner is employed, he naturally looks about for the happy couple. Wagner, however, explains with an air of condescending wisdom that the old-fashioned method is now superseded by a new and strictly scientific procedure, and bends again over the phial. Soon a voice is heard issuing from the phial, calling Wagner Little Father, and Mephistopheles cousin. The great work is accomplished, and Wagner's joy is unbounded. With Homunculus, however, it is not quite so well as it might be. His activity of mind is preternatural, but he is sadly "cabined, cribbed, confined" by the narrow limits of his native phial, which he is forbidden by the laws of his being to quit. Still he is determined to make the best of his opportunities, and cries eagerly for something to do. In answer to this demand Mephistopheles opens the door which communicates with Faust's room, and displays Faust lying there on the bed in a deep sleep, dreaming of woods, streams, swans, and nymphs. Homunculus, whose spirit is in mysterious "rapport" with Faust's, no sooner catches sight of him than by an intuition he sees at once his dream and his malady, and the only possible cure. He prescribes without hesitation an aerial voyage to Pharsalia, and travels in ancient Greece.

Our three adventurers—Faust, Mephistopheles, and Homunculus—embark on Mephistopheles' mantle for a voyage through space. Their destination is Pharsalia, the ostensible death place of the ancient world and birth place of the modern. About midnight they reach the battle-field, and find assembled there the collective fabledom of Greece. For it is the anniversary of the eve of the battle, and naiads and nymphs, oreads and dryads, sphinxes and syrens, lamiæ, griffins, the Graiæ, Chiron the centaur, the empusa, that strange double of Proteus, and a less noble sort of pigmies and cranes, ants and dactyls, have all trooped together to hold high festival.

So solemn is the occasion that even Thales and Anaxagoras have not disdained to dignify it with their philosophic presence.

Our aeronauts have no sooner touched *terra firma* than they stumble across those χρυσοφύλακες Γρυπές of

Herodotean memory, with their neighbours the one-eyed Arimaspians,* who have travelled all the way from their homes beyond Scythia to keep the feast at Pharsalia, and doubtless to enjoy for one night in the year the society of those wealthy ants from India, *μεγάθεα ἔχοντες κυνῶν μὲν ἐλάσσονα ἀλωπέκεων δὲ μείονα,*† on the spoils of whose hills of gold dust the natives, if we may credit Herodotus, used to enrich themselves in his time.

The party soon separates. Mephistopheles is at first somewhat attracted by the sphinxes. His advances, however, meeting with a decided, though very stately rebuff, he betakes himself elsewhere. The syrens had made a dead set at Mephistopheles, as soon as he came within earshot. But their ravishing strains are quite thrown away on Pferdefuss. He needs not, with Ulyssean weakness, stuff his ears with wax. To all intents and purposes they are deaf already to the blandishments of syren melodies. He did not travel all the way from the Harz in search of either syrens or sphinxes. Thessalian witches are his quest. In default of them the Lamiæ seem the best thing procurable by way of substitute. To the Lamiæ accordingly he turns. With them, however, he fares even worse than with the sphinxes. They coquet with him till he is on fire with lust, and then leave him cruelly in the lurch, embracing a broomstick or a pine tree. At last good luck brings him into the very presence of the mysterious Graiai, daughters of Phorcys. Then follows a strange, grotesque, humorous, and withal most powerful and imaginative scene, in which Mephistopheles, falling in love with the surpassing deformity of the three sisters, persuades them to coalesce into two (as it seems by some hidden law of their mysterious being they can), and give him rank and status for the nonce as third Phorcyad. There is unique power in this scene. The three weird sisters are not described, for no description could do justice, or other than injustice, to creatures so strangely constituted. Yet a few masterly strokes, and they are before us—as much of them, that is to say, as can be revealed to mortals, painful to look at, pitiful in their hideousness, yet not a little ludicrous withal.

Meanwhile Homunculus, eager to emerge from his chrysalis condition into the fulness of true being, has found his way upward from rock to rock to where Thales

---

* Θαλεια, 116. † *Ibid.*, 102.

and Anaxagoras stand overlooking the scene, and holding high discourse upon the origin of all things. Thales is conservative of his old convictions. He still sees "water, water everywhere," and the contention between the two philosophers waxes hot. Anaxagoras seems indeed to have the best of the argument, for beneath the ground Seismos is steadily working, struggling, with arms upstretched in Caryatid fashion, to heave the mountain up. To which operation, visibly going on before their eyes, Anaxagoras triumphantly appeals in proof of the fiery origin of things. But Thales simply repeats his credo, and is invincible. So Anaxagoras gives up the dispute, and falls to adoration of the rising moon. Thales takes Homunculus under his wing, and the two leave Anaxagoras prostrate on his face in worship. We see no more of them till the last scene but one of the Walpurgis-night, when Homunculus is fairly launched into the sea of being, tossed, in fact, into the Ægean to sink or swim, under the auspices of Thales, Nereus, and Proteus.

While Mephistopheles and Homunculus are having their adventures, Faust is not idle. He makes straight for the banks of the Peneios, led by the music of nymphs' voices. And oh! the unutterable charm of the daintily-tripping trochaics, in which the nymphs speak to each other and to Faust, when he makes his appearance, while the poplar leaves ripple in the light breeze, and Peneios slips by between his banks, "giving a gentle kiss to every sedge he overtaketh in his pilgrimage." Soon Faust meets Chiron, who, with antique courtesy, takes him on his back across the river. To Faust's eager questions about the Argonautic heroes, Chiron replies with the grave dignity which beseems one who has taught demigods. But, so soon as he learns that Faust is in search of Helen, he at once pronounces him to be mad, and takes him with all speed to Manto—not that Manto whom the student of the classics knows as daughter of Tiresias, but a creature of Goethe's own imagination, and daughter of Asclepias. She dwells in her father's temple at Tricca, her occupation being to "lift hands of prayer" to her father.

> "That he illumine the physician's mind,
> And from their rash destroyers save mankind."

Manto, if any one, thinks Chiron, can minister to Faust's diseased soul. In this the demigod is mistaken, for Manto

has no sooner heard the nature of Faust's malady, than, with the mighty words,

"I love him who desires the impossible,"

she sends him down the secret way which leads from the temple to the underworld; the road, she adds by way of encouragement, is the same which Orpheus travelled when he went to seek Eurydice. Thus is Faust lost to sight, until he reappears in the Helena in the guise of a mediæval knight.

Thales, and his *protégé* Homunculus, when they left Anaxagoras to his prayers on Mount Pindus, made straight for the Ægean and the palace of Nereus. On their arrival they found the syrens there before them. A very unhappy part did these syrens play at Pharsalia. They seemed to be (if the vulgarism may be tolerated) "touting" on behalf of Nereus and Galatea. To-night is Galatea's fête night, for Galatea has entered into the inheritance of Aphrodite, and the car which used to bear the goddess now carries the nymph. So to-night Galatea is coming in state over the waves to visit Nereus, and the syrens are at Pharsalia to advertise the event. Yet, "charmed they never so wisely," they could get no one to listen to the voice of the charmers. Mephistopheles was brutally indifferent; Faust would be satisfied with nothing less than news about Helen, and of Helen the syrens had nothing to tell. The earthquake affrights them, and they are out of sympathy with cranes, pigmies, griffins, and dactyls. So, as none will hearken, they raise a final wail of despairing exhortation, and are off, swimming down the Peneios to the Ægean, to attend the festival of Nereus and Galatea. When we next see them, they are "lying on the cliffs, piping and singing" to the moon, in the more congenial company of Nereids and Tritons, who answer them in song from the waves on which they rest. On these latter has devolved a duty of extraordinary difficulty and supreme importance. They are commissioned to bring the Cabiri, those mysterious divinities, from Samothrace, to do honour to Galatea's advent. So they depart—soon to reappear with the Cabiri—as many of them as could be induced to take holiday—in their train. Goethe has not lifted the veil which shrouds these "aboriginal gods." We learn merely that they are gods of peace, and patrons of mankind.

Soon another procession—the soldieries of Rhodes, mounted on "hippocamps and sea-dragons," bearing Poseidon's trident, and chanting the praises of the sun and moon, and the art of moulding brass into the likeness of gods and men. Then Galatea, surrounded by Dorides, with youths saved from shipwreck, heralded by those snake-charmers, the Pselli and Marsi of antique fame, who, in the general wreck of the ancient world, have migrated from Africa and Italy to Cyprus, and there dwell in perfect peace beneath the earth, a life of gods or troglodytes, centred in eternal calm. The choric song with which they announced Galatea's approach is bright and clear as the Ægean itself, and with such a ripple of light laughter in it, as seems the audible counterpart of that *κυμάτων ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα*, on which the eye of the Greek poet rested with satisfaction.

Of this scene, Thales and Homunculus have been by no means indifferent spectators. Homunculus is all anxiety to enter by any highway or byway the great world of existence, and Thales has his reputation to maintain as well as his word to keep. But Thales in his character of mystagogue and hierophant of being, requires the co-operation of more than mortal skill; his hopes lay at first in Nereus. For did not he spend his life in proclaiming Nereus to be god and god alone? And was not Nereus the wisest of all the gods and a prophet and a patron of mankind? So Thales takes Homunculus to the palace just to show him, and get the old man to give him a little friendly counsel. Nereus, however, has not forgotten how little heed Paris or Ulysses paid to the words of prophetic warning which he wasted upon them; besides, he is too much occupied with the thought of soon seeing Galatea to attend to Homunculus's business. So he refers his clients to Proteus—a reference all too vague, as Thales thinks. There is, however, nothing for it but to try and catch Proteus, if he is to be caught. And, in fact, though Proteus does his best to dodge, Thales is a match for him. Ulysses and Eidothea had recourse to main force. Thales takes Proteus sophist-wise, by baiting for his curiosity. Homunculus is the bait; he flashes out his light strongly, and Proteus, "curious as a fish," rises in the shape of a tortoise to see what the light may be. Quick as thought, Thales drops the curtain over Homunculus. If Proteus would satisfy his curiosity, he must assume some less

outlandish form. So is Proteus taken with guile. When he is allowed to inspect Homunculus more closely, he is charmed and astonished. Proteus astonished!

> "A glittering dwarf! a show well worth the seeing,
> Never knew creature like it was in being."

Thales explains the situation.

> "He wants your counsel—has come a long distance—
> His object is to get into existence,
> He is, by what he told me of his birth,
> Miraculously come but half to earth
> A lively spark—has every mental quality,
> But, luckless fellow, t'was his strange fatality,
> An active naked spirit all alone—
> Without a shred of body, blood, or bone,
> Into the world to be at hazard thrown:
> His glass is all he has to steady him,
> He wants and wishes body, life, and limb."

Proteus is as ready with advice as Nereus was chary of it. There is nothing for it (he says) but to launch out boldly into the sea, and sink or swim "through the boundless realm of undying change." No fear but he will become a man in time. Let him put off the evil day as long as possible. Considering that Homunculus's anatomy is of fire, "all compact," protected merely by a glass phial, it seems antecedently probable that such protracted baptism by immersion as Proteus recommends would end in his extinction.

He is not to be daunted, however, and mounts cheerfully on Proteus' back. Proteus has become a dolphin for the nonce—whence, as Galatea's car comes by, he leaps into the wake of it. From such union of opposing elements—fire and water—is born (according to what seems the most probable theory) in the next act Euphorion, the genius of modern poetry.

There is the quaintest humour in this initiation of Homunculus just described. The dry way in which the great hierophants of being speak to one another of the little man and his ambiguous position, and the purely professional interest which they take in him, contrasts most amusingly with the eager anxiety of the little man himself, and his unfailing cheerfulness, courage, and self-respect. Homunculus grows on one till one learns almost to love him. He is so piquant, so naïve, so genuine. There is

nothing in literature comparable to the manner in which Goethe has here given concrete reality and individuality to a conception in itself as abstract as the ἐντελέχεια of Aristotle, or the *actus purus* of the schoolmen. Those who have adopted the popular view of the second part of Faust would do well to study with special care this character of Homunculus, and the whole of the classical Walpurgis-night. For here is unmistakable evidence that Goethe had not in his old age lost his hold on the concrete; that he appreciated as fully as ever the sensuous animalism and keen joy of living which animate the antique world. Amidst the superabundant wealth of the classical Walpurgis-night there is not a single character that is not perfectly individualised even down to the ants and the dactyls. If it is true (as Goethe used to say) that the individual is the life of art, the classical Walpurgis-night is infinitely superior as a work of art to the scene on the Brocken. The witches of the Brocken are a mere confusion of voices streaming along the mountain side. Every figure in the classical Walpurgis-night has the sharp definiteness of a statue.

Yet Mr. Lewes complains that in the second part "the struggles of an individual are displaced by representative abstractions;" that "the real domain of art is forsaken for that of Philosophy, and beauty is sacrificed to meaning." And Mr. Pater (*Renaissance*, p. 122), writing on Leonardo da Vinci, has a remarkable reference to Goethe, which I will quote entire. He says of Leonardo:

"For there was a touch of modern Germany in that genius which, as Goethe said, had *müde sich gedact*, 'thought itself weary.' What an anticipation of modern Germany, for instance, in that debate on the question whether sculpture or painting is the nobler art. But there is this difference between him and the German, that, with all that curious science, the German would have thought nothing more was needed, and the name of Goethe himself reminds one how great for the artist may be the danger of over much science: how Goethe, who in the *Elective Affinities*, and the first part of *Faust*, does transmute ideas into images, who wrought many such transmutations, did not invariably find the spellword, and in the second part of *Faust*, presents us with a mass of science which has almost no artistic character at all."

It is obvious that in this passage Mr. Pater is merely resaying in better language what Mr. Lewes had already said in the chapter of his *Life of Goethe* on the second part of *Faust*, from which I have just quoted. According to Mr.

Pater, the second part of *Faust* is too abstract, too scientific, to be artistic. Of science in the more special sense there is really very little in the second part of *Faust*. In the first scene of the fourth act Mephistopheles develops a quaint theory of his own in explanation of the upheaval of the earth's crust, which he conceives to be due to diabolical agency. This can, however, hardly be described as science. The debate between Thales and Anaxagoras in the classical Walpurgis-night belongs really to the days before science. But perhaps Mr. Pater, like the syrens, takes fright at Seismos heaving the mountain up. Seismos, however, is but a clumsy workman, whose operations have little enough of science. Mr. Pater must mean by science what is usually described as learning, if his remarks are to have any reference to the second part of *Faust*. It would be a task of no small difficulty to make out that the poem is overburdened with science in the strict sense of the term. On the other hand, the work is emphatically learned, teeming with historical and mythological allusion. But learning is not science, much less is mythology and history science; and of all poems produced in an age of reason, the second part of *Faust* has the slenderest claims to be described as an attempt to transmute ideas of reason into images of sense. One is struck in reading the second part by nothing so much as by the absence of "ideas." Commentators may puzzle themselves and their readers by enlarging on the inner meaning—may find an allegory in every episode; they are really only mistaking "bushes for bears." In this way Mr. Carlyle has been a great sinner. The rapturous article with which he introduced Helena to the British public ascribed to the piece a symbolical and figurative character which it really does not possess. Helena is, in truth, about as much of an allegory as *The Tempest*. Mr. Carlyle will have it that Helena is "some dim adumbration of Grecian Art and its flight to the Northern Nations, when driven by stress of war from its own country." Really, what a superfluous conjecture! If true, how jejune! And what evidence of its truth? This sort of criticism would reduce any work of art to a "*caput mortuum*." No wonder Mr. Lewes, accepting the Carlylean idea as the true one, protests against representative abstractions.

Is Helen, then, a "representative abstraction?" She has the misfortune to vanish into thin air at the close of

the piece, but so long as she is with us she is by no means shadowy and unreal, as an abstraction should be. On the contrary, she has all the naïveté that comes of perfect naturalness. When, on her return to Sparta, she finds, in place of the faithful stewardess left in charge by Menelaus, the ominous form of Phorcyas, she is filled with that almost childish terror with which we may suppose distressed beauty always regards the grotesque and hideous. Yet withal she has the dignity and self-command beseeming the daughter of Zeus and sister of the Dioscuri. Her position is perilous enough: on the one side imminent death (for Menelaus is bent on gratifying his own wrath and appeasing Heaven at the same time by making oblation of Helen on the altar of his fathers); on the other side is the doubtful succour of a barbarian people, foes to her race, of whom she knows no more than the hag Phorcyas, who but now so sorely affrighted her, sees fit to tell her. Not without many misgivings she surrenders herself to Phorcyas' guidance, and flees for refuge to Faust's castle, to receive with gracious majesty the homage which is her due. For, though she has seen and suffered so much in the course of her long and eventful history that she is at times tempted to doubt her own identity, yet is she still the same Helen that makes immortal with a kiss. For all she has passed through has not availed to dim the glory of her beauty, but only to tinge it with a seriousness that is not sadness, making it, if possible, the more perfect.

Are Lynceus and Euphorion, then, representative abstractions? We have it on Goethe's own authority that in Euphorion there is a reference to modern poetry, and Mr. Carlyle sees in Lynceus "a schoolman philosopher or school philosophy itself in disguise." Others will have it that Lynceus represents the Goths who overthrew the Roman Empire. A very little ingenuity would be needed to invent other plausible hypotheses. But, after all, to what end? The critic has to do with Lynceus as he seems, not as he is or might be, in his disguise, not out of it. The lyric epic in which Lynceus describes the triumphant march of the heroes who came out of the East to spoil the West is equally spirited, however we understand it or misunderstand it. The character of Lynceus himself, restlessly ranging the earth in quest of things new and strange, his sleepless eyes ever toward the light, his clear vision clouded

only by excess of it, is sufficiently interesting to contemplate, without our endeavouring to theorise it. It cannot gain in objectivity by being explained as a type of this or that epoch, or a symbolical representation of such and such a mental tendency. As reasonably might one set about expounding the idea of Ariel.

In Euphorion "is personified poetry which is bound to neither time, place, nor person." Yet Euphorion is by no means a representative abstraction, but a genuine impersonation, whether he appear as the beautiful youth who drives the chariot of Plutus in the masque of the first act, scattering amongst the crowd profuse largess of jewels which turn to vermin in the hands that snatch them, or (as here in the Helena) exultant in armour, scaling mountains, spreading presumptuous wings to soar above the earth, and perishing by the fate of Icarus.

The fourth act is introductory to the fifth, and, though containing much vivid descriptive writing, and not a little fine satire, is intrinsically of less interest than any other act. We proceed accordingly to the fifth act, merely premising that Faust has now acquired, in return for services rendered to the emperor, a tract of marshy ground bordering on the sea. This he sets about reclaiming. In the course of carrying out his improvements, he improves an old-fashioned couple—Baucis and Philemon, who refuse compensation, and hold fast by the right of ownership—off the face of the earth. The life of these old people, their affection for the old house, linden grove, and church, their simplicity, their quiet stubbornness of passive resistance, are exhibited in the charming idyll with which the fifth act opens. No sooner has Faust heard that his hasty command has been executed to the letter, and that the old couple are dead, and house, and church, and wood in ashes, than "care enters his soul." The scene which describes the entrance of Care, and Faust's colloquy with her, is conceived in Goethe's freest and boldest manner. Four grey women, named respectively Want, Debt, Necessity, and Care, present themselves before his closed door. The three vanish; Care alone passes through the door into the room. In answer to Faust's challenge who she may be, she describes herself and her office in words of such ominous import as might make the stoutest heart quail. Faust, however, is proof against Care. He has still too firm a hold on the real world to quake before a spectre:

"Er stehe fest und sehe hier sich um,
Dem Tüchtigen ist diese Welt nicht stumm."

And though, as she announces that his end is come, she blinds him with a breath, his spirit is unbroken. He knows that his work is not yet done; he hopes to have yet time to do it. Though all is dark without, there is still daylight within him. He will work while it is day. In this spirit he totters out—to find his grave. As he gropes his way into the courtyard he hears the sound of spades, and supposing it is his workmen engaged on the ditching, damming, and draining operations which he has set on foot, he moves in the direction of the sound. In reality the workmen are Lemures, digging, under Mephistopheles' supervision, a grave for Faust. The song which the Lemures sing as they dig, recalls the song of the clown in the famous graveyard scene in *Hamlet*. The similarity in point alike of rhythm and meaning is probably no mere accident:

Wie jung ich war und lebt', und liebt',
Mich daücht das war wohl süsse
Wo's fröhlich klang und lustig ging
Da rührten sich meine Füsse

Nun hat das tuckische Alter mich
Mit seiner Krücke getroffen
Ich stolpert' über Grabes Thür
Warum stand sie just offen.*

Compare these lines with—

In youth when I did love, did love,
Methought it was very sweet,
To contract, O, the time, for, ah, my behove,
O methought there was nothing meet.

But age with his stealing steps
Hath clawed me in his clutch,
And hath shipped me intill the land,
As if I had never been such.

---

* In youth when I did live and love,
Methought it was very sweet!
Where frolic rang and mirth was free,
Thither still sped my feet.

Now with his crutch hath spiteful age
Dealt me a blow full sore;
I stumbled over a yawning grave:
Why open stood the door?

—From Miss Anna Swanwick's very meritorious version.

Faust does not catch the song; his mind is still occupied with his work. He calls Mephistopheles, and with tragic irony bids him press on with all speed, and slacken not until the task is done. For he longs to leave behind him such a substantial monument of his earthly existence as may outlast æons of time; and could he but live to see the pestilential marsh converted into solid land, and peace, plenty, and prosperity for many millions established where now is mere emptiness and desolation, then to the moment that assured him of such a consummation he might at length (so he thinks) venture to say, "Stay, thou art fair." So thinking he sinks back; the Lemures take and lay him out on the ground. His death is followed by a stoutly-contested battle between the forces of heaven and hell for the possession of his soul, which ends, of course, in the victory of heaven, and Faust is borne off by the angels.

As the poem began with a prologue in Heaven, so the epilogue is, if not actually in Heaven, at least in a sort of "land of Beulah," whence Heaven is visible. Than this last scene, which may be called the translation scene, there are few things in literature more sublime. The Divine Love which sustains all life, natural and spiritual, sent forth His angels to rescue the human soul whose earthly life was one consuming fire of love, and as they return, bringing Faust with them, there is joy in Heaven. There is an unutterable, calm beauty in the lyric chants which greet the return of the angels. In these hymns in praise of the "strong Son of God, Immortal Love," meet the ideals, so often thought incompatible, of strength and sweetness, majesty and grace, rapture and serenity. Margaret is discovered waiting for Faust. At the close of the Walpurgis-night's dream Mephistopheles pronounced her lost. Scarcely had he uttered the word when a voice from above proclaimed, "She is saved." The promise then given is in this last scene redeemed. We see Margaret, as on an earlier occasion, kneeling with head bowed in prayer. Then she prayed to the Mater Dolorosa; now it is to the Mater Gloriosa that she prays.

ART. VI.—*The Pulpit Commentary.* Edited by the REV. CANON SPENCE, M.A., and the REV. J. J. EXELL. "Nehemiah," Exposition by the REV. GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A.; "Homiletics," by the REV. G. A. WOOD, B.A.; "Homilies," by Various Authors. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1880.

THE reader of the Book of Nehemiah—the last of the historical books of the Old Testament—cannot fail to be struck with the peculiar character of the devotional element which pervades it. The devotion of Nehemiah is worthy to close the Old Testament; whether we understand the term devotion to mean the subjective spirit of devotedness, or its objective expression. The record is so entirely moulded by the religious habit of the writer, that we may trace his narrative along a regular series of prayers, longer or shorter; the movement of his story is, as it were, regulated by them. These peculiar acts of religion, indeed, serve to help the critic to analyse the book into sections written by Nehemiah himself, as it were, in extracts from his diary, and sections compiled by him or under his authority from other archives. Every single incident or event, down to a certain point, has in it or at its close an act of devotion, either an ejaculation or a set prayer. At a certain point this habit of the document disappears for a season; then it appears again where apparently the writer begins to write from his own remembrance or diary, and so it continues to the end. In fact, it is one of the "tokens" of Nehemiah's personality; as marked as some other characteristics of style and vocabulary. And no critic, determining or trying to determine the component elements of the book, can afford to lose sight of this feature of the writer as one of the leading tests which he has to apply.

Nehemiah performed the special task allotted to him in the Divine Presence; and in the Divine Presence he recorded what he had done. Of course it may be said that this was the case with some others of the ancient agents of the Divine will, such as David and Ezra and Daniel in the Old Testament, and the Apostle Paul in the New; but

he who examines this book will find that the example furnished by Nehemiah is in some respects unique. Its uniqueness rests upon the circumstance that the writer is one whose habit was that of mental or ejaculatory prayer: thinking aloud, as it were, in the Divine Presence, and talking to his God as a man talks to his friend. It is this which gives so indescribable a charm to those portions which Nehemiah himself wrote with his own hand. It is this which marks the book for a place of its own; there is no other which has the same peculiarity. The unknown Chronicler knows nothing of it. Samuel has nothing similar; nor has the Pentateuch in any of its parts, though here and there we note an approximation in Moses. The Prophets are without it. In the Psalms it is swallowed up, of course, by formal worship. But in Nehemiah we find its presence as a law of the composition, even as it was a law of his life. Every now and then we find him addressing an unseen Being with the pen in his hand, and writing down his appeal without any warning to the reader. There is no other instance on record of this kind of parenthetical, interjectional talking with the Supreme. Nowhere do we meet with anything to match his frank revelation of the best and worst of his nature. Nowhere have we such a picture of habitual reference to the Unseen. Nehemiah's thoughts and purposes he knew to be put into his heart by the God of heaven; he feels the pressure and guidance and approval of His "hand upon him for good:" when he is in perplexity or fear he straightway prays to his God, and says so; when his enemies plague him he simply tells his God, and leaves the matter with Him; when he does anything good, he reminds the Great Witness not to forget it; when he does what we of the Gospel might hardly approve, he as it were apologises for it to his Judge; and the last words of his narrative, with which he himself goes out of history, are "Remember me, O my God." His portion of the Bible is one beautiful and most suggestive exhibition of the habitual prayer of ejaculation. We shall devote a few pages to a study of this feature of the book; which, as we have said, will involve in some measure a sketch of his whole mission.

But it would be a mistake to say that this is the only devotion it contains. We must not suppose for a moment that the Old Testament ends all its wonderful revelation of general worship and solemn seasons and elaborate rites

by reducing all to the simplicity of this irregular and free outpouring of the heart. The truth is that the perfection of communion with heaven is such prayer as this based upon the habit of set devotion, offered with all its completeness of form. We have in this chronicle two great instances of this: one of them, at the beginning, showing us an individual, himself, offering it in a perfect litany; and the other, towards the close, showing us an entire people engaged in the same act. The latter we shall reach in time, though it will hardly come within our range; the former must occupy us at once.

Nehemiah was, like Daniel, one of the children of the Jewish dispersion; like Daniel, he was a lover of his people and longed for their redemption; like Daniel, he was a faithful worshipper of the true God; like Daniel, he was a favoured servant of the chief monarch of the world. But Nehemiah was destined for a service not appointed to Daniel; that of taking a prominent part in the reconstitution of the covenant people in their recovered land. He himself never refers directly to this high distinction; although he seems always to regard "the hand of his God upon him," as constantly shaping his course to that end. It is the rule of the records of Divine government to describe the vocation of all the chief agents of the Divine will; a rule richly illustrated throughout the two Testaments. Nehemiah's vocation is described with much simplicity. One of the cupbearers of Artaxerxes Longimanus, he was in attendance upon his master at the court in Susa; and evidently in high favour both with the king and with the queen. The measure of that favour was suddenly put to a severe test. Hanani, his brother, came from Jerusalem with certain men of Judah, and told him of the miserable state of the holy city. A general knowledge Nehemiah must have had already; but he was not aware that the good work of Zerubbabel and Ezra had been rendered so nearly abortive. He heard with dismay that, after all they had done for the temple, the city itself was surrounded by broken walls, and its inhabitants filled with "affliction and reproach." It came upon him as an inspiration that he was called to repair this evil. Meanwhile, all that he heard filled him with anguish; he mourned and wept and fasted and prayed day after day, with the Scriptures before him that predicted the calamities of his people, and pledged, nevertheless, the fidelity of

their God. The prayers he offered during this time are not recorded until the last, which is evidently the supplication by which he committed to God a project that by God's inspiration he had formed. It had Daniel's for its model, but it takes its expression from the sacred writings generally; and reveals to us the ground and secret of the habitual, colloquial prayer that we are now dwelling on. It is a prayer for himself on the eve of a great undertaking. But that undertaking was based upon the fidelity of Jehovah to His covenant with His people: that covenant, therefore, is the theme; the sins of himself and his fathers' house and of all generations of Israel are confessed, and the ancient promises are pleaded. Then at the close we have the remarkable descent to his own new project: "Prosper, I pray Thee, Thy servant this day, and grant him mercy in the sight of this man." The prayer is, as it were, offered up to God in the presence of the king; who, however, in that Higher Presence is only "this man." We can hardly help noticing already, and even in this stately supplication, the peculiarity of plain, straightforward, and almost abrupt simplicity that distinguishes the book generally and its devotions in particular: so far, that is, as they are Nehemiah's; the other great formal prayer is not his, but Ezra's. We are here prepared for what is to follow. The early part of the prayer is full and formal and rounded; as being, so to speak, an extract from the common liturgy of Israel. But before the end comes, we hear Nehemiah himself, gliding into his own familiar style. "Grant me mercy in the sight of this man." And, in this light, how simple is the word that immediately follows the prayer, "For I was the king's cupbearer:" a sentence that could hardly sound so natural in any other book of the Bible as it does in this.

The next scene is the critical one which is to decide Nehemiah's future course. He has resolved on the perilous experiment of asking long leave of absence from the court, and what amounted to the temporary governorship of Jerusalem. The alternative of death and life were before him: Persian princes usually carried these two extremes in their countenance when great favours were asked; and Artaxerxes, although, as Plutarch tells us, distinguished for mildness, was not really an exception. After meditating on his project three months, and sup-

pressing all that time the marks of sorrow, Nehemiah presented himself one day with trouble in his face. To be mournful in the light of the king's countenance was itself a sore offence; and when asked the cause the cupbearer was "very sore afraid." The supreme moment was coming. Nehemiah boldly told his secret; which was simply saying that no favour of his royal master could compensate him for the misery of the distant city of his fathers. Death was not in that reply; but would the answer to the next question be equally safe? "What is then thy request?" The supreme moment had now come. Nehemiah stood before the god of this earth; but he also stood before the Unseen God. He lifted up his heart, "So I prayed to the God of heaven," and all fear was gone. It was "given him in the same moment what he should say." Request after request followed: permission to build the city; to be absent a set time, probably a long one; to have an escort into Judah; credentials to the forest-keepers for the supply of all needful material. Let the words be well weighed that close this inimitable narrative. "And the king granted me, according to the good hand of my God upon me." This last phrase, peculiar to Ezra and Nehemiah, has long been incorporated into the language of devotion. To Nehemiah it meant that he felt himself under the direct guidance of an invisible Hand that directed him in everything. The "good Hand" was the "Hand of His goodness;" and every time the phrase occurs it is of the nature of an ejaculation of thanksgiving and trust combined. So it is here. When the young cupbearer "prayed to the God of heaven," it was because he knew that his God was upon earth also, ordering the things of men, and that His invisible Hand was upon himself for guidance and direction. He records the fact of his elevation of heart at this crisis for the benefit of all who read. It is nothing new in the history of God's servants; but there is something very striking and impressive in this particular mention of it. It brings the Supreme into most direct relation with a man in a time of emergency and fear. The whole tenour of the Bible goes to show that the good Hand is not limited to special agents of its will, such as Nehemiah was; that it is over every good man amidst the difficulties of his duty. But there is no history of the Divine dealings with men in the Bible which brings this truth so forcibly and so dramatically before us as this.

We presently find this pious commissioner of Jehovah's will in Jerusalem. Before entering he marked the enmity of some old foes of his people, but kept silence. Three days he meditated on his plans, still in silence: making a sad pilgrimage each night, with his secret in his thoughts, but not telling any "what God had put it in his heart to do." Not a word was said about the measures to be taken by others until he had decided on the measures he would take himself. We mark here what appears throughout the whole of this personal memorial: the consummate prudence and caution of this man of God. We saw it, or might have seen it, in his first sagacious approaches to the king; in his stipulation for escort, contrary to the precedent of Ezra; in his provision for the house he himself should "enter into;" in his cunning examination of the posture of things before any direct appeal. We shall see it again and again; as for instance in his most careful arrangements in the distribution of the work of building, that all the bands should be busy with the portions of the wall important to themselves; in his devolving the governorship in his absence upon his trusted brother; in his "setting a watch" while "making prayer" day and night; in his resolute forbearance from "requiring the governor's bread while the bondage was heavy upon the people;" in his keen detection of the craft of Sanballat's letters; in his skilful use of the genealogies; in his careful consideration for the Levites; and indeed everywhere throughout these records. But always we see that his religion is uppermost. When, at length, he disclosed his purpose at the set time to the rulers and "the rest that did the work," he first told them of "the hand of my God which was good upon me"—that is, of his assured Divine commission—and then also "of the king's words that he had spoken unto me." The will of God is always first. Even when, as a Jew, he denounced the ever-memorable three, Sanballat and Tobiah and Geshem, it was because he could say "the God of heaven He will prosper us." In fact, it is no other than a true instinct of exposition that has made these three names typical of all enemies of the Faith; and accepted the strong words, "Ye have no portion, nor right, nor memorial in Jerusalem," as part of the devotions of Nehemiah. It was not he, nor was it Ezra before him, who had refused to admit the Samaritans and Ammonites into confederacy with Israel, and rejected

all their office of aid. God, and not these servants of God, was responsible for that. There is no touch of scorn or personal contempt in this language: it was the simple truth that these men had nothing to do with the city and temple and people of God. He only told them what they already knew full well.

The next instance of ejaculatory prayer, or prayer interwoven with the narrative, brings us to a great internal evil which sorely taxed the resources of the governor's discretion and piety, but issued in the conspicuous manifestation of both. During the progress of the work a sudden outbreak of complaint from the men and women of the city required everything to be suspended until it was settled. The scene, as described, is a very strange and embarrassing one. While the wall was in progress Nehemiah's ears were greeted by a "great cry" from the poor, representing that they had been obliged to mortgage their little possessions, and pledge their sons and daughters, for bread. Nehemiah "consulted with himself" — his thoughtful, interior, devout habit appearing here as everywhere—and resolved to come to an understanding with the rulers and nobles upon their practice of usury. This he made a very religious business. He rebuked the extortion and oppression of the rich; set before them his own example of disinterestedness, which is dilated upon and proved at great length; implored them to make restitution and offend no more; and confirmed all by a solemn oath exacted from the nobles in the presence of the priests. With the entire narrative, which is deeply interesting, we have not to do, save so far as it brings out what many have supposed to be an instance of Nehemiah's self-complacent eulogy of his own conduct and appeal to the gratitude of God. He does, indeed, dwell at length on the principle that had governed him during twelve years of administration—for he is adding these reflections to the original account: he plainly says how different it was from that of other governors; and mentions how large had been his daily hospitality, and that he had given of his own substance to the people instead of receiving anything from them. It is easy enough to misinterpret all this. But the candid reader will mark the exquisite simplicity of the account, every word of which breathes purity of motive and fearless honesty. It was necessary that Nehemiah should explain the justice of the argument that had so much

weight with the rulers; it was fitting also that he should justify the severity of his measures; and it was expedient for the public good that he should record his own example for the guidance of others. But he himself gives the redeeming circumstance in his own words when he says: "So did not I, because of the fear of God." We must give him the full benefit of that testimony to himself; what a man does in the fear of God—in Nehemiah's meaning of the word—he would not be likely to record to his own praise. He was a disinterested governor—a rare thing in those days or in any days—and he is not afraid to say so. And doubtless it was "in the fear of God" that he lifted up his heart and said as he wrote: "Think upon me, my God, for good, according to all that I have done for this people." If there still seems to be an evil odour in this prayer, let it be remembered that "according to" is rather forced upon the original; it is "Remember for good what I have done," or, rather, "Put a good construction on what I have done." The whole transaction is one of the most deeply religious —if we may say so, where all is religious—in the history. Nehemiah was never more highly approved of by his God than when he asked for this favourable remembrance. To this people God had sent him; he had done his duty; he asked no gratitude from them; but there was One who would not forget him.

Nehemiah proceeds to record two little episodes which had made a deep impression on his mind; the two final stratagems of his old foes to undo his work and ruin his character. Each seems to be an extract from what we might call his journal, so literally copied in that the pious ejaculation of the moment goes with it unaltered, and thus producing a strange effect on the text.

In the first of these, Sanballat and his Arabian colleague in mischief sent four successive messages to induce him to meet them in a village of the plain of Ono. Each time they receive the same quiet answer, which has been the text of many a sermon: "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down." The fifth time a letter came by a servant, open so that on its way many might read it, which gave Nehemiah to understand that he was slanderously reported by Gashmu—to the effect that he, with the Jews, was conspiring to throw off the Persian yoke; and that to this end prophets were appointed to win favour for his name as the king in Judah. The letter

represented the great danger Nehemiah would incur if this should reach the king's ears, and once more invited him to a friendly counsel on the subject. The answer sent was that Sanballat had invented the whole thing. At the close of the account the writer adds that the device was to weaken his hands through fear. And then follows the remarkable little prayer, taking up the word weaken: "Now, therefore, strengthen my hands!" The words "O God" are not in the original; but there can be no doubt that the apostrophe is an ejaculatory prayer, as it were, written at the time, and copied years afterwards when the whole matter was long passed and settled. That being so, it is simply the swiftest and most natural and most unconventional instance of mental prayer put into words that the Bible contains. It is as if the record was written as before in the Divine Presence; and the prayer which suddenly goes up from his heart, in which there is hardly time even to append the customary "O my God," is put down as it arises. This may seem a forced explanation; but it is the only natural one, and any other that may be substituted is much more violent. Many of the old translations interpret: "So I strengthened my hands all the more;" but the simple text, as we read it, gives no countenance to that interpretation, indeed will not tolerate it. It may be said that in writing long afterwards the historian put in the prayer that he then offered, omitting the words "So I then said;" or even that when writing long afterwards he prayed, in the remembrance of past danger, "Strengthen mine hands still." But how much more natural is the interpretation which makes it a pure transcript from the fleeting devotion of the moment, sudden rather than fleeting, and gives one more illustration of Nehemiah's never-failing habit of ejaculatory prayer.

This little plot having failed, another and different attempt was made to bring Nehemiah into discredit. There was evidently a party among the Jews who secretly gave Tobiah and Sanballat help: either instigated by jealousy or corrupted by bribes. In this party were found prophets and prophetesses and priests, between whom and Tobiah, connected with them by marriage, there was a brisk correspondence by letters. These traitors strove on the one hand to propitiate Nehemiah, on behalf of Tobiah, by reporting his "good deeds;" and on the other they kept Tobiah acquainted with all that Nehemiah did and

projected. One of them, the priest Shemaiah, was bribed to act the part of a prophet and predict to the governor that he would be slain on a certain night. Having a priest's right to enter the temple, he offered to make Nehemiah secure there. Possibly Nehemiah thought of the "old prophet" and his doom. He "considered" the matter, and at once it was, as it were, revealed to his mind: "God had not sent him." But not before he had positively refused to commit such an act of cowardice and sin by entering the temple to save his life. Nehemiah shows at this point all the force of his peculiar character. "They thought to make me fear! they thought to make me sin!" are his two reflections; and under their combined influence he gives vent to his exultation over the dismay of those who sought to make him afraid. He sees them "cast down in their own eyes;" and he is glad, not so much because of their discomfiture, as because "they perceived that this work was wrought by my God." He dismisses his enemies from his record and leaves them with their Judge. "My God, think Thou upon Tobiah and Sanballat according to these their works!" It is important to ask when this remembrance was addressed to the Divine judgment. If it was first written when Nehemiah in old age put together these memorials, it would seem as if he solemnly invoked upon them, long after their short rebellion was over, the vengeance of Jehovah. And there would be nothing inconsistent with psalm and prophecy, with the Old or with the New Testament, in this language; supposing it, as we suppose it, to have been the utterance of one living and speaking in the Spirit of God, and in perfect sympathy with the justice as well as with the mercy of the Supreme. We have examples both before and after Nehemiah that ought to suppress any rash criticism of his words: even though we do not include in their example one higher than David and St. Paul and St. John. Still we may be reasonably desirous, notwithstanding St. Paul's instance, to save Nehemiah's memory from the imputation of having recorded his prayer, when probably these enemies of God and His cause had passed to their account. The Vulgate reads, "Memento mei, Domine, pro Tobia et Sanballat;" but this is a needless evasion of a supposed difficulty. The words were evidently, like the preceding "Strengthen my hands" in the record of the governor, written when the events occurred, and the closing "who

would have put me in fear" are in precisely the same relation to the past as "I perceived that God had not sent him." With this note, thus leaving the matter to God, that fragment of the record ends: the next words are, "So the wall was finished." Nehemiah leaves Jehovah's enemies to Jehovah Himself. It is remarkable that he never indulges in any personal sentiment, nor uses any epithet, concerning these men. He met their cunning by cunning of his own; he answered their hypocritical requests by quiet reasoning; he says plainly what he thought of their wicked designs; but he never pronounced on them even that kind of malediction which was pronounced upon the Jews who intermarried with the heathen. It is very observable that in the case of two classes of men Nehemiah seemed always to avoid "railing accusation," contenting himself with "The Lord rebuke thee!" The high priests and priests we shall see were consigned to the remembrance of God when they disgraced their order: their office shielded them, as it were, from any tribunal but the Divine. So Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem were sent forward to the same tribunal: as if they too were culprits too high for any but the Supreme Judge to deal with. Accordingly this triumvirate has always in the tradition of the Church represented the enemies of God's house. This is their memorial for ever. In this sense God has remembered them. They are linked with Pharaoh and Sennacherib and Holofernes and Herod and the Antichrist for all ages. It is lawful for us to think that Nehemiah wrote this prayer as the organ of the Holy Ghost, who Himself gave them their place in the historical annals of revelation. But that being so, the interjection of this prayer must then be regarded as an instance of that habit of Nehemiah which we are now considering: that of both acting and recording what he acted in the presence of God, and telling Him all his thoughts.

At this point we lose for a time the direct hand of Nehemiah. It is impossible to determine what relation he bears to the narrative of the reformations that followed the building of the wall: suffice that the style is in many respects different from that which begins and closes the book; and in nothing is the difference more manifest than in the entire absence of those interjectional devotions which we have been observing. But there was high devotion of another kind, in which the governor of the state

took his appropriate place. Supreme in one sense still, Nehemiah in the great art of national religion that now follows was, in another sense, subordinate. Ezra, who seems to have returned just at this time after long absence, returning to find many of the evils which he had rebuked still too prevalent, now appears on the scene as the spiritual director of the people's worship. The combination of their functions is made very striking by the new title of Tirshatha given to the governor; by his name occurring first; and by his being conjoined with Ezra and the Levites in the exhortations given to the first assembly. It must have been a glad day to the pious and zealous governor when he heard the people themselves demand to hear the law; and, himself the foremost among them, listened hour after hour to the reading and exposition. This the first day of New Jerusalem must not be saddened by sorrow; and it was Nehemiah who took the lead in commanding the weeping people to be joyful. We hear, as it were, his voice in the honest words: "The joy of the Lord is your strength." On the second day they all found that at that very time they ought to be keeping the feast of Tabernacles; and straightway they prepared their booths and kept the seven days in a style that had not been known since the days of Joshua. After the feast followed the fast, which had been forbidden before: the day of atonement apparently having been either included in the feast of Tabernacles, or on this occasion postponed. The Great Covenant was signed, after confessions and prayers and humiliation before God, the first name that signed it being that of Nehemiah, the Tirshatha. All this, however profoundly interesting in the commentary on the book, does not enter into our present scope. We do not hear the ejaculations, though doubtless they were lifted up often enough.

It is hard to say where the hand of Nehemiah again appears, or where the extracts from his tablets recommence. But his well-known "I" creeps gradually into the story, and with it his well-known habit of talking to his God as he writes. We first recover his individuality in the touching account of the dedication of the wall, where Ezra and Nehemiah—for ever united in the history of revelation—appear together for the last time. The intervening chapters are strictly composed of lists copied in for purposes it is not here necessary to dwell upon. As they end

with "in the days of Nehemiah the governor, and Ezra the priest and scribe," we may presume that they were inserted, or as we may say copied, into his narrative by Nehemiah himself or by his secretary. But the dedication of the wall is described in the old familiar style: the dignity as well as the humility of the writer are very conspicuous. The priests and the Levites purified themselves and the people and the gates and the wall, before the governor had any pre-eminence. But this was a new proceeding: there was no precedent for the dedication of a wall; and Nehemiah, making Solomon's dedication of the temple his pattern, ordered the festival of the day in his own style. The clergy and the laity were mixed, and then divided into two processions; one of which was led by Ezra, the other followed by Nehemiah. If the details are studied, in connection with the chapter that describes the course of the wall, a very beautiful picture is the result. Taking two directions, the two companies meet in the Lord's house. The praise that went up to Jehovah is recorded by the writer in such a style as to show how lasting an impression it made on his mind. The day was the crowning triumph of his life. In what follows in his narrative, there is blended with his memory of service much that was humiliating; much, as we shall see, that drives him, while he is penning the record, to take refuge in the Divine forbearance and mercy. His joy in the work of the Lord was still his strength, as before; but the joy was much mingled with sadness, so unworthily did the people follow up the holy resolves of the sealing and dedication. But as yet he had nothing but gladness in his experience. God alone was magnified. When "the cry of Jerusalem was heard afar off," it was God who "made them rejoice with great joy." It was not Nehemiah; there was no self-complacency in that "and I" which the reader observes. "Ezra, the scribe, was before them," "and I after them;" that is the order. The devotion of Nehemiah has no more touching memorial than the events of this, the brightest day in his life.

And now we come to the last fragment of this history, which is, every word of it, written by Nehemiah, and, if we might say so, on his knees or under the immediate supervision of heaven; with a remarkable combination of self-approval and self-distrust, both leading him to make a direct appeal to his Judge. During his absence from his

charge—the reason for which is not given, as Nehemiah's own personal history is a matter of no importance in his account—many abuses sprang up. These he felt to be a flagrant dishonour to his own former administration; humbling him, as Ezra had been humbled in the same way. They were a bitter disappointment; which must be remembered when we witness the anger that he displayed. But he felt them all the more, because the evil practices which stared him in the face after years of absence were, some of them, the very practices which the people had "sealed" themselves not to commit. But most of all he resented them for the contempt they involved of the house and worship of God. No one can read this history with an unprejudiced eye and not see that the honour of Jehovah was the standard by which Nehemiah estimated everything, public and private. Three crying evils are referred to in the closing section, and his stern method of dealing with them.

The first brings before us Tobiah once more, though indirectly. The high priest Eliashib—passed over in comparative silence out of respect to his office—had set the example of dishonouring God's house by letting the Ammonite, related to him by marriage, take possession of some of the outer chambers. From some of these had been removed all the sacred provisions needed for the temple; they had been made into one "great chamber," where Tobiah, the old enemy, was installed, or at any rate his household stuff. Nehemiah places this abuse first. He records, without a word about Tobiah, whom he had already dismissed into God's memory, that he ordered every vestige of his property to be cast forth, and the place purified from the defilement; adding here no apology either to heaven or earth. He does not stoop to make any remark about his old enemy, the man who had himself done him, and who had instigated his master Sanballat to do him, so much personal wrong. It is obvious that the circumstance is only mentioned because of what follows. The scandalous impropriety of giving this Ammonite a town residence in Jerusalem, and that in the courts of the temple, was only part of a wider system of iniquity. In the course of his examination of this matter, Nehemiah "perceived" that the services of the Levites and singers were suspended because their means of subsistence were cut off. The "rulers," representing the wealth of the com-

munity, had in Nehemiah's absence kept back the tithes; the Levites, who had the care of the ordinances, had been obliged to go down to their farms or plots of ground for their own sustenance; and the house of God, instead of being a busy scene of service and sacrifice, had become a solitude. This was a frightful contrast to the earlier days of Nehemiah's administration, and needed vigorous measures. The account is very brief, containing only a few notes; but we gather that the governor had a severe contest with the rulers, in which he was perfectly successful. The treasurers, who had been appointed before, but had forgotten their office, were reappointed with the addition of a layman from the nobles, and provision made for the permanent care of the temple; a provision, traces of which go down to the times of the Gospel history. The treasurers were men "counted faithful," and they were "to distribute to their brethren;" so that the layman, a necessary guarantee in the treasurership, was not in this arrangement the actual distributor. So much for Nehemiah's order for the house of God itself. At the close of his account, he makes, after his manner, a solemn appeal to that God as the God of his life and all its actions. "Remember me, O my God, concerning this, and wipe not out my good deeds that I have done for the house of my God, and for the observations thereof." He who can regard this as the expression of self-complacency, or as stipulating for "posthumous fame," does not know Nehemiah. And he who condemns this as the utterance of a hireling or a mercenary spirit, does not understand the terms on which the Lord permits His faithful servants to stand to Him. If God keeps that "book of remembrance," of which Malachi spoke not long afterwards, and if He reminds His people of this to strengthen their fortitude and confirm their devotion, then every good and faithful man may delight in the thought of having his deeds written there. To make humility surrender this privilege is to pervert humility. But it may be said that it is one thing for the Lord to promise His remembrance, or to announce that "His reward is with Him, to give to every man as his work shall be;" and quite another for the servant to stipulate for the remembrance of his acts. The only reply is that Nehemiah seems to have thought the same. For he only asks to be remembered "concerning this," leaving it, after all, to the Divine estimate and not his own; and further, he ex-

pressly qualifies his words and adds, "Wipe not out my good deeds that I have done:" as if any one of his own faults out of a thousand might have availed, if the Judge were rigorous, to blot out the memory of all that he desired should be remembered. The two clauses make the prayer perfect; and it is not right on the part of some critics of Nehemiah's ethics, that they fasten upon the former and neglect the latter.

The second vigorous act of reforming zeal was a vindication of the Sabbath. The holy day was desecrated in the city and in the country; not only the grain that might be necessary, and perishable fish, but wine, and "all kinds of ware," were brought commercially into the streets on the holy day. It was not simply that the Syrians dwelling in Jerusalem were suffered to carry on their trade; but the simple countrymen in Judah forgot the day of rest. In this, as in the matter of the Levites, Nehemiah looked at the nobles as the most guilty parties: it was their extravagance and luxury, on the one hand, that encouraged the traffic; and, on the other, it was their neglect that had strengthened the abuse. The contention with the nobles was renewed: indicating that these had their arguments to bring, the nature of which many passages of the prophets enable us to imagine. The prompt action that followed is graphically described. As before, the honour of God is first; then comes the appeal to their fear lest the Divine judgments should return; then a guard is put to keep every profane foot from the gates during the holy day; then those are threatened who still lingered about the walls in hope of furtive entrance. "If ye do so again I will lay hands on you"—hands that had no "doubting" in them, though no little "wrath." When the practice was entirely suppressed, and the streets of Jerusalem were still on the day of rest, Nehemiah relieved his own servants and threw the burden of protecting the fourth commandment on the Levites, who must purify "themselves" to do their duty, as it was one of peculiar sanctity. Then follows the appeal to his God once more. "Remember me, O my God, concerning this also, and spare me according to the greatness of Thy mercy." That deep feeling of his own sinfulness, which was never wanting, here finds expression. In the instance we have just had—the case of Tobiah's ejection, or that of his goods, from the precincts of the temple, and the re-establishment of the

Levites in their rights—we do not find this humble addition: that was a good work which did not bring to Nehemiah's mind any fault of his own; it was an act of holy decision which he was well pleased to keep in the Divine memory; and in the discharge of this duty there had been no intermingling of human feeling. But, as to the matter of the Sabbath, his retrospect is slightly different. The thought of the holy day brought him, as it were, into the more immediate presence of the holiness of Jehovah. In regard to this commandment that he vindicated, he was not faultless himself; he could not think of the supreme worship it demanded without a consciousness of his own shortcomings. Moreover, he had been obliged in his zeal to do what was itself very like a violation of the Sabbath rest; and his hearty threats still rankled in his mind. Hence this conscientious, true-hearted, and sensitive man cries here and here only: "Spare me according to the greatness of Thy mercy."

One more rank abomination remained. It has been recorded in the beginning of the final chapter that a great reform had taken place through the reading of the law; all the mixed multitude were separated from Israel, that is, the strange women and their offspring were put away, even as on the great Fast the people had separated themselves from the stranger. Much importance was attached to the exclusion of the Ammonite and the Moabite until the tenth generation had cleansed away their defilement; but the "for ever" of the original ordinance—meaning that the ordinance should stand "for ever"—was now in later Judaism applied to the eternal exclusion of the heathen, a development of bigotry that enters largely into its later contest with the Gospel, and was swept away in the final triumph of that Gospel. In the reform of Nehemiah there was a profound necessity for strict interpretation of the law for the time that then was. The literal wall around Jerusalem was absolutely necessary for the defence of the temple and polity of Judaism, and the accomplishment of the purposes of Jehovah in keeping this people separate from the nations, and the preservation of the people from intermixture with heathen nations, was a wall of another kind that was equally necessary in the estimation of the God of Israel. This question, in fact, came now to the forefront, and was one of the leading questions of these generations. This last historical record

agrees with Malachi, the last prophetic record, in assigning tremendous importance to it; and when Nehemiah watched the people in the outskirts—for the words mean, "I looked after the Jews"—and heard their children speaking a language that savoured of Ammon and Moab and Philistia, he saw the germ of an evil that would do more to bring about a melting of the covenant race among the nations than even the captivity or the breaking down of the city walls. It was not the spirit of hatred towards the land of Sanballat and Tobiah and Gashmu that animated him. He was simply the administrator of a Divine law, which forbade the mixing of this nation with other nations. Probably he knew little about the supreme reason which kept Judah apart until the fulness of time. We who comment on his conduct know very little more ourselves. Certainly there seems something stern, if not ruthless, in the conduct of the governor, though nothing of the "arbitrariness" that Colenso ascribed to him; as what he did was done according to law. He contended with the transgressors, who had not only forgotten the laws of Deuteronomy, but had also broken the more recent covenant entered into under Ezra, and the still more recent covenant made under his own administration. It is true that he "reviled" them, and had them beaten, and their hair plucked from their heads. This seems hard enough, but it must be remembered that he might have done worse, as his powers were scarcely limited in any sense; that we know nothing about the peculiar character of this punishment, nor about the exasperating conduct that rendered this indignity justifiable; and finally, that he was protected by the privileges of zealotry when this "whip of small cords" was, as it were, in his hand. It was his zeal for the Lord God of Hosts that prompted him. He appeals to the miserable example of Solomon, who sinned through "outlandish women." He shows plainly that what moved him most was the attempt of these men to persuade their hearers to think lightly of the offence, and thus to tempt others to sin. "Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God?" What follows is very pithy and very suggestive and very solemn. Nehemiah's respect for the priesthood and the Levites is marked throughout his narrative, as we have seen. The defection of the family of Eliashib touched him keenly. Not a word does he say about the aged delinquent himself,

who was connected by marriage with Tobiah; but he remarks that one of his grandsons was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite. This must have taxed him sorely. It was a severe calamity that the high-priestly line should be thus defiled. It was grievous that the offence should be committed with the stock of Sanballat. "Therefore I chased him from me;" that is, he pronounced on this youth the sentence of banishment. He drove them all from his own presence, but that is not all. He invoked on them the judgment of God in the style familiar throughout the Scripture; a judgment, however, that of course had reference only to the earthly tribulations that were the desert of such a crime. "Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood and of the Levites."

This "Remember" in connection with the third reform is diverted from himself by the holy indignation which cannot allow sin in holy things to be unpunished. It is turned aside in passing to the greatest offenders with whom Nehemiah had to do: "Remember them, O my God!" But the word was intended for himself, after all, and is only postponed for a few moments. The few words that intervene take up the subject again, and continue it as being still the record of the work given him to do. They contain, in a line or two, the whole sum of the governor's work during his second visit, so far as it related to the honour of God's house and the functions of its officers: the common people with whom the reformer had dealt so rigorously are no longer thought of, but the ministers of the sanctuary are alone in his thoughts. His final report of his mission with regard to them is summed up under two heads. First, he cleansed them from all strangers: one was banished, and the rest were required, in imitation of Ezra, to give up their heathen wives. How much anxiety and labour this required he does not say: this he leaves to the remembrance of his Master in heaven. Secondly, he appointed the offices both of priests and Levites: that is, he took order for the regular discharge of these duties, so far as concerned the provision for the temple, which alone fell under his supervision as the civil ruler. One thing he especially mentions, the care he took of the Wood-offering, which he mentions as his own arrangement, one of the fruits of his own legislation: in old time it was not necessary; but the gradual removal of forests

rendered it important that men should be charged, at certain periods of the year, to bring fuel for the maintenance of the sacred fires. This was Nehemiah's own addition to the statutes; but what follows was only a reformation. The firstfruits had been neglected; and thus the very foundation of the economy of tithes had been undermined. Nehemiah took order for the cure of that radical abuse. That is, he did what in him lay: Malachi, alas, must give his evidence with what effect. Instead, however, of dilating on his labours for God's house and its decent service, the humble servant of Jehovah simply appeals once more to his Master: "Remember me, O my God, for good." He had not said, "Remember these defilers of the priesthood for evil:" they were simply consigned to the just judgment of God for their discipline. "For good" he hopes himself to be remembered: not for reward; but, as in the prayer that went before, simply and solely for the exercise of the Divine clemency and goodness.

We cannot but feel the pathos of these words as Nehemiah's exit from the scene on which he had played so conspicuous a part. The reader who is content with a fleeting glance at the history, and receives only a general impression of this great man's work; who knows little more about him than that he was a colleague of the greater Ezra in re-establishing the polity of Judah after the captivity; that is to say, who is acquainted with him just as he is acquainted with other leading names of the Old Testament—will hardly sympathise with our feeling. He comes to the end of the book, and feels when he reads the last word that the writer is simply taking his pious farewell as becomes a man of God, though not without a touch of wonder at the peculiarity of the close. But we would advise the reader to read his Bible—Old Testament and New—in a different style from this. He should give Nehemiah—for it is with him we have now to do—a careful and affectionate study from the first word to the last: by all means in the original and with the old versions around him. He will then contract a personal love for this ancient governor: a sentiment that no other inspires, not even Ezra, besides Daniel and himself. Daniel does inspire it, though not to the same extent: there is something so high and so utterly beyond the round of mere human experiences in his pages, that we keep far from Daniel in awe, while we find in him the "man greatly

beloved." But the diligent student of Daniel feels himself enchained after all to the man; and his heart is moved by the way in which his history closes. "Go thy way, Daniel; thou shalt stand in thy lot in the end of the days" has an indescribable pathos, which every devout reader feels. Our hero, Nehemiah, seems to have remembered that scene well. And before he closes his record, whether or not conscious that he was writing what would be had in everlasting remembrance, he asks to be remembered as Daniel was. We cannot help saying, with the sound of that wonderful "Amen, Amen" of ch. ix. in our ears, Amen to his prayer.

Nor can we fail to remember, as we say it, that we are really taking our farewell of the whole series of historical writers who have left us the Old Testament. And that suggests the other thought, that the next history we shall read is that of the Blessed Gospels, describing the course of Him who came to lay the foundations of a new and better temple, to gather from the nations a new and better Israel, and to give them a new and better city than Jerusalem to dwell in. And we ask, what was the relation of Nehemiah's narrative to this new creation? The answer, if given rightly, is one of immense interest to the commentator on this book, and to the student of the character of Nehemiah. Not a word that he wrote is directly quoted in the New Testament. But he was one of its forerunners. He wrought a work which had very great importance in the ancient kingdom of God, without which, indeed, the continuity of the Divine order would have been broken. But that is an idle word; of that may be said what was said of the Scripture, it "cannot be broken." Nehemiah's work could not but be done. His reformation was necessary, were it only to prepare the scene for the fulness of time. Though the New Testament does not remember him by name, it abounds with memorials that he had lived; for he was one of the chief founders of that later Judaism in the midst of which our Lord lived, and moved, and had His being. Moreover, though the later Testament does not quote him, it throws a rich and steady light upon the typical meaning of all that he suffered and accomplished for the cause of God. The entire history of Christian exegesis bears witness to the instinct which has discerned in the labours and hardships and triumphs of this ancient builder of the

wall and restorer of worship in Jerusalem an example for the builders and reformers and guardians of the Christian Church in times of decline and danger.

What we mean may be best illustrated by a reference to the book which heads this article. Its peculiarity is that it opens out the treasures of the histories of Ezra and Nehemiah for the use of the Christian preacher; the only book known to us that does so on so full a scale. This work we cannot review at large. In fact, the notes above were written before it reached our hands, and a few remarks upon it are added by way of appropriate supplement. It is a volume of what is by this time pretty well known as *The Pulpit Commentary*, edited by Canon Spence and Mr. Exell, a Methodist minister. In all respects this is a very excellent contribution to exegetical literature. It contains Ezra, and Nehemiah, and Esther, and treats them, we may say, exhaustively, if we may judge by a rather careful study of Nehemiah. The greater part of the matter consists of homiletic sketches and suggestions, based upon an exceedingly close analysis of the book. For ourselves, we have no special pleasure in the abundant homiletic material that is given in some commentaries, such, for instance, as Lange's, which are not professedly for the preacher. This, however, is avowedly for the preacher's use, and he will find himself assisted, almost too abundantly, at every point. It ought to be added, in justice to the work, that some of the homiletic expositions are really as much expository as homiletic; that is, they really throw a considerable light upon the difficulties of the text. Perhaps they go too far in the way of accommodation to Christian purposes—an error of excess in the right direction which will help to neutralise the opposite error, only too prevalent in the treatment of these three books of Holy Scripture. Finally, and this is the best thing we have to say of this handsome and well-edited volume, the Commentary proper, with Introduction, from the hand of Professor Rawlinson, is the model of what such a work should be; it is, in fact, for its extent, the most satisfactory, readable, and useful exposition of Nehemiah that we know. We are very thankful to possess it, and wish the editors all success in an undertaking which does them honour.

ART. VII.—*Minutes of Several Conversations at the One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Yearly Conference of the People called Methodists.* London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1880.

IT is needless to apologise for devoting a few pages to the subject of this article. Many of our readers may, indeed, think that they have heard and read enough about the Methodist Conference for one year; and reserve their interest for renewal at Liverpool, in 1881. Others, however, will welcome some general retrospective reflections now that all is over. Moreover, we write for a considerable number who may be presumed to be little acquainted with the abundant current literature of the Conference proceedings. Lastly, and this is a main reason for penning these lines, we hope to say what may profitably be read not only by members of this community, but by others who watch them from without.

We use the conventional word "Conference;" but, strictly speaking, there have been two: one the Conference proper, the lineal continuation of those gatherings with which old City Road was so familiar, in which John Wesley and his coadjutors conversed about the work of God committed to them; and the other a recent creation, known as the "Mixed," or the "Lay," or the "Representative" Conference, administering the financial and economical affairs of the Body. These two are perfectly distinct, and yet closely connected. They are distinct: the former has to do with the relations of the ministry to each other, and to the flock as their teachers and pastors and overseers; the latter is occupied from beginning to end with the institutions of Methodism as such. They are, nevertheless, interwoven with each other: they are under one President, they both have legislative and administrative functions, both overlook the Society affairs of the Connexion, they have a common interest in its religious prosperity, and the proceedings of each are ratified by the same court of One Hundred. Why then do they meet apart, each constituting itself annually with perfect dis-

tinctness? Simply because in maturing the great change that has so lately taken place, Methodism, in its ministry and its laity, has been faithful to its original charter and to the Word of God. Neither the one of these nor the other has been, it may boldly be affirmed, violated by the new order of things. The old Conference remains as supreme as it ever was, though disencumbered of many too heavy responsibilities, and effectually aided as it never was before. Anomalies there doubtless are, which would scarcely endure keen scrutiny. Such would be reckoned by some the fact that the one word Conference covers both, suggesting to the outer world that there is one assembly, from the commencement when the President is chosen to the end when all is ratified. Others would deem it an anomaly that many matters, scarcely to be distinguished from the government of the Church, are decided upon by men not ordained even as Lay Elders, who help to legislate without any such sense of abiding responsibility as Scripture implies to be necessary to such a function. It would be easy to multiply these departures from the highest ideal in the new economy. But it is more becoming to work on in hope that they will create their own rectification.

We write this immediately after reading the Reports of the Proceedings in the Commission of the Scotch General Assembly, in the case of Professor Robertson Smith. There we have the Conference of the Presbyterian Church; and find that some of the most influential speakers on the question of supposed heresy are what we should call laymen. In fact, there is no ecclesiastical legislation or administration which is complete without their presence and concurrence. But then it must be remembered that, though we might call them laymen, they do not so call themselves. The theory of their Church does not so regard them. They are called and chosen and separated to this responsibility, as Elders appointed to govern the flock in conjunction with those who are appointed also to teach and instruct it. The Scotch Presbyterian system has its anomalies, which are really more critical than those that beset Methodism. At the present time some of the gravest questions that can agitate the heart of a Christian community, are publicly and privately discussed by clergy and laity with equal freedom. That they are privately discussed is matter of course in all Churches. But they are publicly discussed in the Scotch Assembly,

with its Commission and Committees, by ministers and non-ministers, by theologians and non-theologians, alike. The most important speculations, as subtle as they are important, are brought into the heated atmosphere of a public meeting and dealt with by men, many of whom have no faculty, natural or acquired, for examining them. As this matter is treated elsewhere in this REVIEW it is needless to dwell on it here. Suffice that it is an anomaly that the Methodist system of Church government cannot be charged with. The question of the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of a theological professor has never been, and can never be, introduced into the Second Conference. That ssembly would feel itself aggrieved by the very suggestion of such a thing. Looking round on its members, and noting whence they come and what their occupations are, and the nature and limits of their annual trust, it would tself be the foremost to disavow any such responsibility, thankful that the maintenance of the faith is in such good and faithful hands. To speak the honest truth on this matter—not the first time that it has been spoken in this journal—the new constitution of the Methodist Conference has tended more than ever to hedge about the ministerial order and to ensure to it its Scriptural functions and duties and rights. In old time, the very fact that it included in its province such a bewildering variety of merely financial and quasi-secular affairs led to some suspicion as to the validity of its claims generally; or might have led to such suspicion. It was or might have been always an open question whether the governing body as a whole, and in all its functions, ought not to be liberalised. But such a question cannot emerge now. It has been agitated, pondered and settled. The things of Cæsar have been rendered to Cæsar.

It is very generally understood that the laymen of the Connexion are content with their position. They have no sympathy with the notion of Calvin, that some elders may be ordained to govern without having the charge of Word and sacraments; nor has it ever entered their minds to covet any factitious and unreal orders of that nature. They desire to be laymen, and nothing more, having an equal share of burden and responsibility in all matters that concern the ways and means of the work of Christianity. No one can read the reports of their recent gathering without marking the enthusiasm with which many address

themselves to their business, bringing to it the same energy and practical sagacity which they show in their private affairs. It is sufficiently evident that their new status is valued by them, and that there is no need to stimulate them to their duty. There were not wanting prophets of evil who prognosticated that when the charm of novelty had worn off the lay representatives would soon leave their seats vacant, and let the new order of things languish by default. Such prophecies will be heard no more. These representatives have shown themselves in the recent Conference to be in deep earnest. Indeed, some of them seem, judging by the public prints, to have shown almost an excess of zeal in their suggestions, and hints of motions, for revising the economical business of the Connexion. Such excess of zeal must be expected in the younger members, and pardoned in the older. In either case it is at the worst a venial error, and will in the long run do good..

But this introduces a topic that must have a fresh paragraph. According to the reports, the winding-up of what is well known as the Thanksgiving Fund, received a considerable amount of discussion, issuing in a determination that its accounts should not be closed until the sum of three hundred thousand guineas shall have been reached; a sum which will enable the Connexion to free itself from all existing financial embarrassments, and set out afresh, as it were, with an undistracted mind. This decision was not reached, however, without much argument for and against. The debate was in every sense a typical one, fairly representing the spirit and manner of the new Conference. An analysis of it is not without interest. The great majority evidently regarded the Fund as literally an oblation, a freewill and supernumerary oblation of gratitude for the peaceful establishment of the new order of things; and it was very honourable to the minority on that point that not a single remark was made in demur. A considerable number never desired the new order, and therefore have not given this special proof of gratitude; but they are, nevertheless, among the most liberal contributors to the fund, and will heartily join in the endeavour to make its issue and consummation triumphant. Their loyalty to the movement should have great weight with those many men of influence and wealth who have hitherto withheld their assistance: who, in fact, if they would only act in the same spirit, could at once place the fund at its

highest point of aspiration, and very much more than that. But it was remarkable with what unanimity the conclusion was reached that this great presentation to God should not lose its character as a perfect freewill offering. It was agreed that no one who has kept aloof should be urged or even appealed to on its behalf. The generosity, spontaneousness, and nobility of the effort is to be preserved to the last. All the congregations of Methodism, or at least all the leading congregations, are to have the opportunity of giving their practical testimony. Should there be, after all—what is not probable—a deficiency, it will be no more than fair that those who value the new constitution most, and really regard the Thanksgiving Fund as a grateful commemoration of it, should feel themselves spontaneously moved to make that Fund worthy of the object they value so much.

Out of one little element of sorrow there arose what seems matter of great consolation. Something was said by men who were incapable of sinister meaning about the constant pressure on the Methodist people for money. Such remarks received a noble answer, and the kind of answer they received was the consolation to which we refer. It is matter of strong and well-grounded hope to many, that the new financial order of things will have the effect of greatly promoting the pecuniary strength and the spirit of giving in the Connexion. It cannot be affirmed that there is no room for improvement. It would be idle to say that the Methodist people are pressed at all; certainly it would be worse than idle to say that they are "pressed beyond measure." The measure applied in heaven to man's giving upon earth, is somewhat different from that too generally applied by man himself. Judged by the standard of other Christian communities, the Methodist giving is good, though no more than good. Judged by the standard set up by the Common Master in the Gospels, and by His interpreters in Acts and Epistles, it is, to say the least, this side of perfection. The Thanksgiving Fund is and will be a noble expression of Christian charity. Far be it from us to write a word that would disparage its beauty, or its grace, or its real grandeur. Remembering that it is to a considerable extent over and above the general contributions of the people, that it is presented in a time of deep commercial depression, that it has laboured under the disadvantage of being an appeal to defray

debts without absolute guarantee of their not recurring, and other things that might be mentioned as drawbacks, we cannot but regard it as one of the noblest efforts of the age. The sum is a very large one in itself. But it leaves an immense fund untouched. The hundreds of thousands of Methodists could give very much more than that if cause were shown: or if we could suppose His claims presented, not by His ministers, but by the Lord Himself in person. The blessedness of faith is that it does give its offerings as it were into His hands. And assuredly those who have this faith will never think that the people are too often asked to present their substance to His cause. However, all moralising apart, we have great confidence that this great thanks-offering will be as much honoured at the end as it was at the beginning; and that its success, surpassing even hope, will gladden one of the sessions of the next Representative Conference.

But to return to the point. Whatever other good results may be expected from the new economy, this one may certainly be expected, that the scale of support given to all existing institutions, and of provision for new ones, will be considerably raised. The men who hold the purse of Methodism are now committed, as it were, and their honour is at stake. Undoubtedly the matter was mainly in their hands before, but now it is much more directly under their control. We may more confidently predict the effect than define in what way it will be produced.

The effect will be, of course, indirect. In the Conference there is no appeal made to liberality, nor has there been any instance of its enthusiasm being turned to financial account. But the Conference represents great wealth, and its members have great influence over the wealth of others. They are sincere, straightforward, and earnest men. It will soon be seen that much trust begets much sense of responsibility, and that much sense of responsibility begets much effort. It is hard to show what shape this improvement will take. But it is easy to give one possible instance. The Representative Conference has accepted the scheme of the Birmingham College; if we mistake not, they who demurred to its early opening were not the laymen. Now it will be found that the effect of this vigorous determination will be to raise almost everywhere, but especially through the midland districts, the rate of subscription for the support of this good enterprise.

It is one that peculiarly unites the interests of ministers and people. It will plant a new centre of a special kind of life and activity where it is much needed. It will satisfy a deep desire and redeem a pledge long given. The establishment and inauguration of this institution is specifically bound up with the new Conference, for, though the pledge was given when the new Conference was not dreamt of, the realisation of the idea would have been indefinitely postponed had it not been bound up with the present order and the great Fund. Many subscriptions have been and will be greatly increased, and, unless we are more sanguine than wise, the ample maintenance of the new College will show that the laity regard themselves as bound in honour to accept this touchstone of their sincerity. That, however, is not putting the matter on the true ground. A hundred better reasons are so obvious that they need not be mentioned why the intelligent laity of Methodism should encourage a new centre of Christian faith and ministerial instruction.

This suggests—and it is high time to refer to it—that the Representative Conference is not fairly dealt with if it is regarded as having only to do with financial and economical affairs. Many of our readers must have read with deep interest the glowing reports of the long Conversations on the Work of God which, mingled with prayer, occupied hour after hour of the late Conference. They must have remarked that there was literally no difference between the two Conversations, save, indeed, that in the second Conference it was much more full while equally spiritual and searching. This points to the fact that the two assemblies have one common heart and soul in all that pertains to the carrying on of that sacred work for which Methodism exists. As an organ for the spread of truth and the manifestation of the Lord Christ to the souls of men, and the increase of that kingdom in the world which all Churches work in promoting, what men call Methodism holds lightly the distinction between ministers and laymen. There comes in its glorious principle of the Universal Priesthood and the vocation of every Christian under the unction from the Holy One to preach and teach Jesus Christ and to contribute his measure to the growth of the body in love. It does not hold lightly the distinction in itself; there is no community to be found which has a clearer definition of it, which has done and suffered more

to maintain it, or which at the present moment exhibits it more consistently in the eyes of men. But this is for its own place. When the progress of religion, or the end for which all means are ordained, is in question, the distinction is not known. The pastorship is this man's, the preachership and teachership is this man's and the other's; but the Cause is common to all. We must confine ourselves, however, to the reported conversation, some of the echoes of which may glide into our remarks. Under the godly guidance of the President it was the most remarkable of all that have occurred under similar circumstances. None were absent, none were indifferent, and none for a moment really wandered from the subject, though some might wander on their way to it. As might be expected, some things were said to which a fastidious taste might take exception; and some things which savoured rather of the special idiosyncrasy of zeal not perfectly controlled. But on the whole, such a conversation may be fairly styled excellent almost to uniqueness. It would be hard to find in any similar convocation such a specimen of true and deep and earnest discussion of the interests of religion. The speakers, however, were Methodists, with one common regret in their hearts, that, considering all the expenditure of means and toil, comparatively slight success is reported. Justice was indeed done to the evident tokens of prosperity which are to be seen from one point of view; but, looking from another point of view, almost all were saddened by still more evident tokens of decline. We shall occupy a few paragraphs with each of these lines of perspective.

But first for a preliminary question. Some one spoke of Methodism prospering as a Church, but declining as a Society. This remark depends for whatever truth it has on a definition of the terms. These terms, as set one over against the other, are of modern invention. Time was when the Methodist Societies were formed in the heart mainly of the Church of England. They had their strict rules of membership, their peculiar usages, their fixed classes and leaders, their itinerating teachers and preachers. They were a refuge from the world as such, and from that kind of world which constituted the mass of the Church in the midst of which they were set. Their purity and goodness were seen in themselves partly, and partly as in relief against the dark background. In other words, they were a society of strict Christians in the midst of a Christian

Church not so strict. Their prosperity was only that of their Society: tested by increase of numbers, by fidelity to their rules, by abstinence from all things interdicted by those rules, and by all the sure tokens of the life of God in their assemblies. They prospered, while the Church behind and around them, to which indeed they belonged, was declining by every token. But by degrees much of this changed; and the change which had been gradually betraying itself plainly enough to all, at length was suddenly accomplished. The Societies of the eighteenth century within the Church of England became, in the nineteenth century, the Societies of Methodism within what was really a Methodist Church. That is to say, Methodism was a corporate body within a Church of its own: the background of the Society was the same as before, with the addition of a certain new ecclesiastical economy. It is useless to disguise this fact; it is impossible to deny it. Whether rightly or wrongly, this community has assumed all the characteristics and responsibilities of an organic church of the Presbyterian type: it has its ministry and sacraments, and Confession and Catechism, and all that goes to the perfection of ecclesiastical organisation.

Three possibilities here arise. The Methodist Church may be comparatively unprosperous and the Society in full vigour; or the Society life may decay, and the Church behind it, as a vast organisation, be in high efficiency; or—and this, it need not be said, would be perfection—both the Church and the Society might be alike healthy and effective.

So far all is plain. And it would be easy enough to determine in which of the three categories the Connexion must be placed, were there not a peculiar difficulty in the way. There is no theory of the relation between Church and Society that will satisfy the mass of those who have to form the judgment. The solution of this difficulty has never been attempted: at any rate, no suggested solution has yet been accepted. It will come; for an irresistible necessity demands it. But it will probably come through the gradual operation of the same Hand that formed the organisation at the first. John Wesley, and the men who used to meet with him in City-road, must have had a presentiment sometimes of the difficulties that would confront their successors. They must have foreseen that in due time the Class meeting would have to be adjusted to the

Sacraments, and that the Preachers would become Pastors. But they left the embarrassment to Providence and posterity. The most holy Providence of God will order all things well in His own time. Meanwhile the inheritors of this difficulty find it embarrassing them at innumerable points. The Society and the Church are blended together in many respects. For instance, the pastoral ministry of the Methodist Church is the identical body of itinerant preachers, who began to live with the Society, and are still to a man sent hither and thither, according to its ancient laws. Again, the most glorious work of Christ's Church, its Missions to the Heathen, is carried on from centre to circumference on the same old principle. In these and other respects, which there is no space to indicate, the Church and the Society are literally coincident. But in many other matters they do not coincide precisely, however harmoniously they work together. There are baptised members and worthy communicants who are honourable children of the Methodist Church, and own no mother besides, but are not members of the Society properly so called. It is here that the difficulty arises; though it is rather a difficulty in theory than in actual practice. There are offices which from the beginning have pertained to the Christian Church as such, but are held only by members of the Society: an anomaly that gives no trouble in practice, but would startle a student of the economy coming from without armed with ecclesiastical laws and precedents. The difficulty, however, never appears more formidable than when the question, Is Methodism on the advance or on the decline? is asked, in any year or series of years witnessing of such declension in Society members as has lately been reported.

In the judgment of many the Methodist Society cannot be said just now to be in a prosperous state. They do not base this conclusion on dwindling numbers altogether. To have Classes and Societies swarming with nominal members is no token of prosperity; rather the reverse. The Founder of this Body often invigorated a declining Society by pruning away almost all its branches: probably he would not do that in the present day; but certainly he would require that all whom he retained should observe the rules. There lies the real secret of the decline in the Methodist Society. It is not so much that many fail to make their appearance weekly, as rather that many who

do appear trifle with the laws and regulations of the Body to which they profess to belong. The fact is, first, that there are not as many as there used to be, and as there ought to be, constantly joining the Society; and, secondly, that those who belong to it are, as a rule, not so strict and severe in their personal discipline, not so zealous and full of charity in their relation to others as, perhaps, their fathers used to be. These pages are hardly a fitting vehicle for monitory reflections on this subject. But we cannot help saying that this last evil, which was more dwelt on than any other in the Conversations, is the true secret. Much might be said to abate the severity of judgment on some other points. For instance, very many do not add themselves to the stricter fellowship because they cannot find leaders to their mind; probably they would be glad to put themselves under their minister's guidance on any terms. Again, there is much delusion in the statistics so solemnly appealed to: on the one hand, many reckoned as converts were never true converts at all; and, on the other, many who are not found in the rolls are not lost, as is supposed, but mingled with the congregation still, and certainly not utterly gone. When, however, we read the startling indictments against the manners and habits of the Methodist People, it appears that there is too much reason to think that some of them must be true. A buoyant and hopeful critic of these indictments will of course find something to say even in defence against them. He would urge that the amusements, recreations and acts of conformity to the world which are charged upon Methodist People, are not generally to be found among those who are actually numbered among them. He would also plead that in the old times there were the same charges and the same reason for them; that, in fact, the old Methodists were not very much better than their descendants. But his best defence would be that, with all deductions, there is a sound, warm, pure, loyal heart beating under all the signs of declension; that there is now actually living and praying and watching and working a large number of as strict and self-denying Methodists as ever bore the name. But, after all his defences and counterpleas, even he will be obliged to admit that the Methodist Society is not prospering in the ratio of its prosperity as a Church and denominational power in the land. Even the most sanguine must confess that, as generations roll on, there is a

great danger that the strictness, zeal, and unworldliness of the people called Methodists should fade away, and their meeting in Classes and Bands and Lovefeasts should become a tradition only. Now any real approximation to that would be a great calamity to Christendom.

There are few who would venture to say that as a Church, or congregation of Churches, having its centre of influence in England and its circumference the ends of the earth, Methodism is other than advancing. One or two points may be glanced at in illustration of our meaning: namely, that the great organism which men will call in the next census the Methodist Denomination or Church, is in the enjoyment of a good amount of prosperity; the word prosperity being taken with a wide latitude of acceptation.

Its unity of faith and worship may be regarded as the first token of this fact. Ecclesiastical history gives evidence that churches declining have invariably lost their hold on sound doctrine. It matters not whether orthodoxy is regarded as the cause or as the result of true prosperity; it has always and invariably accompanied it. It is a remarkable fact, and one that seems not to have had half the attention it deserves, that there is at the present time what may be called a perfect unanimity in Methodism as to the essentials of the Faith. It is not that there is a lack of free inquiry or a spirit of indolent acceptance of a conventional body of doctrine. Never does a year pass without evidence that inquiry is going on only too industriously; and one after another goes his way because he can no longer be fettered in his creed. Certainly, there is no sign whatever of indifference to the distinction between orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Everybody knows the excitement produced by the promulgation of what were held to be new and doubtful views in a late Fernley lecture; views which, though they are not regarded as endangering any really fundamental doctrine, and therefore do not impeach the orthodoxy of their promulgator, have possibly kept him out of a theological chair which seemed otherwise naturally to wait for him. The Methodist Conference has always been and still is exquisitely sensitive when sound faith is concerned; and it might be easy to furnish a very remarkable catalogue of illustrations, more or less important, from the standards which have issued in the separation from it of worthy men. It is, therefore, matter of congratulation and good omen, that there is unbroken theological peace

in the borders of Methodism. It is, we venture to say, a most substantial proof that this Church, as representing one of the Confessions of Christendom, is prospering. Year after year, numbers of probationers are received into the ranks of its ordained ministry who avow their fidelity to the system of doctrine handed down by their fathers. Some of them may have had to struggle through many doubts and difficulties, and some of them may be conscious that they will have yet to struggle; but the fact remains that every Conference is able to fill up its ranks and provide for the growth of its work by a sufficient number of men who, in the most solemn manner, pledge themselves to the truth and to the whole truth. This of course is a most obvious and a most important guarantee of the doctrinal soundness of the community. But it is not the only one. Every token that could be asked is given of a determination to hold fast the faith once delivered. It is enough, however, to say that there is literally no sign to the contrary. The Catechisms are undergoing a certain amount of necessary correction; but a thousand eyes watch narrowly that no truth is changed in them or veiled. The Liturgy is under laborious reconstruction; but the same tenacious anxiety to give up nothing good keeps that work back. No Tutor or Professor in any of many Chairs is under suspicion. In fact, all things show that Methodism, as a branch of that Church which is the pillar and ground of the truth, is still under the watchful care of the Holy Ghost a faithful witness.

How great is the value of this token of well-being in the Methodist community as a Church would best appear by a consideration of what the opposite of this state of things would be. The supposition is a painful one; but we may suppose this unanimity gone: gone for some reasons which it is happily hard to conceive, the chief of them, however, necessarily being indifference in the Conference to the Standards with which it is entrusted. Were such an evil day to come, what would be the issue? a relaxation of the supreme vigilance would infect the lower guardians, and teachers would creep in such as have never yet passed the strict portals of the ministry. The question would come to be asked, not, What constitutes the Faith once delivered to the saints? but, How many errors can be made consistent with that Faith? The colleges would become training schools of latitudinarian casuistry, and no longer

of the old orthodoxy of evangelical fundamentals. The pulpits would utter discordant sounds; and there would soon be—we say it without any offensive meaning—the same uncertainty which is felt in too many of the other denominations of British Christendom as to the quality of doctrine that might be expected. Now and then there would occur the frightful explosion. Some flagrant error taught in the Chair, or published in a book, or announced from the pulpit, would awaken the slumbering sensitiveness of the Connexion. District Meeting and Conference would be absorbed with charges of heresy, and all minds would be occupied with one sad subject. Meanwhile, that most salutary restraint would be gone which, under God, keeps so many from wandering into the way of error—that restraint of submission to ancient authority which free thought mocks, but which He who knows our frame has imposed for our safety and peace; and that grand and most honourable prestige of unity and fidelity would vanish which has made Methodism the envy of other communions and a terror to scepticism everywhere. It may be said that this is not a probable evil; it cannot be said that it is an impossible one. That it is not now manifest is a proof of the prosperity of the community as a Church of the living God. And it is a token that should inspire gratitude to Him through whose blessing it comes. It should also inspire a deep anxiety to preserve what is of such great value. There is nothing that ought to be so carefully watched as the integrity of doctrine. A multitude of forces are at work that work dangerously. Their mischief is only too evident in the neighbouring communities. It is impossible that this one should escape the trial. The trial indeed it has not altogether escaped, but hitherto it has not fallen. The last Conference reports all well so far. May the next and many to follow it bear the same testimony to this token of continuing ecclesiastical prosperity.

It may be reckoned as another sign of prosperity in the ecclesiastical character of Methodism that the public worship of its congregations is, on the whole, undergoing steady improvement. By public worship is of course meant the whole order of the common devotion as thrown open to all classes of people forming the Christian congregation. But the term has a peculiar significance when used in connection with this people. A large portion of their worship is, strictly speaking, private, not as being

reserved from the public, but as springing out of their Society usages. Unhappily, public worship proper is too much confined to the Christian Sabbath, and it is of that we now speak. The improvement in this respect is manifest everywhere, though marked to a great extent in the removal of evils, and still falling far short of perfection. In our judgment—a judgment in which we do not stand alone, though in a minority—that perfection would be a liturgical service in the morning, and a service without liturgy in the evening, provision being made for the occasional litany and full communion service on the sacramental days. Thus the Psalms and lessons of both Testaments would have their honour; the people would declare their creed; worship proper and intercessory prayer would receive their rights, and the devotions of the congregation approach their ideal. But as no binding rule can be enforced on all assemblies, this cannot be hoped for. It is, however, satisfactory to know that approximations are observable everywhere towards the ideal. The Psalms and Te Deum and appointed Scriptures are gradually heard in places of worship formerly strangers to them. Almost from all parts the demand is heard for help in this matter. Of course, the more obvious improvement is found in the more ancient and central chapels. But it is not confined to them. The casual visitor in smaller places, even in country villages, does not notice as he used to do the hard contrast between Methodist worship and that of the National Church and the Nonconformist bodies generally. As the structures dedicated to the Supreme are becoming more worthy of His name, so the services within them are becoming more worthy. Would that the improvement were more marked than it is in the obscurer parts of the Connexional domain. If the thousands of little societies all over the land are erected into separate Churches, withdrawn, so to speak, from places where they at least would have a well-ordered service and abundance of Scripture, those who accept the oversight of them are bound to see to it that, while they gain much, they suffer nothing by the change. But none will deny that the Methodist Church, as such, is in this respect in a prosperous way.

Reference has been made to the liturgy, with an indefinite hint that the want of success in the attempt to revise that and the Book of Offices, is itself evidence of the tenacity with which the Connexion holds fast its

ancient truth. Our readers are aware that a strong committee was appointed to prepare such a Service Book as should be free from expressions tending to error, and suitable for universal use in the congregations. But they cannot be supposed to know that the Committee has sat again and again, even year following year, and devoted a large amount of patient skill and care to the subject. During their sittings a multitude of suggestions have come up from all quarters. But alas, both the divisions in the Committee, and the conflicting recommendations from the Districts, serve only to show that the thing, however desirable, cannot be done. It seems useless to persevere in what serves to bring out so clearly division of sentiment. A book which should be the result of the revisions suggested would not be accepted by many congregations, and of course it could be enforced upon none. There are great numbers of ministers who would deprecate the alteration of a word in the Communion Service, and there are not a few who believe that the general tendency of the changes proposed in the office for Baptism is to take out of it the doctrine which Methodism has always held. What ground they have for believing this may be seen by a collation of them with Mr Wesley's *Notes on the New Testament*. The revisers go a long way in this direction; but many of the suggestions printed and more or less published go much further. It may well, therefore, appear to many—the majority, as it appears—that, either the project must be abandoned, or attempted again on more restricted principles. For ourselves—though we have no other authority than our literary rights give us—we believe that the end might be attained by suggesting a few necessary alterations in which all would concur, leaving the great majority of contested points to the judgment of the minister as heretofore. The introductory words of the Baptismal Service will illustrate our meaning. They assert what Mr. Wesley asserts in his note on John iii. 5, concerning "water and the Holy Ghost;" let that then be retained. They contain, however, a few other words which the whole Connexion would agree to change. Sent down again with restricted instructions, the same learned and judicious, and in all respects worthy, Committee might present a work that would be accepted of all. But this suggests the next topic.

We hope to carry our readers with us when we say

that Methodism, as a Church, is exhibiting tokens of life and progress in its care of the young. Here we lay less stress on the term Church, for the children of the community belong to it rather as a Church than as a Society, a point to which we shall return. It hardly requires to be said that very much of its recent legislative anxiety has been spent on this question. How much attention has been given to the care of the young in catechetical classes, in Sunday schools, in day schools, all converging to the supreme object of connecting them individually and by intelligent profession with the Christian Church! It would be easy enough to show the imperfection of many of the plans adopted, and perhaps to prove that the best means have not yet been devised for confirming baptised children in the nurture and admonition of Christianity. It would also be easy to draw a mournful picture of failure in carrying out the plans already adopted, and to exhibit very depressing statistics, in which the neglected children figure too sadly. But nothing of this kind will avail to contradict the fact that the Methodist Connexion is every year thinking more earnestly, and labouring more diligently, in the service of the multitudes of children of which it deems itself the mother. And this is itself a token of prosperity. Its very anxiety is a sign of sound ecclesiastical life. And sometimes it occurs to us, thinking on this subject, that Methodism has a singular advantage in dealing with this matter, and will yet be honoured to contribute something to the solution of the problem. Its views of the sacrament of baptism remove a difficulty that obstructs the Church of England. It has at hand the materials which might easily form a rite of confirmation without the evils that mar that institution elsewhere. Its Catechumen and Juvenile Society classes only want the right and efficient working to show their capabilities. There is undoubtedly a great deal of quiet thought and careful consideration devoted at this moment to the question, the fruit of which will hereafter appear. The fruit indeed is already appearing. One circumstance may be referred to, the strong demand for some improvement in the catechisms; and, what is still more to the point, the evidence of a growing desire to use the catechisms in the instruction of children in the Sunday schools and elsewhere. Whatever else may be done in the cause of the children of the congregation, that must not be omitted.

There can never be satisfactory progress until this is much more extensively felt and acted on; and it is more and more felt and acted on throughout the Connexion.

Here we must make a digression. In the Pastoral Conference—if that is the right term—it was announced that the well-known First Catechism had passed through the process of revision at the hands of the Committee appointed twelve months since. The result was formally accepted; and is, or may be at any time, in the hands of the public. We need not say that the work has been carefully done. Much that was beyond the capacity of infants has been simplified. Some things very much objected to by many have been modified, and will now pass the severest ordeal. A considerable addition has been made that will commend itself to the judgment of all. On the whole, the little book will be found much better adapted to its purpose; and the sooner it is turned to good account the better. The Second Catechism, it is hoped, will be issued from the next Conference. Let no one wonder at the delay: it has only to be repeated that even the slightest change undergoes the severest inquisition. The great point is to use the books when they are ready. If they should have the good fortune to find more favour than their predecessors with the mothers of families, and the Sunday-school teachers, and other instructors of youth, it will be a happy circumstance for the future of Methodist young people, and of Methodism itself. No community has ever thriven without its Catechism. There is no limit to its capabilities as an organ of early teaching influence; and it is hard to exaggerate the evil consequences of neglecting it. The instructions wrought into infant minds, and confirmed in childhood, and ratified in youth, are never forgotten: whether connected with Scripture characters, or given in plain definitions, or bound up with texts of Scripture, they are indelible. Such an important element in early training surely ought not to be left to the accidental ability or knowledge of ordinary teachers; and even those who are not ordinary teachers will be much better prepared if they have such a textbook in their hands. Such a textbook, we say: justice is not done to the Catechism unless it is made the vehicle of personal, face-to-face, affectionate colloquial teaching. As things are, it is useless to enforce the use of the Catechism in all schools. But the ministers, especially the young ministers, have this matter very much in their own

hands. They may use it themselves, and commend its use to others, with great effect. And, on the whole, there is not much reason to complain: the circulation of the Catechisms has always been large and always increasing.

Once more, it may be safely affirmed that the Methodist community is advancing in influence as one of the leading religious bodies or Churches of the British empire. In estimating this influence, we must not make too much account of diminishing numbers as reported lately, year after year. That the numbers in the Society diminish is, of course, a sign of declining power in a certain direction; and is matter of reasonable sorrow. That decline might indeed be ascribed to transitory causes, the removal of which would restore the older and better state of things. Should there be found no transitory causes adequate to the effort, it would be necessary to admit that the recruiting power is not what it once was: that something or other prevents the winning of people from the world, or the gathering into the Society. To whatever extent this might be the case, it would be a dire calamity. But still it would not affect the general fact that the influence of Methodism, as a whole, its worship, its ministry, its literature, its education upon the land is increasing, and increasing for good. Very much is reported to have been said in the late Conference as to the extraordinary vigour of the clergy, and their ever-increasing sway over their congregations, and their persuasive pastoral energy in the heart of society: all this being set in sharp contrast with the comparative inefficiency of modern Methodism. Undoubtedly there is much of truth in the picture thus sketched; and in some respects the Anglican revival does distance in its energy all competition. Relatively it may be true that the Establishment is more increasingly influential than Methodism. It may also be true that Methodism is increasing in influence, though not in the same ratio. But there is much to be said on the other side. The preachers of the Connexion never had so large a portion of the people under their ministry. The community at large was never so much respected as now. The voice of the Connexion, heard in its representatives, was never more powerful or influential on public opinion, or on the Legislature, than at the present time. Perhaps there is no denomination or Christian Church existing which can send forth so unanimous, and therefore so strong, a voice on any

question of ethics or doctrine. And if all this be true, it establishes our point that Methodism is prospering as a Church. However much we may value, or even prefer, the tokens of prosperity that would be found in more converts and enlarged societies, we cannot be insensible to the fact that as it respects those manifold influences that sway the world, but cannot be shown in statistics, the Body represented by the Conference is not declining, is not stationary, but steadily and surely progressing.

Returning, however, to the point from which these remarks diverged, we must express our strong conviction that Methodism, as such, can never be said to be in full prosperity unless and until it prospers equally as a Church and as a Society. We may have readers who are loth to admit this distinction, who may indeed think it a misleading or dangerous subtilty. But this it is not. There must be in the nature of things an abiding distinction between the organic Church instituted by our Lord, with its sacraments and laws, and the particular society instituted by man under His guidance, with its rules and regulations. If the analogy may he permitted, what the Churches themselves are to the universal kingdom, individual societies are to the Church. But what the precise relation of a society within the Church may be to the Church itself, admits of a variety of illustrations. In the great communion of the Mediæval Church many separate orders or societies sprang up, mutually independent, and, it may be, mutually hostile, but all owning allegiance to the one authority that bound them all together. So it has been more or less in the Church of England; and we can very well imagine the Methodist Society to have acted out the original intentions of its human founders, and to have continued as an accepted Order within the national Establishment. This, with the facts before us, is a hard supposition, but not extravagantly beyond the limits of reasonable argument. However, the will of the Divine Founder of Methodism has manifestly been otherwise. The Head of all Churches has thrown around the Methodist Societies their own Church, perfect and complete, lacking nothing for diffusion at home, or for propagation abroad. But the history of this new constitution of things imposes an obligation to remember the peculiar claims of the Methodist Society from which the Methodist Church sprang. For this is the peculiarity of the case, that the Church did not give birth to the Society,

but, conversely, the Society gave birth to the Church. Had not the Methodist Societies existed, there could never have been a Methodist Church. We know very well that there are some enthusiasts or idealists who would if they could reject the idea of a Church in connection with this system; who would prefer to hold fast the reality of the Society, and leave the Church around it as a mere abstraction. When this abstraction does take form, it may be the Church of England, the Church universal, or the mystical Church. But we are compassed about with hard facts, and no process can enchant away the reality that Methodism is an aggregate of churches, and withal an aggregate of societies coexisting with those churches, but never precisely and literally coinciding with them. We repeat, that the perfection of prosperity in this Connexion is the same thing as the common prosperity of both these elements. This is the peculiarity of Methodism among the denominations.'

Falling back again upon reasonable suppositions, we can imagine one branch of this twofold prosperity aimed at, and the other comparatively neglected. Methodists may come to rejoice in their sanctuaries—to use the modern inappropriate word—in their liturgical or other worship, in their decent sacraments, in their organisations for children, in their teaching, and literature, and general influence; while the Classes, and all the other special means of social fellowship are by degrees neglected. There is hardly a candid judge, within or without the Body, who would not regard this as a great calamity. So far as the evil exists, it is a great calamity already. Whatever may be said of other Christian Churches, the healthy life of this one is bound up with its Society life. It is this that has been its secret of vigour from the beginning, and has made it a name throughout the earth. The Lord and Giver of life can bestow that life through many various instrumentalities, and make subordinate channels for it as He will. There are channels for it supreme and common to all, but these subordinate channels are peculiar to each. To Methodism it is the old Society organisation in all its forms. The Class meeting receives its converts and instructs them and confirms them in grace; it binds all the members together in sympathy and social communion; it binds them all to the pastoral ministry better than any other method ever devised. Were every child in the community guided early towards it, and every com-

municant induced in some way to conform to it, nothing but good would be the result. To let this institution sink to decay, to neglect anything that might tend to increase its efficiency, to cease from carefully selecting and watching over qualified leaders, in a word, to accustom the people to regard this institute as matter of indifference, is in plain language to shear the locks of this ancient Samson in the Christian world. One of its best differentia would be gone, and all the rest would be impaired.

We can imagine also the opposite evil; not as coming in the future—that is not the danger—but as existing more or less in the present. Methodism, forgetting the obligations it has voluntarily or involuntarily assumed of discharging all the duties of the Christian Church, may seem to hold lightly the fellowship of the congregation as such, though bearing the Lord's name upon it, and may be less than sufficiently anxious to give all their rights to those who are only communicants at its altars. Let it be observed that we do not suggest the possibility of their undervaluing, or placing in any second order, the sacraments themselves. They who bring that charge charge this people falsely; rather they come to a rash and hasty conclusion. There is no ancient or modern legislation that has even approached the theory that none but members of the Society can enjoy the fundamental privileges of Christianity in the Body. Legislation has indeed most wisely aimed at keeping inviolable the Society test, and at making those who assume the Society rules faithful to them as the subordinate test of their fidelity to the Head of the Church. But in this respect the tendency of loose practice has run contrary to the tendency of strict legislation. There are two classes of persons who are found at the Lord's table in Methodism: a few who are admitted by the guardians of that sealing ordinance without taking upon them the Society obligations, and a large number who are voluntarily under those obligations. Both stand or fall to their own Master. But the latter accept a strict interpretation of the principles of Christian practice as applied to personal habits, to the recreations of life, family observances, and some duties of charity. They at any rate should keep these rules; their doing so would be a strong inducement to others to adopt them. But here is the deep complaint; not that they neglect the Lord's Supper, but that they come to it as members under certain obligations

which they violate. That they thus come, and that they are permitted thus to come, is one of the tokens of the evil alluded to, namely, that while the Church character of Methodism is, on the whole, prospering, its Society character is not so prosperous. It is a good sign that worthy professors of Christianity are recognised as such without being bound to Society usages; but it is an evil sign that those who are so bound neglect their obligations. To go farther into particulars would not become these pages. Suffice that, if we echo faithfully the strain of the Conference Conversations, the deep determination of both ministers and laymen is to strive for a revival of the old Methodist life, to inspire the people with a generous enthusiasm for its ancient usages, and to quicken their reverence for fidelity in that which is least as well as in that which is greatest in their own communion. In proportion as this end is attained, Methodism will be beautiful and prosperous both as a Church and as a Society.

But, having returned to this point, we must go a step further back still, and take up again the Conversations out of which all this sprang. Such a Conversation is the glory of the Conference; and, as it were, the defence of its glory. It was wisely done to make formal provision for it, and to give it a prominent place early in the programme of procedure. In the judgment of some it is capable of further improvement. It would be useless to suggest that still more time should be allotted to it; pressure of business, and the inevitable flux of words attending it, would forbid that. But, supposing the heart of the second morning devoted to this important subject, the evening might be set apart for the Sacramental Service in which ministers and laymen renew their vows together. This service has already approved itself to the minds and hearts of all; it is an institution the value and the grace of which cannot be exaggerated. But, as hitherto held, it has been subject to many serious inconveniences. It has interfered with the rest of the Lord's day, it has rendered necessary the absence of very many who ought to be present, and for other reasons it has only partially answered its object. Following the Conversation, and early in the evening of the same day, it would fully accomplish its purpose, and be productive of more good than it would be easy to describe. By bringing into the heart of the Conference itself this most sacred ordinance of common devotion to the Head of

the Church and of love to each other, it would help to keep alive a sentiment too easily forgotten in all such assemblies, that they meet simply and solely for religious purposes. This is as true of the one Conference as of the other. That in which the ordained and separated ministers transact their business is necessarily, and especially in its present constitution, occupied every hour with matters that directly concern the kingdom of God. But that also in which the representatives sit is less directly, but not less really occupied with the affairs of the same kingdom. This is admitted by all; but there is an obvious danger that it may sometimes be lost sight of. Lay gentlemen sent up to a representative assembly have a model before them in the house of national legislature; and may insensibly glide into an imitation of its spirit and practice. They have certain institutions, which are institutions of human creation, in charge; and the administration of funds connected with them is in their hands. Sometimes the connection between these institutions and Christianity is not at once apparent; at any rate, not sufficiently apparent to operate as a constant remembrancer. And then many of these representatives are young and comparatively unversed in the usages of large Christian legislative assemblies. Nor have they, as in the Presbyterian assemblies, the restraint of a certain ordination and responsibility. They are elected often to a function for which they have not been prepared, and which is to be discharged, as it were, under the eye of the constituency far away. And it must not be wondered at that we suggest such a caution as this. The more impressive the religious services connected with the Conference can be made, the better for the maintenance of that one principle which will alone save it from the vices of a popular democratic assembly; the principle that the Head of the Church has summoned its members to mind certain affairs of His, which well minded, they again retire.

But, it will be said, Is not the other Conference liable to the same danger, and by long accumulated evidence actually under the condemnation that is here implied? Undoubtedly these remarks apply to the Conference as a whole; and, from whatever quarter the suggestion, well if heed were given to it. Two reflections, however, here arise: the evil is not to be cured by setting up too high an ideal, from which all legislative human nature must needs

decline; and, secondly, it may be kept within narrow limits by high religious influence, though by nothing else.

The highest ideal of a legislative assembly like the Methodist Conference is easily sketched; more easily sketched than realised even in imagination. All the members are supposed to have come up deeply impressed with the solemnity of their responsibility; to give their best and most anxious attention to every detail of the public interest, under the watchful eye of Him who summoned them, who, indeed, is Himself specially present; for it was with reference primarily to such assemblies as these that He said, "Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." Each individual member is supposed to leave his ordinary habitudes and secular relations outside, and enter the assembly esteeming every other better than himself. In this spirit he will be more disposed to hear than to speak; will indeed never claim the attention of so large a body unless constrained to do so, and as soon as possible withdraw into retirement. Meanwhile, with the lovely inconsistency of Christian ethics, he will not mete to others the measure he metes to himself, but be rejoiced to hear their suggestions: if they are aged, listening to them with reverence; if they are younger, listening to them with the interest and sympathy which would give encouragement. Not indeed that the young would often be found in the position of speakers: they would, as in ancient times and among rude tribes, give their suggestions when kindly pressed and urged to do so. Every session of such an assembly would be attended with scrupulous fidelity by all: without any regard to special interest felt in its topics; for the plain reason that the duty on which all are alike sent embraces the minutest details of every question. Such being the gravity of the occasion, all would of necessity desire to strengthen themselves by common prayer; and the devotions of the assembly would be most scrupulously honoured. In such an ideal assembly gravity would always preside: sometimes deepened into awe, never dissolved away into mirth. All hearts would often be lifted up for guidance and help; for that direct suggestion from on high which has been promised for such occasions. The President, Chairman, or Moderator of such an assembly would have, not indeed a lighter task than he too often has, but

certainly an easier and less obstructed one. He would not have to watch the signs of turbulence and disorder; only to watch the expression of the members' wishes, to speak or otherwise. He would have much time afforded him to retire within himself, and weigh the exigencies of his duty: as also to collect his thoughts and hallow them. His ruling, as the word is, would be instantaneously and always respected: as matter of course, when it commended itself to all; and when otherwise, as matter of courtesy. It would, moreover, always be remembered that the ruling of the Head has high authority; not to say that it is, for the most part, a great advantage to the assembly, and a most seasonable relief: for the sake of which general comfort, an occasional failure should be easily condoned and generously submitted to. Accordingly, in these most rational and Christian assemblies there would seldom be confusion, wrath never, and only under certain restraints anything like excitement. Hurried, impetuous outbursts of will would never take the place of calm and thoughtful expression of mind and judgment. Never would any measure be clamoured into success which had failed to win assent by quiet appeal. In short, such assemblies would be means of grace as well as courts of legislation. Young men might well desire the honour of admittance; for there they would learn wisdom and reverence for authority, and that practical humility which would best prepare them in their turn to become old, and exercise authority. How much more might be added to complete the picture of this ideal assembly!

But after all it is only an ideal. Moreover, it is an ideal which has never been realised from the beginning, scarcely even in the days of the Apostles themselves. All through the ages of the Church's history the synods and councils and legislative assemblies of all communities alike, East and West, North and South, have been something rather different from this pious sketch. The Moravian conclaves have been hardly an exception in older times, nor the meetings of the Friends in times more modern. Whether composed of clerics or of laymen, or of the two orders combined, bodies of men legislating or administering are liable to excitements peculiarly their own. Wherever there is freedom of debate there will be vehement collisions with all or most of their consequences. These serve, at any rate, to show the deep interest felt by those who take part.

And many of the phenomena that border on tumult or lawlessness are to be accounted for on physical principles. It may also be said that the Methodist Conference is not worse than its former self, nor worse than its neighbours. We firmly believe that it is better than most of its neighbours, and that it will bear comparison with Methodist Conferences of older times, always bearing in mind, that is, the increasing numbers that attend the earlier Conference especially. Whether these numbers should not be considerably restricted is an important question, and one that has two sides to it. To shut out large numbers who desire to be present would be, especially now that the Representative Conference is so carefully defined, a perilous expedient. And it would be taking away a most important influence for keeping up the feeling of Connexional brotherhood, and a most important element of Methodist education. A small Conference would mean the dissipation of much good feeling somewhere, or rather the suppression of much good feeling. But the number in City Road was inordinate, and at certain times rendered calm decisions and decent order impossible. Such is the account, at any rate, that transpired at the time, and still lingers in public feeling. But we have nothing to do with such matters as these.

During these observations we have for obvious reasons mentioned no names. But we cannot close without paying our tribute to one name, that of the Rev. E. E. Jenkins, the respected President, whom in this Review we have a right to claim as our own. We do not allude to him, however, because of his sometime connection with us, but because of the deep impression made on our own minds by all that we saw and heard of his conduct in the chair of these important assemblies. The remarks we have just been making forcibly bring to our remembrance one marked evidence that Mr. Jenkins was appointed to his place by more than merely human suffrages; the dignity, self-control, and tenderness of spirit that never forsake him for a moment. How much of the deep religious influence which, despite some fleeting deductions, pervaded the sessions, was due to his most eminently Christian supervision of the whole, we have only to suggest to the grateful memory of many. But the Connexional year is before him, and in it ample scope for his sanctified ability. *Majus his videbis.*

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

The Gospel for the Nineteenth Century.

The Gospel for the Nineteenth Century. Fourth Edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1880.

In its first edition this work bore the title, "Leaving us an Example: Is it Living—and Why?" Neither title is to be admired. Indeed, neither perfectly expresses the object of the writer, which is, "to place the Perfect Human Example of Christ in what he conceives to be its proper position as the great Central Truth of Christianity, by demonstrating the close and vital connection which exists between this and the other great truths of the Faith." The author himself practically acknowledges the inappropriateness of the titles: of the first by changing it; of the second by disclaiming, in his preface to the third edition, "any idea of putting forth a New Gospel." His disclaimer notwithstanding, we believe the present work does teach a new Gospel, or at least a Gospel not delivered to the Apostles nor received by the primitive Church. And that which was not the Gospel of the first century cannot be the Gospel for the last.

The main position of the book, as stated above, is one we cannot accept, nor is the promise of a demonstration one that inspires much hope. All the great truths of the faith have a close and vital connection, but they cannot all be central. What the author obviously intended to promise, was to show that the doctrine of Christ, as our Example, is that which gives life and meaning to all other doctrines, and from which all others borrow their importance and efficacy. This object he steadily keeps in view, but, as we think, without success. If he had contented himself with aiming to trace anew some lineaments in the perfect Character, and to do his part toward presenting an aspect of Christianity which past ages have too much overlooked, but which the present one is assiduously studying, we should have congra-

tulated him upon the undertaking. As it is, any good that might have been done by his endeavours to portray the character of Christ is more than counteracted by the evil of his attempts to exalt it to that place in the Christian scheme which is due to His vicarious Passion. The author is not a Socinian: he does not deny the Divine Sonship. He is not a Pelagian: he does not deny man's need of a Mediator. But he approximates too closely to both: to the one by his almost exclusive insistance on the human element in the life of the Saviour; to the other by his formal deposition from its supremacy of the Atonement consummated by His death.

The gist of the whole book is found in the following sentence: "Looking at the perfect development of human nature in Christ, and at the results of this, we may say boldly that it was for this end that the human race was first called into existence." The Incarnation was not for man, but man for the Incarnation. The Incarnation was not an intervention due to our lapse from original righteousness: it was only the accomplishment of a purpose which, for some unknown reason, God could not effect at the Creation. In other words, God did not really create man in His own image. If the author does not intend this conclusion to be drawn from his words, it is, as we think, legitimately deduced from them. The Incarnation is "the highest term of a series—the crown and completion of a long growth. It is the highest example of the operation of a general law—the fulfilment of the creative idea of man. Christ is the Incarnation of the Moral Power, whose influence is constantly felt but imperfectly obeyed by mankind in general. The difference between Christ and other men is this—the contact with the Divine Nature which is imperfect in them, is perfect and complete in Him. In them the Divine and the human meet, but are often in conflict: in Him the two are at one: there is a personal union between them." How is it, we are constrained to ask, that the Divine and the human should meet in man and yet be in conflict? Is not the human the offspring of the Divine? And if the moral unity of the Divine and human in Christ be due to an union in Him of Divine and human persons, how is that moral unity to be brought about in us who do not participate in the personal union? We trust we shall not be misunderstood. We hold as strongly as our author that through Christ man is promoted to a far higher moral status than he could have attained, even if unfallen, apart from His gracious interposition. But we deprecate any attempt to naturalise the supernatural, to attribute to an inherent imperfection of God's handiwork what was only necessitated, if necessitated at all, by our own spoiling of it. The satisfaction of those who object to the Incarnation, that it "does not seem part of God's orderly working," must not be purchased at too dear a

price. We should concede far too much if, for the purpose of overcoming such persons' prejudices, we were to give up or explain away those Scriptures which affirm the primary purpose of the Incarnation to have been remedial. And yet we should not have conceded enough. Their demand would still be for proof of the necessity of any miracle, and their satisfaction would only be complete when we had surrendered free agency in God and man alike.

It is easy to understand the dislocation that ensues upon this substitution of the Incarnation for the Atonement as the centre of a theological scheme. First, as we have already seen, the doctrine of Original Sin is practically eviscerated. True, we meet with the language of that doctrine, but its force has almost disappeared. Sin and imperfection are used as interchangeable terms. A meaning is put upon John xvi. 8 which it would be very hard to defend, consistently with any rational rendering of Scripture generally. It is that the Holy Ghost was now for the first time in human history to create a consciousness of sin. "It needed a perfect human example to be set forth before the world could be convinced of sin." The only proof of this afforded is a quotation from Lecky to the effect that the ancient Greeks and Romans "had a sense of merit, but not of sin." Supposing this sufficient for the case of the Gentiles, was there no sense of sin among the Jews? That Christ enlarged the range and deepened the meaning of the law there can be no question; but if both the law and the prophets were impotent to produce the sense of sin, why did He not rather come to destroy than to fulfil? And whence His life-long homage and indeed indebtedness to the Scriptures, of which the author in an earlier chapter so beautifully treats?

While the doctrine of Sin is weakened, several others are completely metamorphosed. The Atonement is an atonement no longer. There was no substitution: there was not even an intervention, in the ordinary sense of the term. Christ offered a sacrifice, but it was not designed to propitiate the wrath of God. "There is no idea here of wrath or of punishment." A penalty was endured, but it was "the penalty which He, as the actual and rightful Representative of a sinful and therefore a suffering race, naturally and necessarily incurred: . . . it attached to Him as being the Head of our race." Illustrations of this are to be seen in the "kingly sorrows" of such sovereigns as Alfred the Great or Gustavus Vasa. The priesthood of Christ is thus merged in His kingly office. The relations of the cross to the crown are reversed: Christ does not reign because He once suffered, but He once suffered because He had always reigned. The session at the right hand of God, referred to in Heb. i. 3, is thus reduced to a barren ceremonial. It was simply the resumption of a dignity which Christ enjoyed before: it added no new glory to that which

He had with the Father before the world was. The Passion was a meaningless episode in His Incarnate life: nay, that life itself was a needless break in the round of His eternal existence. For if all that men required was a pattern, not only were the sufferings of Christ unnecessary in the nature and degree ascribed to them, but the close conjunction in Him of the Divine with the human was an obstacle, rather than an incentive, to imitation. Despair is all that could ever have been produced by the exhibition of such an Example: hope could only be inspired by an act whose unique virtue it was to satisfy the demands alike of the law without and the conscience within. The Divinity of Christ is not denied, but it is a positive encumbrance to such theology.

By a necessary sequence, the views of Justification, and of the faith which secures it, are very different from those we find in Scripture. "Forgiveness of sins is the boon with which God welcomes all who come to Him in Christ. The very act of accepting Christ as their Master and Guide is rewarded by God with the gift of a full pardon of all past sin. In the language of St. Paul, it justifies the sinner." The reality and magnitude of sin are not here called in question, though they seem to be elsewhere. Nor is the value of our justification underrated. But the ground of it on the Divine side is not stated, and the condition of it on the human side is stated wrongly. Why does God reward us for "accepting Christ as our Master and Guide"? To this question no answer is given. If the sacrifice of Christ was only the suffering of a "penalty" which He "naturally and necessarily incurred," whence arises its peculiar "meritoriousness?" If He only bore His own penalty, who but myself shall bear mine? Nay, more, if it comport with the justice of God that such a dignity as the Headship of the race should necessarily entail such a penalty as the sufferings of Christ; how can it comport with the same justice that the race itself should escape the penalty due to its sin? According to the author—and here we do not disagree with him—"the human mind can conceive nothing more Divine than absolute moral perfection." It must be this, then, that has given our Lord the Headship of the race, and the Headship has entailed a penalty similar to that which should have been endured by every one of us—at least the hiding of God's face, if not His wrath. Righteousness in the Head thus produces the same penalty as sin in the race, with this difference that, as endured by Him, it obviates the necessity of its endurance by us.

Meantime, what are we to make of the condition of salvation? It is still "faith" that justifies, but the term is used in a sense different from that which it has been customary to put upon it. Faith is no other than "the act of accepting Christ as our Master and Guide." Upon consenting to become God's servants, we are

transformed into sons. We had always supposed that our surrender to Christ as our Lord was involved in the process of repentance rather than of faith. Whatever else it may mean, faith has always been regarded as including trust. But with the Atonement explained away, there is no room left for its exercise, and the distinction between repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ vanishes altogether. This is not the way to establish the "reasonableness of justification by faith."

We are sorry to be obliged to dissent from a writer whose studies of the character of Christ, extending over the first two hundred pages of his work, have afforded us so much pleasure. But there is great danger in the present day lest the moral aspects of Christ's life-work should cause its distinguishing features as a redemptive economy to be thrown into the shade. Such books as the present are but too well calculated to increase that danger. There is no finality about such a compromise as is attempted here. The only resting-place is Unitarianism, even if it is to be found there. One Unitarian leader is largely quoted by the author. But we believe it requires a stronger than Dr. Channing to exorcise the spirit of scepticism which still animates the followers of John Stuart Mill.

Row's Jesus of the Evangelists.

The Jesus of the Evangelists: His Historical Character Vindicated; or, An Examination of the Internal Evidence for our Lord's Divine Mission with Reference to Modern Controversy. By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's. Second Edition. London: Frederic Norgate, 7, King Street, Covent Garden; Williams and Norgate, 20, Frederick Street, Edinburgh. 1880.

We are glad to see a second edition of this masterly work. A more complete refutation of the mythological theory of the origin of Christianity we have never read. Its republication is timely, coinciding as it does with the appearance in this country as a lecturer in connection with the Hibbert trust of one of the foremost advocates of that theory. Criticisms of this book have been both numerous and varied: a reply is not likely to be forthcoming. Mr. Row possesses the historical faculty in a degree not surpassed by any of those who have presumed themselves competent to pronounce on the genuineness of the sacred narratives. The task of reconstruction he sets before those who have hitherto employed their powers mainly in the work of demolition is one that will require, to say the least, great hardihood. It is impossible for us to trace here the course of the writer's argument: suffice it to say that the general impression made upon our minds by a close

study of it leads us to endorse without any hesitation the following bold identification. "How did the Atheist of old create the universe? Infinite bodies of atoms, in the course of infinite time, rolled in obedience to some eternal laws through infinite space. These laws, however, allowed the atoms to effect an infinite number of fusions. At last they rushed together, and thereout emerged the world. The Atheist, out of a congeries of atoms, creates the harmonies of nature. The Mythologists, from a congeries of myths, create a glorious Christ. But the one has at his command eternity, the other not above seventy years."

We are sorry to have to take any exception to a work of so much excellence. But fidelity requires it. Before accepting all that Mr. Row has said about the relation of the Christian dispensation to that which preceded it, we should have very seriously to modify our views of inspiration. We have been accustomed to hold the unity of the whole Bible as strongly as the unity of the New Testament. We think we owe the same reverence to the Old Testament as was paid to it by Christ and His apostles. And we confess that we are disposed to receive with some distrust any statements that tend to exhibit the relation of the New to the Old as one of almost unrelieved contrast rather than of a necessary and legitimate development.

It may be, indeed, that Mr. Row is more at one with us than at first sight appears. It is the unity of revelation that we contend for, not of those to whom in successive ages the revelation has been given. That the ancient oracles had been misunderstood by those who were the depositories of them is to be frankly admitted. Such perversion Christ Himself pointed out and condemned. But to say or to imply that those oracles themselves contained anything really at variance with that which Christ came to do and to teach is either to enunciate the paradox of a self-contradictory revelation or to subvert the reality of revelation altogether. Such an intention Mr. Row would probably be the first to disclaim. But if so, we wish his language had in several places been more guarded than it is. The depreciatory style in which he writes about the old dispensation is a weapon that it is not difficult for his opponents to turn against himself. Nor do we think his position is capable of being sustained by facts. Having said so much, we must say a little more, lest our general assertions should seem to be insusceptible of proof.

We must confine our remarks to what we find in the eighth chapter, entitled "The preparations made by Providence for the introduction of Christianity through the developments of Judaism." The position apparently laid down at the outset is that Christianity was not, as the mythic theory would require, "a natural growth out of Judaism, according to the laws of development of the human mind," but that Judaism was nevertheless "a

preparation for the development" of the "Christian ideas." In order to determine which of these two opinions is the correct one, the author proposes first to "take a brief view of the religion and morality of the Old Testament, and the progress of their gradual development;" then to "examine the nature of its Messianic predictions;" and in the last place to "ascertain the precise state of thought and feeling out of which, if it be a mythical creation, the conception of the Jesus of the Evangelists must have originated." It is to the first of these three investigations alone that we can direct attention.

The author says, "The Old Testament contains two developments of Judaism in its moral and religious aspect, that of the Law, and that of the Psalmists and the Prophets." The priest and the prophet are supposed to stand at the head of two systems, the one posterior in its establishment to the other, and taking its place by the side of it as a corrective to its pernicious tendencies. If the author had regarded the prophets as raised up to keep alive a principle that from the first had distinguished the Mosaic economy, but which the unfaithfulness of men disposed them to forget, we should have been in entire accord with him. But, as it is, we must express our dissent. In the first place, we think he post-dates the appearance of the prophetic element. The era of Samuel is fixed as the "first great development which took place in the Jewish mind" in this direction, signalised by his "establishment of the schools of the prophets." It is spoken of as "the culmination of the prophetic period." And the whole context seems to show that "the institution of the prophets" is to be dated from Samuel. But how shall we reconcile this with the undoubted fact that Moses himself, the founder of the ceremonial service, is spoken of as the first and greatest of the prophets, or with the appearance of the gift of prophecy among the Israelites in the wilderness?

In the next place, we fail to see that there was any necessary antagonism between the prophetic and priestly elements. If there had been, how could the two offices ever have met in one man? Samuel belonged to the tribe of Levi, and from his birth was dedicated to the service of the sanctuary: yet he established the schools of the prophets. Two out of the three greater prophets were of priestly descent. That "the efforts of the prophets were directed to the unfolding of the moral and spiritual elements in religion" we freely admit, and even that, "compared with these, the ritual was a subject of their positive depreciation." But which of the priests ever attempted to exalt ritual above morality? Who maintained the superiority of the moral element more earnestly than Israel's great lawgiver? Who ever discerned any antagonism between Leviticus and Deuteronomy? The assertion of Jeremiah is not that God had given Israel ritual by Moses, and

that now He was about to replace it by morality, but that the moral law was binding from the beginning, and of such importance that in comparison the ceremonial was of very small account (Jer. vii. 21—23). The necessity for such teaching as that of the prophets proves a lapse from the original standard, not a defect in the standard itself,—just such a retrograde movement in fact as the author allows to be of frequent occurrence in the history of religion and morals. Such a lapse Moses predicted and strove to avert.

There are other statements concerning the character of the Mosaic economy with which we do not feel perfectly satisfied. It is said that "the religious and moral aspects of the first stage of Judaism present us with a religion and morality only suited to an infantine state of the human mind." The proof of it is that "its worship was unspiritual; its morality that of a barbarous age; its political institutions were only suited for a nation in a low state of civilisation." There is no doubt some truth in these statements; but we do not think they give an adequate account of the Mosaic economy, nor do we find anything to make up for the defect in the succeeding paragraphs. We feel that such assertions as the following require very considerable modification before we can accept them. "The truth of the Divine unity was one too sublime to be accepted by the national mind in its fulness. Its clear light was darkened by being enshrouded in a cloud of localism, ritualism, and symbolism." Such language seems to reflect on the wisdom of God in establishing the Mosaic economy at all. Indeed, it would seem as if its Divine authorship were itself a matter of doubt. "Here," that is, in the Temple, "the Jew was taught to believe that Jehovah had His special habitation, and that He contemplated it with peculiar delight." One would suppose from this that Solomon's prayer was the invention of later times, or at least that it introduced ideas that were altogether new. Certainly from the time of the dedication of the Temple none could be in doubt as to the sense in which it was to be regarded as the habitation of the Most High.

There was much more than the unity of God involved in the form of religion established under the shadow of Mount Sinai. All the doctrines of the New Testament are found there in germ. They were not all fully apprehended: it was not possible to apprehend them fully: only the Divine power that fashioned Judaism could have caused such a system as Christianity to emerge from it. But they both bear tokens of the same Artificer: the enigma and the solution of it were products of the same Mind.

We regret that limits of space forbid our further investigation of the subject, and still more that there should have been any need to enter upon it. A tendency to make too little of the Divine elements in the elder economy, and to make too much of

the human elements, is the principal fault we have to find with a work which, for its noble vindication of the claims of the Founder of Christianity, deserves a high place in the apologetic literature of the day.

Laidlaw's Bible Doctrine of Man.

The Bible Doctrine of Man. The Seventh Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By John Laidlaw, M.A., Minister of Free West Church, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38, George Street. 1879.

The aim of these Lectures is to investigate the psychology of Scripture, "those views of man and his nature which pervade the sacred writings." The mode of treatment is suggested by the character of those writings. Scriptural psychology is given in "a revelation which declares the Divine dealings with man in order to his redemption." The order followed is therefore that of the great theological topics. Since the psychology of Scripture must always be studied with a view to the elucidation of its theology, this method has advantages which more than counterbalance the lack of scientific precision thereby entailed. If any further justification be needed for the adoption of this method, it is to be found in the fact that the field is one in which very little has been attempted, and that little not always with satisfactory results. A theological bias has too often taken the place of that spirit of calm, judicial impartiality which is so essential to success in such inquiries, and so difficult to attain when they are prosecuted with exclusive reference to some particular topic of theological controversy. The reader will not find this book destitute of references to controversy: on the contrary, it abounds in them. But it is not itself a polemical treatise: its object is to point out the importance to all theology, controversial or not, of clear and correct views as to the nature and faculties ascribed by revelation to the being whose spiritual ruin it so faithfully depicts and whose spiritual recovery it so graciously unfolds.

That a consistent scheme of human nature is to be found in a book professing such an origin and such purposes as the Bible, may be taken for granted. The discovery of that scheme may be expected to add one more proof of the Divine origin of the Scriptures. At the same time, it is not to be expected that God's portraiture of man will exactly tally with man's portraiture of himself. Omissions may have to be supplied, exaggerations to be reduced, inconsistencies to be accounted for. Above all, if the purpose of revelation be what it professes to be, the future may be expected to throw light upon the present; the destiny of the being in question to explain mysteries in his

nature which to his own unaided powers must have remained insoluble. Such expectations are already more than fulfilled. Man cannot for so many ages have gazed upon the mirror of God's Word without discovering himself to be a grander creature, grander in the very depth of his degradation as well as in the possibilities of a regenerate life, than mere self-study would have enabled him to imagine. And the more critical and scientific the examination of the sacred canvas, and the more thorough and fearless the comparison of the figure drawn upon it with the vague outlines struck out by an uninspired philosophy, the more confirmed will be the conclusion that the Artist was himself the Artificer, that it is his Maker who here shows man to himself.

Every page of Mr. Laidlaw's book bears out these observations. The originality and independence of the New Testament writers in their use of terms common to them and the Greek philosophers, and the deeper significance they infuse into them under the direction of the inspiring Spirit, are clearly brought out. So also are the transitions from the earlier and less spiritual to the later and profounder meanings of these terms. True, knotty problems occur, which have taxed the powers of the most thoughtful minds, and still remain without a solution. But these only tend to strengthen the conviction that the Author of our nature is also the Author of our faith. For what merely human writer would have propounded these problems, or, having propounded, would have dared to leave them unresolved? The glimpses given us are enough to show at once the depth of our ignorance who are startled by them, and the depths of His knowledge who, when it pleases Him, can so easily draw aside the veil.

Among the most important topics discussed in this book are the Origin of Man, and the contrast between the Scriptural account of it and that given by modern speculation; the Dualism of Human Nature, and how this is consistent both with the monistic hypothesis and the doctrine of trichotomy; the Divine Image, and the various views of it that have been entertained by different schools; the Origin of Evil in Man; the Psychology of the New Life; and the relation of the subject to a Future State and to the Resurrection of the Body.

It is impossible, of course, that the questions here suggested should receive definite settlement or even exhaustive investigation in the course of six Lectures. It is enough that they should have been rapidly surveyed, viewed in their mutual relations, and in their bearing on dogmatic theology. To this must be added a mass of notes, almost equal in volume to the Lectures themselves, containing the fruits of wide reading and extensive research. The result is a book which forms a valuable introduction to a very important field of thought, which sets its

readers on the right track to the solution of difficulties even where it does not venture on working out a solution of its own, and which vigorously and yet not ungenerously exposes some of the most pernicious errors that infest modern thought. We cordially commend it to every one who feels desirous—and what student of theology does not?—to climb heights from which a bird's-eye view of the whole field of theological inquiry may be readily gained.

Leathes' Old Testament Prophecy.

Old Testament Prophecy: its Witness as a Record of Divine Foreknowledge. The Warburton Lectures for 1876—1880. *With Notes on the Genuineness of the Book of Daniel and the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks.* By the Rev. Stanley Leathes, D.D., Rector of Cliff-at-Hoo, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, Professor of Hebrew at King's College. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

The Warburton Lectures were founded by the celebrated Bishop of that name, with direction that the lecturers should "endeavour to prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Christian in particular, from the completion of those prophecies in the Old and New Testament which relate to the Christian Church, especially to the apostasy of Papal Rome." Dr. Leathes, in the present volume, limits the inquiry to the "evidential value of certain typical portions of Old Testament prophecy as shown by their fulfilment in Christ and His Gospel; a sufficiently important subject, it will be allowed, in the existing condition of religious thought." Not all the Old Testament prophecies, it will be seen, are investigated, but "a few salient and typical samples." Modern "advanced criticism" has expended enormous labour and ingenuity in assailing the Divine authority of Holy Writ. As usual, the keenest and most formidable assailants have been the critics of the German rationalistic school. Professor Kuenen, of Leyden, is indeed a Dutchman, but his views and mode of treatment attest his adherence to the tenets of that school. Dr. Leathes considers that Kuenen has made the most considerable attempt against Old Testament prophecy in his work entitled, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel.* The learned and acute philosopher and critic is "a strong and determined anti-supernaturalist." He tries to prove that "Old Testament prophecy is a purely natural and psychological phenomenon, unique and historical indeed, but simply natural as the accidental form in which one of the 'principal religions' of the world developed and expressed itself. It has no claim to be regarded as a direct and supernatural message from God." Of

course it follows "that there is nothing in the Old Testament of the nature of prediction." This was merely an accidental form assumed by prophecy, varying with various prophets, nay, with various writings of the same prophet; "was in many cases notoriously falsified by subsequent events," and "where not, was always to be referred to the prudent foresight of the prophets, if, as was not seldom the case, owing to the credulity of the actors, it was not in itself an efficient and effectual means of working out its own fulfilment." Dr. Leathes acknowledges the manifest thoroughness of Kuenen's theory, and sets himself to as thorough and earnest a scrutiny of that theory as can be imagined. He points out that the question under discussion is not one of detail, but of principle, remarking that "the Bishop of Durham has conclusively disposed of the detail so far as relates to the early Christian literature: others have more directly assailed the principle. With regard to the Old Testament, the case is somewhat different. There is not the same evidence within our reach, and the answer must be to a certain extent dependent upon the results of the inquiry with regard to the New. If we have here sufficient evidence to warrant us in accepting the presence of the supernatural, then, so far as the supernatural in the New Testament involves the supernatural in the Old, the presence of it in the one case carries with it the presence of it also in the other. For example, is it or is it not a fact that Christ literally rose from the dead? Is it a fact that He did? Then it is simply playing with words to represent that act as a natural and not a supernatural act. Again, is there or is there not evidence that Christ led His disciples to believe that He would rise again from the dead? If He did, then is Christ a supernatural person, not only unique in all history, but separated from every other character that can be named by an impassable barrier. And if this be so, then do what we will there is in the Christian religion a core and kernel of the supernatural, which we cannot destroy without destroying that religion. But then, also, not only is it one of the 'principal religions' of the world, but it has also a just claim to be regarded as *the* 'principal religion,' the *only* religion that comes to us with Divine commendation and authority, with the sanction of the 'supernatural'" (*Preface*, pp. x., xi.).

The author pursues this proposition into many important and most interesting details; shows how almost everything depends upon our answer to the Master's own question, "What think ye of Christ?" and retorts upon those who call His mode of reasoning "unscientific," that the conclusions drawn from the "critical method" are "self-contradictory and therefore self-destructive;" and if his "method is vitiated by a foregone conclusion of belief, the method of the critics is no less vitiated by the arbitrariness of their principles." Kuenen assigns "the

origin of prophecy entirely and alone to the subjective conviction of the prophets;" to which our author replies, that the result in such a case could not be "an Isaiah or a Micah, a Joel or an Amos." He clearly sees, and brings it out into the daylight, that Kuenen "denies that we have any veritable communication from God that we can absolutely trust; and certainly this is not to be found in prophecy." The author's contention is, of course, the exact opposite; and he illustrates his "meaning in this endeavour to defend 'supernaturalism,' by showing why it seems to me to be indispensable. How can the Church, at large, for instance, or how can any individual Christian believe in the forgiveness of sins, unless there has been an actual communication to that effect from the Most High Himself? It is not enough for Christ to have proclaimed the doctrine; for if Christ was not a supernatural person, He may not—nay, cannot—have been in any special communication with His Father, and, therefore, in trusting His word we trust to something which is unauthorised unless He had authority to speak it. But if He had authority to speak it, then we can trust it to the end, and trust it infinitely; and the administration and application of it becomes merely a matter of degree, of time, and place, and circumstance. We have a Divine basis, a 'supernatural' foundation underlying all, and on that we can rest; but take away this, and even the forgiveness of sins itself becomes nothing more than a vague, shadowy, and unreliable hope, or mere hallucination. This is only an illustration to show that unless ultimately we have access to the 'supernatural,' we have not access to God; and what is true of the Gospel itself is in its degree true likewise of prophecy, which was the preparation for the Gospel" (*Preface*, pp. xvi., xvii).

This passage points out "the need for supernaturalism," but, as the author admits, does not prove the existence of any ground for believing in it. That can only be done by evidence. Kuenen attributes prophecy to the "moral earnestness" of the prophets and their intense conviction. Dr. Leathes points out how hopelessly inadequate is such a theory of the origin of prophecy; and instances Isaiah xxxv. and lxi. as examples, apart altogether from the predictive element of "a principle at work in them (the prophets) which is not of man, neither by man; which is not of the earth earthy, but is more than human, and is, strictly speaking and in fact, Divine." Kuenen hopes to establish the human and subjective origin of prophecy by discrediting its predictions; but our author, by such instances as the above, effectually disposes of him.

But it is time to say something of the work itself. The great object of rationalistic criticism is to eliminate "the predictive element" from prophecy. It strives with prodigious and perversely ingenious labour to prove that the prophecies, as a

whole, were written either after the events which are supposed to have fulfilled them, or so soon previously as to make it easy to clear and foreseeing minds that such events would happen. It is with this proposition that Dr. Leathes chiefly grapples. He tests it, and proves its falsity in the cases of "the Promise to Abraham; the Influence of the Promise; the Tabernacle of David; the Sure Mercies of David; the Heir of David's Throne; the Threatened Captivity; the Approaching Doom; the Promised Return; the Fulfilment of the Time; the Seventy Weeks; and the Spirit of Prophecy." The book is not expository, its one object being "to show that Old Testament prophecy is a record of Divine foreknowledge;" and to that our author adheres with a rigidity, a severity of logic, which is not often exhibited. The 'critics' assume that there is nothing in prophecy but what the prophet apprehended when he spoke or wrote. Our author again and again conclusively demolishes that assumption; and many familiar passages of the New Testament must convince every candid mind that the prophets might be, and in the majority of instances were, ignorant of many of the events in which their utterances, spoken under a Divine *afflatus*, should attain their fulfilment. Dr. Leathes shows, by reiterated and unanswerable proof, that the full meaning of the predictive words of the prophets was hidden from themselves; and proves, moreover, that the difficulties in reason created by the attempt to post-date the prophecies are immeasurably greater than any which their acceptance by faith as truly predictive can ever create. Necessarily we have now and then expository allusions, but the argument does not depend upon their correctness. It is made abundantly clear that, upon any exposition, the really predictive character is manifest. His "thesis is one which perhaps does not admit of actual demonstration; but there can surely be little doubt in which direction the logic of facts points us. We must either forcibly distort them in order to reduce them to the measure of the insignificant and the ordinary; or we must accept the witness of their extraordinary character which points us to the conclusion of faith—of faith, that is, in the ministry of prophecy as a select and authorised Divine agency for making known the Divine will for a special and ordained purpose, which, though faintly grasped by believing minds at the time, could only be perceived in its completeness when the purpose was fulfilled" (p. 157).

The book is altogether remarkable and great as a contribution to Christian Apologetics. We especially call attention to the lectures on "The Fulfilment of the Time;" "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel;" and "The Spirit of Prophecy." The lecture on "The Tabernacle of David" somewhat disappoints us. Dr. Leathes, in common with most writers who treat of this, assumes that by this designation is meant the royal house of the Hebrew

monarch. The late Dr. Smith, of Camborne, in his *Life and Reign of King David*, published several years ago, showed such fair reasons for understanding it as the tabernacle which David built on Mount Zion, that we are surprised not to find a hint, either in these Lectures, or in Bishop Ellicott's *Commentary for English Readers*, or in *The Speaker's Commentary*, or in Lange or Baumgarten, at the mere existence of Dr. Smith's theory. For ourselves, we have long felt that his explanation was by far the more satisfactory; and it seems to us, with all deference to the distinguished author of the present volume, that the theory would materially strengthen and confirm his argument. But, regarded as a whole, we hail this learned and very powerful book as a triumphant demonstration of the author's position as to the Old Testament prophecy being a "record of Divine foreknowledge." The volume is much enriched by an appendix dealing with the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, Professor Kuenen's view of the Prophet's Seventy Weeks, the Function of Prophecy in the Divine Records, and the Credentials of Revelation.

A book like this can have only the scantest possible justice done to it in a paper so brief as our limits impose upon us. It demands deep and protracted study, and we commend it to young ministers and theological students as a storehouse of information and unanswerable argument upon the subject of which it treats.

Church's Gifts of Civilisation.

The Gifts of Civilisation, and other Sermons and Lectures, Delivered at Oxford and at St. Paul's. By R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L., Dean of St. Paul's, Honorary Fellow of Oriel. New Edition. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

This volume contains four sermons preached at St. Mary's, and seven lectures delivered at St. Paul's. It is not, however, the medley which such a list of its contents might lead us to expect. But with the exception of the last two lectures, one theme runs through the whole—the influences of Christianity upon civilisation, and the attitude with respect to it that Christians ought to maintain. And there are few subjects of greater interest, or more appropriate to a university pulpit. For no observer of the present times can fail to see that society is debating whether it shall remain Christian or not. On the one side there is a tendency to isolate religion from civilisation, and for the sake of the former to despise and sometimes even to revile the latter. And this disposition has a numerous and strong party arrayed against it, who are apt to regard civilisation as a substitute for religion, destined, as it becomes more comprehensive in its aims

and more perfect in its methods and work, entirely to supersede it. Dean Church did a good piece of work when, ten years ago, he contended against both of these tendencies. And since society has not yet consented to adopt the *via media*, and honour civilisation whilst it keeps religion supreme, it was well that these wise and earnest words should be reprinted.

The drift of the sermons may be gathered from their titles, which are respectively "The Gifts of Civilisation," "Christ's Words and Christian Society," "Christ's Example," and "Civilisation and Religion." The first insists upon the necessity of recognising the truth that men are, to the full, as much stewards of their civilisation as they are responsible for their knowledge and for their gifts of grace. In the second, Dean Church examines the contrast between the acknowledged standard of life in the New Testament, and the ordinary life of Christian society. He does not examine that contrast philosophically, but practically. There is indeed an unerring philosophy underlying all he writes, but, at the same time, he never forgets that he is in the pulpit of a Christian Church. And his conclusion on the matter is, that God meant Christianity first of all to remake society, and then to rule over it. Wherefore the progress of civilisation must not be undervalued or thwarted; but men must set themselves, in imitation of their perfect Example of love and sacrifice, to promote it still more and to purify it. The Example forms the subject of the third sermon, in which the great fact is exhibited that Christianity is a universal religion, meant for all men, because its moral standard is not verbal rules, but a character. Last of all, the limits of civilisation are described. Its tendency to put out of sight the supreme value of the spiritual part of man, and to obscure the proportion between what is and what is to be, can be corrected, we are told, only by that religion which extends man's horizon, and strengthens his hold on the highest and central truths of humanity. It is, moreover, indubitable that there are many ugly symptoms in the attitude which civilisation assumes towards purity, that flower of the graces. And there is no part of Dean Church's sermons, which one who has the well-being of society at heart will value more highly than his clear and hearty treatment of this matter. "There is no point of morality (he writes) on which it is easier to sophisticate and confuse, easier to raise doubts of which it is hard to find the bottom, or to make restraints seem the unwarrantable bonds of convention and caprice. It is eminently one of those things as to which we feel it to be absolutely the law of our being as long as we obey, but lose the feeling when we do not obey. Civilisation in this matter is, by itself, but a precarious safeguard for very sacred interests. By itself it throws itself upon nature, and in some of its leading and most powerful representatives looks

back to paganism. It goes along with Christianity as to justice and humanity; but in the interest of individual liberty it parts company here. What trenches on and endangers ideas of purity it may disapprove, but it declines to condemn or brand. At least, it does not condemn, it does not affect to condemn, in the sense in which religion condemns; in the sense in which, *with* religion, it condemns injustice, cruelty, and falsehood. It is too much to hope that civilisation by itself will adopt and protect these ideas. And the passions which assail them are not among those which wear out with civilisation, and tend to extinction; they are constant forces, and as powerful as they are constant. Argument is hardly a match for them. They are only to be matched successfully by a rival idea, a rival fire, the strength of a rival spring of feeling with its attractions and antipathies, a living law and instinct of the soul. Civilisation supplies none such but what it owes to Christianity. Purity is one of those things which Christian ideas and influences produced; it is a thing which they alone can save."

The lectures in this volume belong to three series, and were originally addressed to audiences in St. Paul's, on week-day evenings of three winters. The first series is concerned with the differences between Roman civilisation, and that which began to prevail under the influence of Christianity. In the second, the influences of Christianity upon national character are traced, with special reference to the Greek, Latin, and Teutonic races. The third is devoted to the sacred poetry of early religions, and shows clearly that all early religious hymns, except those of the Bible, are now simply dead relics, while the religions themselves have undergone the same unvarying process of ignoble and irresistible decay. Several of these lectures are of permanent value. Though their titles contain no indication of novelty, their contents are yet altogether fresh, and do not follow the old lines of historical treatment, familiar to all students of the evidences. In the lecture, for instance, devoted to civilisation after Christianity, Dean Church does not content himself with enumerating the political and social changes effected by the Gospel, but he explains how the Gospel managed to effect them. And again, when he is discussing the influence of Christianity upon the national character of the Latin races, his plan is original enough. He first proves that the Gospel caused the affections to occupy a different sphere and space in national character, and that it fertilised, if it did not even produce imagination. And next, in a dozen of his finest pages, he illustrates both points by the institution of comparisons between the *Æneid* and the *Divine Commedia*, between Marcus Aurelius' *Meditations* and Augustine's *Confessions*.

In interest and in suggestive thoughtfulness, it is probable that these lectures have but few rivals. The sermons are equally

distinguished for culture and for manifold learning. The style unfortunately suffers through the character of the materials which compose the book; and whilst sufficiently appropriate to a pulpit, is a little irksome to a reader. Though there is no passionate utterance and no pathos, there is throughout a quiet and controlled earnestness. Through the intellect to the soul, is the course of teaching Dean Church follows; and appeal is always interwoven with discussion. This reprint will be welcome to all who prize eloquence of thought above verbiage, and are anxious to worship "with the spirit and with the understanding also."

Calderwood's Parables of our Lord.

The Parables of our Lord: interpreted in view of their relations to each other. By Professor Calderwood. One Vol. Macmillan and Co. 1880.

This work will be heartily welcomed by Bible students. Some curiosity will be excited by the fact that it is written by one whose labours are better known in widely different fields. Many will wish to know whether a mind daily occupied with the most abstruse problems of philosophy can possibly feel at home in handling the parables of our Lord. In his modest preface Professor Calderwood says: "I have never been without the consciousness of a measure of unfitness for the self-imposed task, acknowledgment of which should here be made. For adequate treatment of the parables, the artist's eye and the poet's fancy are both needful, and neither belongs to the writer." No one coming to this volume will therefore expect the descriptive treatment which is to be found in the writings of Guthrie, Arnot, Hamilton, and others. But what we find in this volume is of great permanent value. It contains many seedt-houghts, and is a worthy attempt at the consecutive exposition of a most important part of Holy Writ.

The principal feature of the work, and we think its most valuable one, is the endeavour to ascertain the relations of the parables to each other, contemplating them "as a unity, a revelation within the Revelation of God." As the result of this we have four divisions. Parables of man's entrance into the kingdom of God; the privileges and duties of the kingdom; the relation of the kingdom to the present state of the world; and the relation of the kingdom to the future state of existence. Such a grouping is of the utmost value, as showing how the parables of our Lord are the complements of each other, and in their unity present a body of truth which is never fully seen when they are isolated from this connection. In illustration of this we may cite the remarks of Dr. Calderwood on the parable

of the Pharisee and the Publican, as related to the three parables of Luke xv. So again certain questions suggested by the parable of the Great Feast in Luke xiv. are partly answered in that of the Pharisee and the publican, such as—Are those who refuse to come simply left to themselves? In giving a welcome to all, does God make no account of the character and conduct of those who seek to share in His favour? Is there any condition of welcome other than their willingness to come? "To afford the fuller answer, the analogy of a feast is brought forward anew with needful additions." We then have the Royal Marriage Feast of Matthew xxii., teaching us that union with the Son is the condition of favour with the Father.

The chapter on the Friend at Midnight is a capital specimen of true and original exposition. So too is a most suggestive chapter on the parable of the Net. We cannot regard all parts of the book of equal merit, for sometimes the expository skill of the author seems to desert him, and then a succession of trite sentences only puts what the parable says into other words without any fresh elucidation. The parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard is a case in point. The exposition of it is incomplete and inconclusive. Indeed, it could hardly be otherwise, since "work and wages in God's service" is a very wide subject, treated of in at least three parables, and not at all exhaustively dealt with in this. The proper way to the interpretation is that suggested by Dr. Bruce in his charming volume *The Training of the Twelve*, namely, the Function of Motive. We must content ourselves with expressing our dissent from the novel exposition of the parable of the Pearl of Great Price. The two most noticeable instances of comparative failure are to be found in the last two chapters of the volume, on the parables of the Talents and the Pounds. For the former Professor Calderwood gives us as its subject "different talents yielding equal rewards," and for the latter "equality of gifts with diversity of results." We venture to say these are not subjects at all, but only statements of what happens in the parables; yet he says, p. 423, "our Lord makes the parable an impressive unity." Why then did not our author find it and treat of it? His expository skill seems at fault too in this latter parable, since he makes no mention of the difference in the commendation bestowed by the Lord on the servants. Yet how significant is that difference! In contrast to these we would mention as a happy instance of seizing the lesson of the text, the subject assigned to the Leaven—"The assimilating power of Gospel Truth."

We would especially commend to our readers the exposition of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, though we do not agree with all Dr. Calderwood's suggestions and inferences. Here is a most careful treatment of the narrative, both in what

it says and in what it omits to say. For reverent, sober, and most skilful exposition, we regard this as the gem of the volume. The words on p. 373 are befitting the dignity of the whole chapter. "The life of worldliness which has led into the present misery cannot be changed now; the recollections of a past life cannot be altered, any more than the events which have registered themselves on the tablets of memory, and they cannot be obliterated by the purest and deepest sympathy; the sensibility of the mind under presence of such recollections and the self-reproach they occasion cannot be deadened. All these are fixed results, as fixed as the results of a life of patient trust in God; as persistent as the recollections dwelling in the soul of the escaped sufferer, or the sense of rest and thankfulness flowing steadily in upon his spirit. The inevitable fixedness of result flowing from the life we are now living is what a gracious, loving Saviour would have us ponder while we live. We are living, and we must hereafter continue to live, under the government of fixed law."

With this extract we take our leave of a book which must survive many others on the same subject. Its teachings will be not only profitably pondered by private Christians, but assimilated and reproduced by many whose business it is to teach others. Higher reward Dr. Calderwood will not desire.

Farrar's Ephphatha.

Ephphatha; or, The Amelioration of the World. Sermons. By Canon Farrar. One Vol. Macmillan and Co. 1880.

We have here another volume from the prolific pen of Canon Farrar. It is marked in a conspicuous degree by the many excellences of its author, and by not a few of those faults which we would gladly miss. There are ten sermons in the volume, seven of which, preached consecutively at Westminster Abbey, give its title to the book. Two others were preached at the opening of Parliament, and the tenth was preached at Westminster Abbey in April, 1879. There is a certain unity in the volume, for each of the sermons is true to the subject declared on the title-page. The sermons are the product of a singularly facile mind and an enthusiastic and generous soul, but while we acknowledge this, we feel keenly the omissions which mark the book. We refer as an instance to the sermon on "Sincerity of Heart the first Condition of Service." The whole of this sermon is a declaration that men must be good, but *how* it does not tell, beyond saying we must pray more and be pure in life. We doubt the utility of any mere exhortation to pray. We need to be told *through* whom to pray, *by* whom to pray; for the relation of Christ to

the individual soul as the atonement for its sins is the true evangel which at once discloses personal guilt and inspires hope of salvation. The sermon on "The Wings of a Dove," for poetical thought, is the finest in the volume, and as it is read one sees how the flowing eloquence of the preacher was aided by the finest possible surroundings in the venerable pile in which he ministered. The cure for sorrow here prescribed consists of action, patience, faith, hope. If it were worth while to describe the disease as fully as is done here, it were surely worth while also to describe its cure; yet Faith as a remedy for sorrow is dismissed in about twenty lines, and, divested of embelliahments, the twenty would be reduced to two.

Again, sermon six, on "The Mending and Marring of Human Life," is a fine instance of manly Christian speech; but the more this is felt, the more do we long for that evangelical teaching which would give living power to such utterances. So again in the sermon entitled "Last Lessons from the Sigh of Christ." Just when we are led to expect that the preacher will insist on and enforce personal regeneration and personal trust in Christ, he drifts into a side issue about future punishment amid much declamation, sets up certain foes only to knock them down again, and with some declarations about the all-conquering, all-forgiving love of God, which is to save us all, so takes his leave of the subject. The two sermons preached on the opening of Parliament are very excellent specimens of a class of discourses such as only a man of Dr. Farrar's position and attainments can be expected to deliver.

In conclusion, we gladly bear witness to the love for God and man displayed in this book, and the enlightened conception of Christian duty here shown, but must once more insist on the extremely partial character of its teaching. Love of nature and akilful interpretation of her utterances, fearless courage and hearty attachment to all that is true and noble, faithful exhibition of the moral law in its varied requirements, these are good. But to these must be joined the old evangelical fidelity which calls sinners to repentance, and knows nothing among men save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Only an unmutilated Gospel can ever maintain a lasting hold on the consciences of men. Whatever its external adornments, a wavering latitudinarianism does not respond to the instincts of human nature, much less to the wants of the Christian Church. There is no necessary antagonism between the gifts of learning and eloquence and the simplicity of Christ. This is proved by many examples in and out of the Establishment. Let us hope their number will increase.

The Religious Condition of Christendom.

The Religious Condition of Christendom Described in a Series of Papers presented to the Seventh General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in Basle, 1879. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

It is a great advantage to have now and then a volume giving us a connected view of the position of the Christian religion in the various nations of Christendom. The volumes of the Evangelical Alliance have, from time to time, done much to afford this advantage. Complete information as to the state of the Christian religion throughout the world, it is perhaps too much to expect. We are thankful, however, for the contribution now before us. It consists of papers and addresses touching almost all branches of Church and Christian life. Very interesting reports are given from all the principal countries of Europe. Dr. Stoughton made interesting references to Basle in the time of the Reformation. We have able addresses on such topics as the unchangeableness of the Apostolic Gospel, Ministerial Training, Christianity and Modern Society, Education, The Christian School in the Modern State, Duty towards Workmen, Revival of Christianity in the East, The Press, Jewish and Heathen Missions, Persecution in Austria, Christian Unity, The Present State of Christian Liberty, Socialism, Temperance, and Young Men's Associations. Some of the discourses are not equal in treatment to the anticipation excited by the happily-phrased and attractive headings. Still, taken altogether, the book supplies in miscellaneous form a large amount of important information. We are told that in Holland Popery is gaining ground, while neologic Protestantism is self-disintegrating. A pastor may "claim a place within the church for the 'Atheistic shade of religion and Christianity' without being called to account," and "the neglect of church attendance is on the increase in many places." France contains thirty million nominal Catholics, though the masses are really indifferent. But Protestantism shows signs of aggression. Without, however, noting the shades of difference between the several countries, we find on the whole that notwithstanding many proofs of progress on the part of evangelical religion, the threefold blight of superstition, scepticism, and sordid indifference to religion, largely rests upon the nations of the Continent. More encouraging accounts are given of Britain, and also of the United States of America. The nominal members (worshippers, we suppose) of all Methodist denominations in the latter are computed in Dr. Schaff's paper at 14,000,000, with 52 colleges, 12 theological seminaries, and 32,000 congregations. The communicant mem-

bership is 3,428,050, and the number of ministers 23,562. The Roman Catholics have 6,375,630 nominal members. The communicant membership of the Baptists is 2,656,221, and that of the Presbyterians 1,580,021: the "nominal" is not given in either case. The Episcopalians (corresponding to the Church of England) have 314,367 communicant members, 4,200 congregations, 3,141 ministers, 14 colleges, and 16 theological seminaries.

Dr. Hurst of Madison, New Jersey, in his capital paper on *Christian Union necessary for Religious Progress*, makes three wise and weighty suggestions for guidance in the future. "1. Greater attention must be given to the preaching of fundamental Christian doctrines." "2. There should be more frequent interchange of denominational sentiment." "3. There should be a more intense treasuring of possessions common to us all. The whole Church of Christ has common treasure in the theology of the first five centuries. The writings of all the Reformers can stand in brotherly union on the shelves of any library. To whom belong the martyrs? Shall Italy and Switzerland lay sole claim to their heroic Waldenses? The theology of two centuries ago in England belongs to Universal Christendom. . . . He who has fought well for the good cause of the Gospel belongs to the heroic group of the one whole Church of Christ."

The literature of the Evangelical Alliance, though valuable, is not the greatest of its services to the Church of Christ. It has done something towards presenting to the world an aspect of union among different sections of Christian believers, something as a witness for the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, and still more for the cause of religious liberty; let it remain true to its own avowed principles, and the future will assuredly afford it scope for still greater service in the work of filling the earth with the knowledge of the Lord.

Sunday-School Centenary Bibles.

The Memorial Edition of the Oxford Bible for Teachers. Oxford: Printed at the University Press. London: Henry Froude.

The Sunday-School Centenary Bible; or, Variorum Teacher's Bible. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty. 1880.

The Oxford Bible for Teachers has already received high commendation from the most competent judges. It is the result of praiseworthy efforts to put within the reach of ordinary readers the products of the most recent research and of the ripest scholarship. To a clearly-printed text is added, under the name of "Helps," a large amount of valuable information prepared with great skill for the use of Bible students.

The "Helps" comprise analytical notes and summaries of the several books of Holy Scripture; historical, chronological and geographical tables; lists of the animals, birds, reptiles and plants, the minerals and precious stones, music and musical instruments, with explanatory notes on each; lists of obsolete, ambiguous and symbolical words; also an extended and carefully-prepared index to the Scriptures—a most valuable feature; a concise concordance, containing more than 25,000 references; a dictionary of proper names with their pronunciation and meanings, and a Scripture atlas of twelve clearly-engraved maps, with index indicating the situation of all the places named.

It is not too much to say that so large an amount of trustworthy information, for the use of Bible-readers, was never before presented in so available a form. It is a perfect *vade-mecum* for the student of the English Scriptures. For the accuracy of the text and the value of the "Helps," the Oxford University press is in itself a sufficient guarantee.

In order to place this treasure within the reach of all Sunday-school teachers throughout the land, it is issued during this the centenary year at reduced prices from as low as three shillings upwards. Nine fac-simile editions have been published, ranging from the pearl 16mo (a marvel of compactness) to the minion 4to, suitable for the family or the table of the student. The bindings are of great variety, so that the taste and means of all classes of purchasers are met.

One edition has been printed expressly as a *Memorial Edition* of the Sunday-school Centenary celebration. It is a most useful and handy volume of minion 8vo size; and though containing the whole of the "Helps," extending to 320 pages, it is kept within convenient thickness and weight, being printed on specially-prepared paper.

We very cordially recommend these Bibles to the notice of all our readers, for though they were professedly prepared for the use of Sunday-school teachers, they are really most suitable for all.

Another Sunday-school Centenary Memorial is the *Variorum Teacher's Bible*, published by Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, the Queen's printers. This work has passed through three stages of growth. It first appeared in 1876 as the *Variorum Bible*, by Cheyne, Driver, Clarke and Goodwin; then with the additional service of Dr. Sanday, passing into the *Variorum Reference Bible;* and finally, by the incorporation of *Aids to Bible Students*, becoming the *Sunday-School Centenary Bible*, or *Variorum Teacher's Bible.*

A distinguishing feature of this volume is the presentation on the same page of the Authorised Version with its marginal references, and various renderings and readings with their several authorities. In the New Testament portion are added some very brief explanatory comments. Thus the Authorised Version and the chief materials for its revision are placed at once before the

reader. This will be found of great service when the Westminster Revision comes to be examined. Thus far as to the text and the translation. But the volume has another value in the added "*Aids to the Student of the Holy Bible*"—a similar work to the "*Helps to the Study of the Bible*" published by the Oxford University press, but on an original and somewhat extended plan.

The first section of the contents embraces nearly a score of chapters entitled *Materials for Bible Lessons;* one of these chapters being a summary and analysis of each Book of the Old and New Testament by Dr. Stanley Leathes. These are followed by sections on the plants of the Bible, by Sir J. Hooker; animals, by Canon Tristram; poetry, by T. K. Cheyne; and music, by Dr. Stainer. There are sections on ethnology, and on the political, religious and commercial relations of the Hebrews with surrounding nations, by Rev. A. H. Sayce; on chronology and history, by Dr. Green and others. Besides these, there are a glossary of Bible words, a dictionary of proper names, an extended index and concordance, and maps, with several other useful details.

This is a really valuable possession, a perfect miniature library, illustrative and explanatory of the Scriptures. It is a very much better book for Sunday-school teachers and Bible students in general than any individual commentary can be. The careful and diligent use of such a volume would put any thoughtful reader in possession of such an amount of information on Biblical subjects and clear up so many apparent difficulties, as to render the Bible of unspeakably greater service than it could otherwise be. Every Sunday-school teacher in the land ought to possess one or other of these invaluable books.

Cyples' Process of Human Experience.

An Inquiry into the Process of Human Experience, attempting to set forth its Lower Laws, with some Hints as to the Higher Phenomena of Consciousness. By William Cyples. London: Strahan and Co. All rights reserved.

The writer of this bulky volume appears to be convinced that he has thought out a new theory of human nature; but what the theory is we are wholly unable to divine. We have a sort of dim perception that the work covers the entire field of philosophy,—including sensation, pleasure and pain, memory, attention, succession of ideas, intellect, the ego, the emotions, will, conscience, "hypothesis of the soul," faith, experience, the problem of evil, metaphysics, "evidence of entity other than matter," art (the order is the author's own),—and we are assured that nothing but want of space prevented a discussion of physiology and sociology; but what the author has to say on these multifarious topics is effectually concealed by a style and terminology to which we fail to attach any meaning. The obscurity pervading the entire work arises partly from what seems an affectation of origi-

nality, as in the use of "awareness, self-awareness, unawareness," for "consciousness, self-consciousness, and unconsciousness." But this is only a minor cause. The obscurity goes deeper than mere phraseology. It is inherent in the very substance of the work. The clearest of the eight hundred pages is the title-page quoted above. We knew as much about the book after reading the title-page as we did after reading the whole. We cannot even make out with certainty which side in philosophy the writer means to take. From the frequent references to Spencer, Lewes, Mill, and Bain, and the few references to others, it seems natural to infer that the writer belongs to the same school. "The cerebral process of conscience" has a terribly materialistic ring, and the interdependence of the mental and physiological elements pervades the first part of the volume. But, on the other side, seemingly approving references to Christian doctrines look the other way. On the whole, we should not be safe in expressing an opinion on the point. But for the difficulty of conceiving a book of such a size meant other than seriously, we should suppose that the author had intended to set a series of puzzles, or to furnish the greatest possible number of illustrations of explaining the clear by the obscure. That we may not be thought to speak without reason, it will only be right to give an example or two. "To any one who has not fully acquired the habit, reading brings drowsiness," a tolerably simple and familiar phenomenon. Now for the explanation. "That is, he or she has not gone on far before the only ill-habituated neurotic-associations then actualising consciousness fail. An uneducated man remaining quiescent, cannot think consecutively without falling asleep; the ratiocinative cerebral activities are not coincident enough to carry on the egoistic actualisation. Rocking motion will put a very young infant to sleep at almost any time." No explanation is appended of the last phenomenon. The definitions given seem like bad imitations of Mr. Spencer's, which, at least, are generally expressed in grammatical English. The following is our author's "rough definition of the soul." "It is the interior, higher, egoistically-obtained organisation of the actualising-apparatus always modifiable by the moral conduct of the ego, but representing potentially its total of reminiscence available for the conditioning and defining of personality; carrying forward the possibility of specific-actualisation of the ego in the intervals of its suspensions as those are fixed by the fundamental law of consciousness, and enabling and conditioning the ego's resumptions at the next occasion simply by taking on motion from the lower organic-operations of the physiological-frame, and the impressional-cues at the time acting; giving, in case of there happening right prompting, possibilities of recurrence of any of the ego's historic-personalities beyond the current actualisation, in so far as that does not include them." Probably the reader has had enough.

MISCELLANEOUS.

GREEN'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. VOL. IV.

History of the English People. By John Richard Green, M.A., Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Vol. IV: The Revolution, 1683—1760. Modern England, 1760—1815. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

IN this volume, well supplied with maps and an index, Mr. Green completes the task he set himself a few years ago. His aim has been to write the history of the English people, beginning with the period when the people began first to enter as a factor into the plans of kings and into their troubles, and closing with the final collapse of Napoleonic designs upon England, her liberty and empire, at the battle of Waterloo. And in execution, no less than in purpose, Mr. Green's book is superior to any of a similiar kind, and will probably without delay supersede all other general histories of our country. Its most striking characteristic is, perhaps, the perfect unity of theme which binds all together, which is never forgotten by the writer, however strong his temptation to digress, and which the reader is never permitted to forget. Other histories are, with few exceptions, mere chronicles of seemingly isolated events, or disquisitions concerning law and constitution. And the handbooks popular in schools, for their amenability to cramming, suggest rather the fondness of the age for competitive examinations, than its earnest interest in the growth and in the method of growth of the nation. Mr. Green's book will need to be supplemented by such as treat of the domestic life, the manners and the literature of the people; and occasionally it will be necessary to consult other works for a sufficiently full account of certain acts of legislation. But no historian whose materials have been equally bulky, or who has sought to cover an equally long period of time, has succeeded so well. Elsewhere, with pains, a reader may discover all the links that connect the England of to-day with the small area over which the early kings reigned. Here he finds with pleasure all the different links welded together into one long chain; and the process of consolidation and growth becomes more intelligible than any other writer has been able to make it. The skill with which the various events are woven together, and all their mutual inter-

dependences, their causes and issues traced and described, is the leading feature of a book the ability and value of which can hardly be exaggerated.

Nor does Mr. Green fail in that quality which has been made indispensable by the brilliancy of the principal historians of the present century. It is now a *sine qua non* of circulation and success that a history must be vivid and forcible. For since the days of Macaulay, dulness has been apt to be esteemed a greater vice than inaccuracy; and for a man to permit himself to be ponderous is to doom his books to swift oblivion. No reader of average intelligence will find Mr. Green heavy. The necessity of compressing the story of several centuries into a smaller number of volumes compels of course the exclusion of much detail that would have been picturesque, and the avoidance of frequent elaborate portraiture. But in this matter Mr. Green is led by trained instinct to shun the peril that threatened him on either side. He does not bury his subject in unmanageable details, as Buckle was wont to do. Nor does he hesitate to linger for a moment whenever proportionate greatness of character or deed justifies or demands complete treatment. But his pauses are never more than momentary, and are always made subservient to his great purpose of describing the progress of the people to their present position of freedom and of self-government. To students in search of solid information this work will abundantly commend itself. And readers in want of a vigorous, reliable, and readable history of their own land, will gradually learn to esteem it above all others.

It has often been debated whether it is possible for an historian to be impartial. But whatever opinion may be held upon that question, Mr. Green may safely be said to be as impartial an historian as it was possible for him to be. Infrequently, perhaps, his own politics colour slightly his narrative, or may be inferred from his distribution of praise and blame. But there is not apparent anywhere the spirit of eager adherence to personal theory or prejudice which disfigures the pages of most popular histories. He maintains persistently the attitude of a spectator of the strife between royal prerogative and the principle of parliamentary government, between despotism in Church and State and the democratic convictions that withstand it, but does not unduly mingle in the combat; and he who least sympathises with Mr. Green's own views and conclusions cannot fairly accuse him of partisanship, of any conscious or unconscious misrepresentation of the past, under the influence of present rivalries or differences.

The most interesting and probably the most important part of this final volume consists of the frequent sections which trace the gradual change from the system of personal government, which

prevailed under the Tudors and the Stuarts, to the system of representative government under which at present we live. The election of William and Mary and the Declaration of Rights constituted the first step in that change, and formally put an end to all claim of Divine or of hereditary right independently of the law. Since that time English Sovereigns have reigned simply by virtue of an Act of Parliament. The same convention—Parliament—introduced two other alterations, which have tended greatly to secure the personal liberty of the present day. The vote of supplies was made thenceforth an annual instead of a life vote; and control over the army was transferred from the Crown to the Parliament, pay being provided and discipline secured by the passing of a Mutiny Act year by year. And inasmuch as no State can exist without supplies, and no army without discipline and pay, the annual assembly of Parliament became a matter of absolute necessity, and the greatest constitutional improvement that history has witnessed was brought about, indirectly indeed, but efficiently and without bloodshed. Another step was taken when, by the advice of the Earl of Sunderland, William introduced the modern Ministerial system into the government, and originated the custom of selecting the ministers of the Crown exclusively from among the members of the party which was strongest in the Lower House. Not only did such a plan effect a unity of administration which had been unknown before, but it organised the House of Commons, and made the ministry practically an executive committee, representing the will of the majority, and capable of being set aside and replaced according to the fluctuations in the opinions of the majority. The process was completed under George III. He resolved to be his own chief minister. The authority which the throne had wielded before the Revolution, he determined to regain and to hold in his own hand. He refused to adopt the methods and limitations which had grown up under his recent predecessors. And the result was that the early part of his reign is just a miserable story of the ceaseless quarrels of Whig factions with one another, or of the whole Whig party with the king. But "in the strife of those wretched years began a political revolution which is still far from having reached its close. Side by side with the gradual development of the English Empire and of the English race has gone on, through the century that has passed since the close of the Seven Years' War, the transfer of power within England itself from a governing class to the nation as a whole. If the effort of George failed to restore the power of the Crown, it broke the power which impeded the advance of the people itself to political supremacy. Whilst labouring to convert the aristocratic monarchy of which he found himself the head into a personal sovereignty, the irony of fate doomed him to take the first step in an organic change

which has converted that aristocratic monarchy into a democratic republic, ruled under monarchical forms."

Few events in the eighteenth century are so marked or have proved so world-wide and permanent in their effects as the outbreak of activity, political, industrial, and religious, which followed the long and quiet breathing-time of England during Walpole's ministry. Mr. Green devotes ample space to most of the matters in which this revival showed itself. He writes kindly and appreciatively, though not without a few errors, of the work of John Wesley and his brother. It is not right, for example, to attribute the hardships to which John Wesley submitted, and which he often humorously recounts, to asceticism, nor his noting of providential occurrences to "childish fanaticism." Nor was his practice of sortilege so frequent as to justify the tone in which Mr. Green speaks of it. But Mr. Green's account of the Wesleys is a fair specimen of the spirit and manner in which he writes, and for that reason, as well as for the sake of its special interest, may be condensed and quoted. "Charles Wesley," he writes, "was the sweet singer of the movement. His hymns expressed the fiery conviction of its converts in lines so chaste and beautiful that its more extravagant features disappeared. The wild throes of hysteric enthusiasm passed into a passion for hymn-singing, and a new musical impulse was aroused in the people which gradually changed the face of public devotion throughout England. But it was his elder brother, John Wesley, who embodied in himself not this or that side of the new movement, but the movement itself. In power as a preacher he stood next to Whitefield; as a hymn-writer he stood second to his brother Charles. But while combining in some degree the excellences of either, he possessed qualities in which both were utterly deficient; an indefatigable industry, a cool judgment, a command over others, a faculty of organisation, a singular union of patience and moderation with an imperious ambition, which marked him as a ruler of men. He had besides a learning and skill in writing which no other of the Methodists possessed; he was older than any of his colleagues at the start of the movement, and he outlived them all. It would have been impossible for Wesley to have wielded the power he did had he not shared the follies and extravagance as well as the enthusiasm of his disciples.

"Throughout his life his asceticism was that of a monk. At times he lived on bread only, and he often slept on the bare boards. He lived in a world of wonders and Divine interpositions. It was a miracle if the rain stopped and allowed him to set forward on a journey. It was a judgment of heaven if a hail-storm burst over a town which had been deaf to his preaching. One day, he tells us, when he was tired and his horse fell lame, 'I thought, Cannot God heal either man or beast by any

means or without any?—immediately my headache ceased and my horse's lameness in the same instant.' With a still more childish fanaticism he guided his conduct, whether in ordinary events or in the great crisis of his life, by drawing lots or watching the particular texts at which his Bible opened. But with all this extravagance and superstition, Wesley's mind was essentially practical, orderly, and conservative. No man ever stood at the head of a great revolution whose temper was so anti-revolutionary. In his earlier days the bishops had been forced to rebuke him for the narrowness and intolerance of his churchmanship. To the last he clung passionately to the Church of England, and looked on the body he had formed as but a lay society in full communion with it. And the same practical temper of mind which led him to reject what was unmeasured, and to be the last to adopt what was new, enabled him at once to grasp and organise the novelties he adopted. His powers were bent to the building up of a great religious society which might give to the new enthusiasm a lasting and practical form. The body which he thus founded numbered a hundred thousand members at his death, and now counts its members in England and America by millions. But the Methodists themselves were the least result of the Methodist revival. Its action upon the Church broke the lethargy of the clergy; and the "Evangelical" movement, which found representatives like Newton and Cecil within the pale of the Establishment, made the fox-hunting parson and the absentee rector at last impossible. In Walpole's day the English clergy were the idlest and the most lifeless in the world. In our own day no body of religious ministers surpasses them in piety, in philanthropic energy, or in popular regard. In the nation at large appeared a new moral enthusiasm, which, rigid and pedantic as it often seemed, was still healthy in its social tone, and whose power was seen in the disappearance of the profligacy which had disgraced the upper classes, and of the foulness which had infested literature ever since the Restoration. A new philanthropy reformed our prisons, infused clemency and wisdom into our penal laws, abolished the slave trade, and gave the first impulse to popular education."

There is but one fault to find with the way, otherwise beyond all praise, in which Mr. Green has done his work. He has not allowed haste to interfere with his study and assimilation of the results of previous labourers in the field of English history; but he has seemingly allowed it to interfere with the expression of the conclusions he has arrived at, or, perhaps it would be better to say, with the correction of his proofs. The style of the book, as a whole, is thoroughly good. And it may be that the very mastery of English it displays renders the more obvious its few defects. There are, for instance, half a dozen sentences on page

273 which are almost a verbatim repetition of sentences on pages 149 and 150. If such a repetition was, as its closeness suggests, designed, it is none the less unwelcome to the reader. Judging moreover from the frequency with which they recur, Mr. Green has a great liking for a certain card-playing metaphor, and an inordinate fondness for the useful little word "sheer." In a book of less value than the present, points of this kind would not need to be noticed. But this book is almost certainly destined to a wide circulation, and to a place of high authority amongst the scattered English people. And care over the proof-sheets of its subsequent editions will make it the best story of England's progress, enshrined in some of the best of English prose.

Smith's Duff Missionary Lectures.

Duff Missionary Lectures. First Series. Mediæval Missions. By Thomas Smith, D.D., Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1880.

The series of Lectures, of which this is the first, has been instituted under the provisions of the will of the late Dr. Alexander Duff, that venerable missionary's name giving title to the lectures by the arrangement of his son. According to the will, a series of not fewer than six lectures, "'on some department of Foreign Missions or cognate subjects,' is to be delivered once in every four years, each lecturer to give only one course." Most naturally, the choice for the first series fell upon Dr. Smith, who had "been long associated with Dr. Duff in mission-work in Bengal, and afterwards in the home management of the Missions of the Free Church of Scotland." We think the lecturer has been peculiarly happy in his choice of a subject: he has assuredly been so in his treatment of it. The popular notion of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages used to be that it was in a state of absolute and unqualified lethargy and corruption, utterly unconcerned about evangelistic duty, and hopelessly corrupt and abominable. To those who still entertain this notion the present volume will convey a most agreeable surprise. We are introduced to noble bands of missionaries who, in what we call "the dark ages," were all aflame with "the passion for saving souls," and whose laborious preaching of the Gospel was crowned in Europe, Asia, and Africa with truly astonishing success.

Dr. Smith considers that the thousand years embraced in his review (A.D. 500—1500) "very conveniently divides itself," though by no means with a hard and fast line, into "the East and West;" and he begins with the latter. After a few general observations on the decadence of the Roman Empire, and the effects of the barbarian invasions, he confirms the statement of Gibbon that "at the close of the fifth century Christianity was embraced

by almost all the barbarians who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western Empire." But, as the same writer tells us, the Franks and Saxons were exceptions to this rule, and were firm in their adherence to the errors of Paganism. It was the appointed task of the Church "to bring these Franks and Saxons to the acceptance of the Gospel, and to bring the other nations to the acknowledgment of Christ as a Divine Saviour;" and right dutifully and manfully did she set about the work. Clovis stands out in marked relief among the potentates of the time, and our author gives us a most interesting sketch of his character and career. Long before his professed conversion he had learned to reverence Christianity, and cherished feelings of respect and affection towards the clergy. In 493 he married Clotilda, a niece of the King of the Burgundians. She seems to have been a true "Christian according to her light, which was probably none of the brightest: a helpmeet for her husband, who was evidently won, by the good conversation of his wife, at least to think well of the God whom she worshipped, the Saviour whom she loved." The story of his conversion is very curious. He was fighting with the Allemanni, near Tolbiacum (Zulpich). His troops were hard pressed, and prepared for flight, when he cried aloud to the God of Clotilda for help, promising in the event of victory to believe in Him, and be baptised in His name. Almost immediately the King of the Allemanni was slain, and his army completely defeated. On quitting the field of his victory, Clovis appears to have placed himself under instruction as a catechumen. His true-hearted wife rejoiced far more at God's victory over her husband's heart than at the defeat inflicted by him on the enemy. At her request Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, undertook to prepare the king for baptism. The bishop seems to have been a good man, and an earnest and zealous evangelist; for he had already induced thousands of the subjects of Clovis to abandon Paganism, and it is said in one account that 3,000, in another 5,000, were baptised with him.

The following general reflection on the conversion of Clovis is very true and very important:

"The controversy which was recently carried on, more on the Continent than in this country, between the advocates of nationalism and those of individualism, had not formally arisen, but the subject-matter of that controversy must ever exist, and must influence the character of all missionary work. I ought, perhaps, to state that this controversy and this difference have no connection with the controversy and the difference on the subject of established Churches, and the duty of nations in their national capacity towards the truth and Church of God. The difference may exist inside of established churches, and inside of non-established churches, and has no relation to the difference be-

tween these two. Both in the case of Clovis, and very notably in the case of some of the Saxon kings of England, it is quite manifest that the great object which the missionaries of those times set before them was the securing of a general or national profession of Christianity, rather than the conversion of individual souls to God. Now, I am far from a desire to depreciate or undervalue the former of these. No one who has lived so long as I have lived in a heathen land, and so long as I have lived in a Christian land, can have any doubt as to the immense importance of the diffusion of the light of the Gospel amongst a community. The suppression of heathen rites and usages; the creation of a national conscience; the formation of a public opinion in favour of the pure, the honest, the true, the lovely; the elevation of the moral standard by even the formal recognition of the pure law of the Gospel; the overthrow of superstition, and the vindication of the right of man to exercise the faculties which God has given him as a rational creature,—all these are unspeakable blessings, and all of them are blessings which the Gospel surely brings in its train. But they are secondary blessings, and, as such, they are to be received with devout thankfulness. When the spiritual life of a church, or minister, or missionary is vigorous, and the eye is fixed on the rescue of perishing souls from death, these secondary blessings will come unsought, as the thunder follows the lightning,—unsought, but not unheeded, or unacknowledged, or unappreciated. But when in church, or minister, or missionary the spiritual life is low, when there is little experience and little appreciation of the blessing of personal interest in Christ's great salvation, then these secondary blessings are regarded as primary. So they are sought, and when so sought they are not attained. To produce an echo, you must first produce a sound. To diffuse light or warmth through a hall, you must have brightly burning lamps or a glowing furnace. To leaven the three measures of meal, you must have real active leaven inserted into the mass. Again, I say that I do not undervalue the outward recognition of the Gospel by large numbers of men; but yet I maintain that there is a more excellent way. The Gospel must first work inwardly before it can effectively work outwardly. I doubt if all the thousands who were baptised with Clovis did so much to elevate the tone of thought and action in the army and the nation as might have been done by some two or three men in whose hearts the fire of divine love had been kindled, and who were by grace made willing to spend and to be spent for Christ, who counted all but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus their Lord" (pp. 24—27).

Unquestionably Dr. Smith is right. He need not have said, "I doubt." Christian society, intercourse, jurisprudence, legis-

lation, social institutions, and all the habits of the Christian body politic, can only truly and satisfactorily subsist upon the basis of personal conversion, and of the faith and love which are in Christ Jesus.

Dr. Smith carefully, however succinctly, narrates the work, and estimates the character, the labours, and the successes of many a once great but now almost forgotten name in the glorious annals of Christian missions. In Lecture II. he dwells on the introduction of the Gospel into Britain; the Early British Church; St. Patrick (only incidentally named, as he lived before the millennium here surveyed). The missionary heroes of the sixth century are Columba (concerning whose death he produces one of the most touching, beautiful, and pathetic records we have ever seen); Kentigern or Mungo (whose name Glasgow still reveres in undiminished vigour and brilliance, and to whom its cathedral is dedicated); the agents of the Welsh Church; Augustine and Romish aggression; Pope Gregory's lieutenant in England; Paulinus, in Northumbria; Aidan. Lecture III. introduces us to the Scottish Missions, which were such wonderful means of revival on the Continent of Europe. Fridolt, Columbanus, Brunehilde, Bregenz, Gallus, Fursœus, Severinus, Amandus, Eligius, Clement, Boniface (on whom our author pronounces an elaborate and well-merited encomium), and Alcuin, are all named, and their share in the work of European evangelisation duly, as it seems to us, appraised.

Lecture IV. deals chiefly with the missionary work in Scandinavia, notably in Denmark, Sweden and Norway. The names of Willebord, Anskar, Ebbo, Ardgar, Haco, Olaf, form a conspicuous and brilliant galaxy in this firmament, and their work is described by Dr. Smith with great vividness and picturesque effect. From the Scandinavian Missions the author turns to the Greek Church. But we feel that we are already transgressing all allowable limits, and must close somewhat abruptly by commending this choice book to the attentive and devout perusal of our readers. Dr. Smith is conspicuously sound and evangelical; but he has at the same time considerable breadth of mind, great learning, deep and tender sympathies. And we scarcely think any one else could have done the work here achieved half so well.

Baird's Rise of the Huguenots.

History of the Rise of the Huguenots. By Henry M. Baird, Professor in the University of the City of New York. In Two Volumes. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

The *New York Tribune*, a few months ago, introduced this work to

its public as "one of the most important recent contributions to American literature." If English be substituted for American, as a general name for all the literature produced by English-speaking people, the statement in the *Tribune* will become not only more satisfactory to Professor Baird, but more true to fact. For this book of his supersedes all its predecessors. It does not indeed thrust aside the monographs that deal with some of the more striking incidents, with the Siege of La Rochelle, or with the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. But as a disquisition upon the general theme, wherein the various events receive each its proportionate attention, and are all duly knit together as the advancing stages of a drama, the catastrophe of which was the depopulation of France, it will rank with the best productions of Motley or of Prescott, as pre-eminently the authority on the matter of which it treats.

Undoubtedly Professor Baird has enjoyed and improved certain advantages, which were not within the reach of students thirty or forty years ago. For both national enterprise and private research have during the last quarter of a century opened up stores of information that were closed before. The correspondence of kings and the plans and methods of statesmen have been rendered accessible in the great *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, the publication of which the Ministry of Public Instruction is still continuing. Not only have the archives of most of the European capitals been explored, and many valuable manuscripts disinterred, but the reports of the Venetian ambassadors, generally as accurate and sensible as they are full, can be easily consulted now in the collections of Tommaseo and Albèri. Official statements can be paralleled with cipher. And the letters of the English agents, many of whom were as skilful in the use of the pen as in diplomacy, can be found in the foreign series of the *Calendars of State Papers*, containing all the minute and continuous information that was daily sent across the Channel. But beyond these different governmental publications, the "Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français" was founded in 1853, and its monthly "Bulletins" are rich in documents that were inedited before, and in original treatises bearing upon phases of Huguenot history. Pamphlets and broadsheets, once supposed to be lost, have been unearthed and reprinted. The earliest of the liturgies of the Huguenot Church and its earliest confession of faith—Farel's "Manière et Fasson"—was altogether unknown until Professor Baum discovered a copy in the Library of Zurich, which he published in 1859 on the occasion of the tercentenary of the French Reformed Church. Of the famous *Epître au Tigre de la France*, not a single copy was known to be in existence, so completely had it been destroyed through the influence of the Guises. In 1834, M. Louis Paris accidentally found one, the fortunes of which

have been as romantic as singular. Purchased by the jealous collector Brunet, it was carefully preserved under glass, rarely permitted to be seen, and never to be copied. Upon his death it was bought by the City of Paris at the price of 200 francs per leaf. Placed in the Hôtel de Ville, almost alone of the priceless literary antiquities in the library it escaped the flames of the Commune. At last in 1875 a photographic fac-simile, with copious notes, was issued by Mr. Charles Read. And whilst Professor Baird has availed himself of all these materials and enriched his pages as they could not have been enriched half a century ago, he has patiently mastered the host of original chronicles, histories, and kindred productions with which men of letters have long been more or less familiar. There is not a chapter in these volumes that does not bear abundant witness to his diligence and erudition, his accuracy, impartiality, and skill in execution. He leaves no act unexplained, either as to the motives that led to it or as to the issues that followed. He permits no Protestant sympathies to obscure the merits of some of the Catholic leaders and plans, or to paint over the blemishes, in character or in method, which the Huguenots were not without. Condé the libertine appears in his due place, as well as Condé the intrepid captain, the idol of the Huguenot soldiers. Charles IX., a profligate weakling, had yet elements in his character that deserve and at our author's hand receive the notice which has been too often refused. But in addition to these great qualifications, the complete knowledge of his subject and a judgment that rarely fails either through ignorance or through prejudice, Professor Baird possesses all requisite facility and taste in the art of composition. His details are never trivial, his discussion of principles never heavy. On the contrary he displays occasionally an enthusiasm in his narrative, always perfectly under control, which enables a reader to single out passages that will compare with any in the masterpieces of historical literature. And it is for many reasons to be hoped that he will quickly complete his work by presenting the world with the results of the investigation he contemplates into "the subsequent fortunes of the Huguenots of France—their wars until they obtained recognition and some measure of justice in the Edict of Nantes; the gradual infringement upon their guaranteed rights, culminating in the revocation of the Edict and the loss to the kingdom of the most industrious part of the population; and their sufferings 'under the cross' until the publication of the Edict of Toleration."

The period with which Professor Baird deals in this instalment of his work, is aptly called the formative age of the Huguenots of France. It commences with the publication by Lefèvre of his treatise on the three Marys, and it closes with the death of Charles IX., when the reformed communities had become fully organised

and consolidated into a zealous Church and a well-defined party in the State. For fifty years fire, massacre, craft, warfare had been used against the Huguenots. Four civil wars had been waged, edicts of repression without number promulgated. Yet so completely had the system of persecution failed, that, whilst Charles lay dying at Vincennes, the people were arming for the fifth time, with demands greater than they had ever urged before, and with leaders higher in rank and more numerous than those who had perished on St. Bartholomew's Day. The story of those fifty years is told by Professor Baird with a fulness and exactness that have probably never been equalled. It is impossible to follow him within these limits, and the less necessary, as his volumes are almost certain to enjoy a very wide circulation.

There are, however, one or two points at which his opinion diverges from the current one. Several inaccuracies in Froude's account of the Colloquy of Poissy and the Affair at Vassy, which amounted almost to a misrepresentation of those events, are corrected upon ample authority. The strange character of Queen Elizabeth, as it revealed itself in her relationships with the Huguenots, appears in frequent quotations from her personal and official letters. Not religious zeal nor human sympathy was her ruling motive in her alliances with the Protestants of the Continent, though of neither of these virtues was she entirely destitute, but generally pure selfishness and the lust of power or land. The charms of Calais and Dieppe had probably more to do with all her earlier negotiations than the wrongs of outraged Christians or the tyranny of the Catholic Powers. And even after St. Bartholomew's Day she was ready to toy with proposals of marriage with the Duke of Alençon, until time should show whether it was most to her interest to accept or to reject him. About the least creditable feature of her reign consists in her deceitful dealings with the persecuted Protestants of France and the Netherlands, the duplicity of which dealings research is showing to have been extreme and unquestionable.

But Elizabeth's relationships with the Reformed Churches of the Continent have not been so generally misrepresented as have the transactions between Catherine and the Duke of Alva at the Conference at Bayonne. It has long been the almost universal belief that then was concocted the plan of that famous massacre, the execution of which was delayed by various circumstances for seven years. And even where the formation of such a purpose has been objected to, as unsupported by more than rumour and inexplicable in connection with the delay, it has been held that at least a policy of treachery and murder was agreed upon by the representatives of the Spanish and French Crowns. Professor Baird shows that even this more moderate opinion is incorrect. And no one can resist his conclusion upon the subject, inasmuch

as it rests upon the actual correspondence of the Duke of Alva with his master, which has been found among the manuscripts of Simancas. Not only does it appear that Alva did not even himself declare in favour of a general massacre, but the tone of his letters is lugubrious and sometimes almost hopeless as to the future. He has to report that the queen-mother refused peremptorily every proposition that looked like violence, and that his interviews with the king were not more satisfactory. To all his crafty suggestions, Charles IX. made the brisk response, "I have no disposition to complete the destruction of my kingdom begun in the past wars." Indeed, Professor Baird represents the character of both Charles and his mother in a new light, and undoubtedly he is right. Every incident in the mother's career justifies the statement, "It is improbable that Catherine distinctly premeditated a treacherous blow at the Huguenots, because she rarely premeditated anything very long." The Papal Nuncio, Salviati, in his secret despatches, attributes the attempt at the assassination of Coligny to the queen-mother's jealousy, and states in so many words that the step was decided upon only a few days before and without the knowledge of the king. Henry of Anjou's own account of the period agrees perfectly with Salviati's in this respect. It was the failure of that attempt, imperilling as it did irretrievably the whole influence of Catherine, and arousing on the part of the Huguenots loud demands for justice, which would sound to guilty consciences like threats of retribution, that led Catherine and her younger son to arrange for that general massacre whereby they have become for ever infamous. To them, and not to the king, upon whose fears and passions they wrought, whose orders they in one case acted without and in another anticipated, must be ascribed the principal blame. Or perhaps it would be greater justice to regard the chief responsibility as resting, neither on Catherine nor on Charles, but on the Roman Church and its officials. Year after year, letters and agents from Rome had insinuated that the life of a heretic was of little value. During the whole pontificate of Pius the Fifth, a war of extermination had been systematically urged upon the French Court, and every edict of pacification had been opposed and censured. The joy at Rome, when the massacre was consummated, was extravagant and knew no bounds. Professor Baird can fairly claim a double value for these two volumes. As the history of a period, critical beyond most alike for France and for Europe, they are exact and philosophical. They describe further, impartially and with the strictest adherence to truth, one of the phases of that great struggle between the spirit of freedom, in civil life and in religion, and the spirit of tyranny over conscience and state, which is still raging, but the ultimate issue of which has for four centuries been growing more and more certain.

Poole's Huguenots of the Dispersion.

A History of the Huguenots of the Dispersion at the Recall of the Ediet of Nantes. By Reginald Lane Poole. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

This is last year's Lothian prize essay; and as an essay it is of very considerable merit. Necessarily it lacks the interest that arises from the introduction of minuter details. It can hardly be called with justice a "history;" but it will prove a valuable and very useful synopsis. The notes occupy almost as much space as the text, and render the book further a comparatively full index to the literature of the subject. Mr. Poole has succeeded admirably in condensing the large materials with which he had to deal. He has searched far and wide for facts bearing upon his theme, and has spared no pains. Few treatises, even of those which relate solely to some individual country of the exile, have been overlooked. Whilst the complete picture of the emigration still needs to be painted, Mr. Poole may justly claim that his historic diligence has collected the facts and figures which it remains for historic imagination to group. He describes his purpose as "limited to the indication of the distinguishing lines of the emigration," the brief general sketch being supplemented by the notice of "the points of contrast with society outside," and by a "fairly-exhaustive apparatus of reference to the special text-books of each department of the subject." That purpose has been executed with much ability.

Mr. Poole has chosen perhaps the best method of describing the heterogeneous circumstances which his history of the Huguenot wanderings embraced. He begins with an attempt, not altogether successful, to explain the policy which led Louis XIV. first of all to persecute his reformed subjects and then to drive them into exile. Their dispersion next engages his attention; and he traces different companies of them into the Netherlands, into Holland and the North, into the British Isles and America, into Switzerland and Germany. Several questions of great interest and uncertainty are either discussed, or the opinion upon them to which Mr. Poole's studies have led him is indicated, with the authorities that support it. In such matters he rarely errs. The assertion, for instance, that Huguenot exiles settled in the delta of the Ganges, which has been made by an author of the present century, is shown to lack confirmation. But on the other hand it is indubitable that a number of fugitives joined the Genevese in Constantinople, and that a formal request was made by Louis, through his ambassador, that the Grand Seignior would procure the conversion of all French colonists residing in his dominions or else send them back to

their own country. The total number of the emigrants Mr. Poole sets down at "above 300,000,"—which is a very moderate estimate,—about a quarter of whom he supposes to have settled in England and her colonies; and the great impetus at once given to manufacture is notorious, whilst the steady adhesion of the exiles to William of Orange and the support they rendered him, alike in Holland and in England, were perhaps of even greater value to this country. At the close of his essay Mr. Poole turns from the wide survey of the many paths of the exile back again to the centre from which those paths had all started, and describes the ruin to France that resulted from the suicidal policy of the Recall. Not only did the consequent decadence of trade embarrass the royal exchequer and reduce many of the people to the most sordid want, but the best part of the French army was suddenly transferred into the ranks of the rivals or enemies of France, and absolutism, in Church and in State, inflicted upon itself a blow from which it has never recovered. The habit and the tradition of patient work passed out of the land with the steps of the Huguenots, and almost every good impulse was numbed. France became all Catholic, but Catholic fanaticism soon changed into spiritual heedlessness; and the Revolution of the eighteenth century was the natural effect of the Recall of the seventeenth.

Good as this essay is, it is by no means all equally good. Mr. Poole succeeds better in collecting facts than in commenting on them. When he writes that "the Huguenots had a continued existence as a political party," he certainly sets his own opinion against the persistent and most sincere assertions of the Huguenots themselves. From their rise to their expatriation they were not rebels against monarchy but against spiritual tyranny. Their loyalty as subjects of the reigning king was reiterated again and again, in petitions and edicts without number. And their history in all its stages demands the admission that its basis was insistance upon the natural right of liberty of worship. For the struggle between the crown and the reformed communities of France was not a struggle between a government and traitors, but one between despotism and the consciences of men; and from any other point of view it becomes unintelligible. Indeed, there are occasional indications elsewhere that Mr. Poole has failed to see the intensely religious character of the Huguenots and the influence of their religion upon their history. He presumes to make such patronising remarks as the following: "Some of the commentaries and books of devotion they produced are respectable, and have been useful. But the esteem accorded to them was the tribute of a sect." And many readers will probably wonder whatever the last sentence in the same paragraph is doing in this book: "Should we seek in the Refuge for a

spiritual master, we must travel to our own day to find in the honoured name of Edward Bouverie Pusey the union of the solid judgment of the Englishman, the quick and genial temper of the French, and that profound scholarship and that spiritual force which we connect, and connect rightly, with the confessors of the Huguenot Church." It is true that Mr. Poole, in a note, points out that Laurence des Bouveries came over in 1568, and pleads "the affection of a pupil" as an excuse for the anachronism. But surely the same affection ought to have prevented him from perpetrating such a joke. Dr. Pusey's scholarship and spiritual force are too obvious to need assertion, but to speak of his kinship with the Church of the Huguenots is almost as great a blunder as a writer of history could make.

Banks's Our Indian Empire.

Our Indian Empire: its Rise and Growth. By the Rev. J. S. Banks, Author of "Martin Luther, the Prophet of Germany," &c. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1880.

The author's treatment of his subject is very skilful. An introductory chapter of half a dozen pages contains a sketch of the history of India previously to the seventeenth century. The establishment and fortunes of the East India Company are then traced briefly, up to the time of the battle of Plassey, and thence at greater length to the suppression of the Mutiny. A final chapter comments upon the vernacular languages, religion and philosophy; whilst a short summary of the work of Protestant missions fitly closes the whole. And although all this is compressed into the space of about two hundred and fifty pages, condensation has not been effected at the expense of readable qualities. Occasionally, indeed, the reader is credited with a knowledge of minute incidents, and the meanings of local terms, which not one in fifty possesses. But as a rule the narrative is easy and attractive, and the story of the consummate heroism and craft by which the empire was won and maintained is so told as to betoken the sympathy of the teller and awaken that of his audience. Mr. Banks will hardly expect to find all his opinions readily and generally accepted. To us he seems sometimes to err in the vigour alike of his praise and of his blame. "General J. S. Wood's imbecility has seldom been surpassed" is not a weak remark, but in our author's opinion it needs to be supplemented by the criticism, "there was never a clearer case of lions led by deer." Mr. James Mill's "History of British India" is not a model history, but it is somewhat severe to describe it as "one long indictment of everything the English did, and left undone, in India." But it is obvious that these are blemishes of little

importance, and, in a cynical age, unrestrained indignation almost ceases to be a vice. The narrative part of Mr. Banks's task has been executed with great success; and his book, whilst scarcely suitable for a student's text-book, will probably charm many who want merely a general acquaintance with the events of the establishment of the English empire in India. The lavish illustrations, which with the exception of some of the portraits are of good quality, are in full accord with what appears to be the purpose of the book, and will make it a favourite one in our schools and amongst our young people.

Goldsmith's Outram.

James Outram, a Biography. By Major-General Sir F. J. Goldsmith, C.B., K.C.S.I., with Illustrations and a Map. Two Volumes. Smith, Elder and Co.

Among Indian heroes few names are better known than that of "the Bayard of India," the man who refused to touch the Sind prize-money, because he believed the Sind war to have been needless and unjust; and who, when helping to relieve Lucknow, got off his horse and joined as a volunteer, in order that Havelock, to whom he was superior in rank, might retain the command of the relieving force. And, so long as strict conscientiousness and self-denial are held to be virtues, no name on the bead-roll of Indian history can be better worth knowing than that of James Outram. Outram was the son of a Derbyshire land-agent, who ruined his family by investing all his fortune in the Butterley Iron Works. His father died suddenly in 1806, just at the critical time when his enterprise was beginning to pay, and left a young family (James was only two years old) to the charge of a mother who was fortunately equal to the task. This lady, daughter of Dr. Anderson, well known in connection with Scottish agriculture, especially with a tour, undertaken at Lord Melville's suggestion, among the north-western coasts and islands, was in many ways a remarkable woman. Her relatives allowed her £200 a year; and on that sum, combined with a pension, out of which she literally bullied Lord Melville, she educated her family, choosing Aberdeen as her home, because schooling there was good and cheap. There her younger son was put to school (the elder, Francis, being at Christ's Hospital), and showed himself "the reverse of studious, but great at gardening, mechanics, and every athletic sport." In fact, he was like hundreds of lads who never come to the front; nor in India did he, for some time, show anything more than a strong love of sport, resulting in a wholly exceptional amount of pig-sticking and tiger-killing. Mrs. Outram had managed to get both her sons out to India. Francis went to

Addiscombe, and did brilliantly there; but his Indian career was cut short in a very sad way. In him the opinionativeness which marked his brother James was increased to obstinacy; he got into trouble for insubordination, a fever came on—the result of anxiety—and in his delirium he committed suicide. James went out with a direct Indian cadetship, and, after a little frontier work, was sent among the Bheels. How he gained the confidence of these shy and wild mountaineers, and soon formed a Bheel corps, composed of men who were all personally attached to him, every one who is going to India ought to read; it is a striking instance of that ascendency over intractable minds, and that moulding of the most unlikely material, of which recent Indian history offers several examples. Captain Evans, introducing him to his work, wrote: "The Bheel is a restless and dangerous fellow; he won't settle at the plough, but he will make a famous grenadier when you form your flank companies;" and, again, "You should never consider looks or character in taking recruits; yours is a peculiar duty." This duty Outram interpreted much as Canon Kingsley might have done had he carried out his plan for turning poachers into the best of gamekeepers. Fond of a solitary life, too much given to shrink from society, he buried himself in what he called his own forests, and really lived among their inhabitants, winning their admiration by his fearlessness in the chase, and their veneration by his even-handed justice. "The discovery (says Sir F. Goldsmith) had been made that an Englishman could use the rod with impartiality, even though it were one of iron. . . . The secret of his success over his outlawed friends lay in the power of tested sympathy; they found he loved them, and entered into their fears and difficulties. They felt he essentially belonged to themselves; while his active habits brought him into constant contact with the minute interests of their everyday existence." Once a tiger sprang on him, and they rolled down the hill-side together. Outram managed to draw his pistol and shot the tiger dead. The Bheels, seeing him torn, were loud in their grief, but he quieted them with the words which were remembered among them for years after: "What do I care for the clawing of a cat?" Another time a tiger was driven into a densely-wooded ravine. Outram clambered out on a branch, had himself let down by the turbans of his beaters, sighted the tiger, and got the desired shot. "You hanged me like a thief from a tree, but I killed the tiger," was his comment on the proceeding. Such a man could not fail of impressing such men as he had to deal with; and we do not wonder that his memory should still be revered, and that some of his old sepoys, finding an ugly little image in which they traced a fancied resemblance, set it up, and worshipped it as Outram Sahib. The account of how Khundoo, commander of Outram's trackers, was killed by a

tiger, which Outram at once shot, and how the dying chief put his little son into the white man's hands, is as pathetic as anything ever written. During his ten years in Khandeish, he was present at the death of 191 tigers, 15 leopards, 25 bears, and 12 buffaloes.

In 1835 he was transferred from Khandeish to Indore and the Maha Kanta, and after doing in that place some of the very mixed work of the "political" of those days he was sent to Sind. Here he proved himself as successful with the ceremonious Ameers as he had been with the wild aboriginea. Some arrangements had to be made about the payment of tribute due from the Ameers to Shah Soojah. Before long we find him at Candahar, and his letters thence have a special interest at the present time, especially one in which he says: "Every day's experience confirms me in the opinion that we should have contented ourselves with securing the line of the Indus alone, without shackling ourselves with the support of an unpopular Emperor of Afghanistan;" and, again, "Once involved in warfare, we should have to continue it under lamentable disadvantages in this country. . . . Eager as I am for service, I am convinced that little glory to our arms, and less benefit to the State, could be gained in such a struggle."

He had before long a good deal of work among the now famous Ghilzies. He took part in the storming of Khelat, under General Willshire; and, before long, he was regularly appointed political agent in Sind. Here his tact and integrity won for him the friendship of the Ameers, while his feelings towards them were shown in his conviction that, but for Sir C. Napier's impetuosity, the Sind difficulties might have been peaceably settled. Napier made his conquest in the teeth of the East India Company's directors, making to their remonstrance the pithy reply: "Peccavi, I have Sind." What Outram thought of the matter is shown not only by his letters, but by his refusal to touch any part of the Sind prize-money. To him it seemed the price of blood. His share, we remember, was ultimately handed over to Dr. Duff, of Calcutta, for educational purposes. It is to Napier's credit that he did not resent the outspoken difference of opinion of his subordinate: so far from that, it was he who gave Outram the title, afterwards adopted as his epitaph by Dean Stanley, "the Bayard of India." Very different was the conduct, savouring of malignant hatred, of Lord Ellenborough; but Mr. Gladstone, writing in 1876 in the *Contemporary Review*, has more than justified the view that Outram entertained of this discreditable conquest.

That Outram was too much given to paper war is admitted by his biographer; but as that biographer says: "Don't refuse your official agents the consideration you are ready to accord your friends; and don't assume that fitness for strange and rough work implies the absence of refined sentiment—is the lesson from

Outram's dealings with his Government." Of his later career—his share in the brief Persian campaign, and above all his help in the relief of Lucknow—we need say the less, because these are still fresh in the minds of most readers.

The defence of the Alumbagh the biographer well compares to Wellington's defence of the lines of Torres Vedras; there was the same watchful courage, the same success against great odds. When the mutiny was quelled, Outram was one of those to whom fell the difficult work of the administration of Oude. Here his judgment in dealing with natives stood him in good stead. The rest of his life was mainly a succession of honours; his worth was fully recognised in India as well as at home. The Outram shield, the Oxford degree, many such recognitions preceded the burial in Westminster Abbey and the monument on the Embankment. England has certainly shown that she knew how to value one of her noblest sons.

Sir F. Goldsmith's life is, like so many recent biographies, too long, but the subject was a tempting one; and all that most readers will object to is his strange orthography—jàugal, pugri, kachchari, &c., are puzzling, and we venture to add needless.

De Witt's Guizot in Private Life.

Monsieur Guizot in Private Life, 1787—1874. By his Daughter, Madame De Witt. Translated by M. C. M. Simpson. Hurst and Blackett.

Guizot at home, in that Val Richer that we have all heard of, and where several generations, from his mother to his grandchildren, lived in harmony under one roof—that is what Madame De Witt gives us; and she gives us, besides, an insight into the statesman's inner character. "Guizot (said Senior) is never so great as when at home," and this volume certainly justifies the assertion. His fondness for his children and grandchildren was accompanied with the rare power of entering into their pursuits and sharing their feelings; there never was a better children's correspondent than the historian of the English Revolution.

Guizot, like all great men, owed much to his mother, one of the old Protestant family of the Bonicels of Nismes. His father, though an ardent lover of liberty, perished during the Reign of Terror, which weighed with terrible fury on the south of France. Passionately devoted to her sons, Madame Guizot migrated to Geneva, proper schooling in France having been almost put an end to by the Revolution. Here she lived most frugally, doing the household work, while her sons were attending lectures, drawing, swimming, and riding. She was careful too that they should learn a trade; and François, the future

statesman, got to be a skilful carpenter. Austere, even as a lad, he was often the butt of his more idle comrades, who tried to rouse him from his books with all kinds of practical jokes: "more than once his coat-tails remained in the hands of his persecutors."

At eighteen he went up to Paris, *pour faire son droit;* and at this time his letters to his mother turn mostly on religion. His early training stood him in good stead among the temptations of the capital: "I am blessed (he writes) with the possession of these rallying points; God and the Christ's religion are my guides, moral law is the law to which I refer every question." Sixty-four years later, when making his will, Guizot once more declared his faith in Christ, and expressed strongly the results of his life's experience.

At Paris, Stapfer the Swiss introduced him to literary society, and he began too to work for the booksellers, chiefly as a translator from the German, and an annotator of Gibbon. His future was no doubt much influenced, and his aristocratic tastes fostered, by the society in which he mixed—a little knot of academicians, Suard, the Duke of Boufflers, Abbé Morellet, and other *habitués* of Madame d'Hondetol's *salons*. Here he met Mdlle. de Mentane, a lady whose family had somehow escaped the Terror, and who was supporting her mother and sisters by writing in Suard's paper, the *Publiciste*. We have all heard how, when she fell ill, young Guizot wrote her contribution to the paper, and went on writing for a fortnight without letting her know his name. They were different in many ways, in age as well as in birth and habits; but the marriage which followed, five years after this little episode, was a truly happy one. When she died, Guizot, to whom a literary wife was indispensable, married her niece, a Mdlle. Dillon, who had been on very intimate terms with them during her life. This was in 1828; and during the interval, Guizot had joined the Bourbons, had earned for himself the title (which stuck to him) of "the man of Ghent" by a visit to Louis VI., had held a post under the Duke Decazes, had begun his history lectures and his *English Revolution*. Throughout the letters of this period we notice, what is a striking characteristic of Guizot, and of most of his literary contemporaries, a blindness to the signs of the times, and a sort of political fatalism. The Empire, following on the miseries of the Terror, seems to have been riveted on the French with those very fetters of red-tape, from which the outburst of the Revolution had temporarily freed them, and permanently freed a large part of Germany. The want of political insight of Mr. Senior's friends, cannot fail to strike any reader of his *Conversations;* and in this opening out of Guizot's inner mind we miss those broad views which we might have expected from a statesman of such repute, even in his most private letters. Revolutions seem to take him by surprise; just

before the downfall of Charles X., he talked of "anxiety and incongruity in the moral situation," and felt that "many of the elements of a disturbance, perhaps even of a crisis, were at hand;" but beyond this he did not go. On the other hand, his criticism is always instructive, and so is his advice to literary friends like Dumont. He gives also a few good stories. Thus, "Cambronne, dining with the king of England at Lille, drank nothing but water, while the English were gorging themselves with wine. The king admired white uniforms, and M. de la Châtre said they had one advantage, "each regiment having different facings, it is easy after a battle to find out to which each soldier belonged." "We were 600,000 all in blue," retorted Cambronne, "and we always recognised each other easily."

On the accession of Louis Philippe, Guizot spent three months at the Home Office, giving audiences at 4 a.m., and daily attending two sittings at the Chamber. "Tell M. Guizot not to kill himself at once in your service; you'll want him a long while," said Casimir Périer to the king. Two years after Périer died of cholera, during the terrible visitation of 1832, which also deprived Guizot's great friend, the Duke of Broglie, of a daughter. Towards the year's end Guizot became Minister of Education in the seemingly strong cabinet in which Thiers was Home Minister. Early in 1833 his wife died—another of the blows of which he suffered so many. Even the purchase of Val Richer was speedily followed by the death of his eldest son François. About this Guizot wrote: "To-morrow we go to Val Richer, to the joy of the whole family, from my mother down to Guillaume. I cannot say that I feel very joyful; I had intended Val Richer for my son. I go thither without any bitter feeling, on the contrary, I love the shadow of those I have lost; but there is no joy in this, François was my future." In 1840 he came as ambassador to England; he gives descriptions to his children of his doings at the Mansion House, with the loving cup and the rosewater for the napkins, and also of the pigeons at Epsom, and his winnings at Ascot. The revolution of 1845 made him once more a visitor to our shores; and in his little house at Brompton his mother died. Madame de Witt notices several times the strong friendship between Guizot and Lord Aberdeen; the latter fainted when he heard the false news of Guizot's arrest. Henceforth he devoted himself to literary work, the *coup d'état* making it impossible for him to take part in public affairs. His death was accelerated by the Franco-Prussian war, and by the keenness with which he felt the sorrows of his country. These records of his more private life will be widely read; and for all who read them Guizot will be no longer the austere statesman to whom we never forgave the affair of the Spanish marriages, but a large-hearted loving family man, whose religious views had none of the narrowness

which sometimes mars French Protestantism: "Catholics as well as Protestants (he says) so sadly forget the truth, 'In My Father's house are many mansions,'" and whose single-hearted integrity was no more remarkable than the affection which his family so well reciprocated. The translation is well done; and we are thankful for the explanation of *Doctrinaire*—the name was given to the followers of Royer Collard, who had been educated in a College of *Prêtres Doctrinaires* (members of a secular congregation called the *Doctrine Chrétienne*).

Ward's English Poets. Vols. I. and II.

The English Poets: Selections with Critical Introductions by various Writers, and a General Introduction by Matthew Arnold. Edited by Thomas Humphry Ward, M.A., late Fellow of Brasenose, Oxford. Vol. I. Chaucer to Donne. Vol. II. Ben Jonson to Drayton. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

The book of which one-half is now before us promises to supply a real want, and will certainly do so if the other two volumes be carried out as well as these two. An anthology gathered from the whole range of our poetic literature, from Chaucer to Keble and Clough, and preserving not merely a flower here and there, but a nosegay from each parterre that is thought worth rifling, is a large undertaking, and one worthy of our literature, but one which, curiously enough, has never been attempted seriously before. The plan of setting a number of specialists to do the work separately is perhaps the only plan whereby it could be satisfactorily carried out. Neither in the present volumes, nor in the prospectus of the two that are to follow, do we discover any grave cause of censure in regard to the gentlemen to whom the various departments have been entrusted, though in some instances a better choice might certainly have been made. The selections are judicious; the introductions are well written, and afford just such information as we may reasonably expect in such a work; and the text of each poet, as far as we can discover by testing samples here and there, appears to be soundly and reasonably edited. The general introduction by Mr. Matthew Arnold has a considerable value, not merely for the sound criticism which it contains, but as a word of warning where one was pre-eminently necessary. This very excellent plan of employing writers of special acquaintance to deal with each particular poet has, together with its obvious advantage, the minor disadvantage that each man's special addiction to a given author or period runs him in danger of overrating the objects of his own affection and study, and of

underrating the objects of other people's affection and study. It is not enough that in a work like this a sort of compensation is naturally established by each man riding his own hobby as near as he can to the staff of victory; for no one will sit down and read these volumes right through; and if he did, the average reader might still be led away by an enthusiastic cicerone to exaggerate the importance of many a minor fame. But whoever will carefully and seriously read Mr. Matthew Arnold's introduction will be in no danger. That introduction is written a little stiffly, a little primly, we might almost say, a little pedantically; but there is no mistake possible as to what any sentence in it means, no fear of forgetting what it is all about when you have read it, and no doubt whatever that it is thoroughly well worth reading and laying wholly to heart. The man who has to rely in great part on the judgment of others,—and we take it that most readers, ninety-nine out of every hundred have to do so,—would doubtless be glad to cultivate the faculty of self-reliance in literary study, and possess himself of some veritable criteria of judgment.

Mr. Arnold makes it very plain in this essay, rather by example than by analysis or disquisition, what the difference is between the work which may fairly claim to be classical and the work which may not. He sets you down the main characteristics of the highest poetry, and asks you earnestly to lay them to heart, and keep them in mind when you have to answer to yourself whether such and such work is classical or not. The quality of high seriousness in poetry is what you are to look for; and you find it in Homer and Dante, in Shakespeare, in Milton, but not enough of it in Chaucer or in Burns to make these two glorious and astonishing literary forces *great classics*. Mr. Arnold rightly lays down that, with all their shrewd, wholesome, benign criticism of life, these two poets want the highest touch found in such passages as—

> "Wilt thou upon the high and giddy mast
> Seal up the ship-boy's eyes, and rock his brains
> In cradle of the rude imperious surge. . . .
>
> "Darken'd so, yet shone
> Above them all the archangel; but his face
> Deep scars of thunder had intrench'd, and care
> Sat on his faded cheek. . . ."
>
> "In la sua volontade è nostra pace. . . ."

And you are bidden to bear a few such passages in memory on your way through such a book as the present, and look out diligently for something of that quality before you let yourself award a highest place to any poet who comes up for judgment. Mr. Arnold specially warns the reader against two disturbing forces in our estimates of poetry. Historical considerations and personal considerations; historic considerations, which make a

man's work seem more important than it is, because it forms a link in the great chain of song that binds the ancient to the modern world; personal considerations, which transfer from the man to the work honour or glory that is exclusively the man's. Thus the French Romance Poetry of the Middle Ages is of the highest historic value for its parentage to Petrarch and Chaucer, but is barely readable for ordinary people; and those who go into ecstasies about it mistake its historic interest for intrinsic interest. Thus, on the other hand, the personal force of Burns and many a singer since (Mr. Arnold includes Shelley — perhaps rightly, perhaps wrongly) adds an interest to their work, and makes their warmest partisans regard the real glory of their poetry to be more radiant than it really is.

Such is, roughly, the line Mr. Arnold pursues in his essay; and it is an admirable line. The moral is not that we are to underrate the minor poets, not that we are not to read any but those whose high seriousness and profound wholesome criticism of life make them great classics, not this at all; but that, seeing how great a power poetry has been, is, and ever must be, we cultivate just views about it, learn the difficult art of discrimination of values, and thus get the most we can of good, of instruction, of cultivation, of real adornment of spirit, from our readings of poetry. Mr. Arnold would, we fancy, be the first to admit that any man seriously setting to study a whole course of poetry, such as the projectors of this learned and exhaustive anthology set before us, must of necessity reap great mental benefit from his study; and it may be admitted unreservedly on the other hand, that no one could fail to derive a much higher benefit from such a course by carefully studying and jealously applying Mr. Arnold's introduction.

Ward's Constitution of the Earth.

The Constitution of the Earth; being an Interpretation of the Laws of God in Nature, by which the Earth and its Organic Life have been derived from the Sun by a Progressive Development. By Robert Ward. London: George Bell and Sons. 1880.

We rise from the perusal of this work satisfied with nothing but the good intentions of the author. It consists of a large number of interesting scientific quotations from various sources, connected by much very doubtful analogical reasoning, wild theory, and pure nonsense written by Mr. Ward. Its publication was an unfortunate mistake. We regret as deeply as Mr. Ward any apparent breach between religion and science, but are afraid such books as his will in no wise tend to lessen it. If a writer

in attempting to establish a pet theory of his own rejects on the flimsiest grounds the established facts of science, especially in the name of Religion, he naturally affronts the very persons he is desirous to appease. To show that our remarks are not unwarranted, several quotations from the work are appended, which will prove the inutility of a detailed examination. The prevailing idea throughout is one of growth, organic and inorganic, —the earth is growing in size, weight, distance from the sun, &c., and will in time become a sun itself.

The occasional meteoric showers not being sufficient to produce the amount of growth required by Mr. Ward's theory, he sees fit to invent a decidedly novel process of material enlargement. Resting on the unquestionably sound basis that no scientist has yet proved that exactly as much water rises in vapour from the earth's surface as falls in snow and rain, Mr. Ward thus philosophises: "Observe, it is beyond dispute that several feet of water fall annually: that is *primâ facie* evidence that water affords the earth a means of increase. It therefore rests with the mechanical philosophers to show the contrary" (251). "It seems to me that the ether in which the earth moves affords an obvious and boundless material for the creation of clouds" (*ibid.*). In other words, we are asked to assume the existence of an immense water manufactory on the confines of our atmosphere, which pours down ever fresh streams on the earth, because mechanical philosophers have not proved the equality of the evaporation and downfall of water! The ways and means by which so considerable a formation of water is accomplished might puzzle physicists other than Mr. Ward. But he is not disconcerted. "Hydrogen gas is fifteen times lighter than atmospheric air, and therefore in the free gaseous condition can only exist in the ethereal regions outside of the earth's atmosphere (!) How, then, has it reached the surface of the earth in the form of water? The experience of the chemist suggests the answer. Whenever oxygen and hydrogen gases are mixed together so as to be capable of being exploded by an electric spark, the result is a formation of water. Oxygen gas exists in the air; electricity exists in the air; and we have reason to believe (!) that hydrogen gas may be found resting on the atmospheric envelope by which the earth is surrounded; we are therefore warranted in assuming that, whenever the proper conditions arise, aqueous vapour will be created, which ultimately falls in the form of water. Only by reason of their concentration into the form of water can we account for the fact that a combination of two such light bodies as oxygen and hydrogen gases press upon the earth with metallic force instead of mounting into the air" (338-4). The next sentence reads, "Man can only work successfully in the course of nature," and we may add man can only theorise successfully in the course of nature. We stand aghast at

Mr. Ward's science as well as his logic. He omits to mention that "the experience of the chemist suggests" sundry facts concerning the mixing of gases, systematised in the laws of diffusion. If a vessel full of this light hydrogen gas be placed in an elevated position, and be connected with a similar vessel full of a much heavier gas, such as oxygen or chlorine, by a fine glass tube, the light gas will descend and the heavy ascend till a uniform mixture results. Our physical life depends on this simple fact. Were it as Mr. Ward suggests, the heavy carbonic acid gas, instead of being generally diffused through the atmosphere even in the highest altitudes, would fall to the earth, carrying with it death and desolation. How can Mr. Ward say his wild theory is "warranted," when facts are directly opposed to it? But here as elsewhere facts adverse to his theory are left out of the account. Having thus satisfactorily constructed his water-manufactory, Mr. Ward has to dispose of the water, or the days of Noah would return again, and the world be wrapped in a perpetual deluge. "All things grow older, and so does water. *Hence the existence of salt.* It has been said that man begins in a gelatinous and ends in an osseous state: it may be more truly said that water begins in vapour and ends in salt (!) The saltness of the ocean may, in fact, be described as the beginning of its solidification. All that immense deposit at the bottom of the ocean, in the shape of microscopic shells, which are continually being rained down upon it, and all the coral growth, is a secretion from salt water" (p. 333). In other words, water by some unknown process turns into salt, chalk, and flint. Considering the large amount of mineral water carried down in solution or suspension by the rivers into the sea, and the concentration of the latter by evaporation, we regard it as certainly the most convenient of all liquids in which to demonstrate a change from water to salt. We should like to know what changes Mr. Ward has found in the closely stoppered flagons of distilled water he has carefully preserved for so many years to illustrate this remarkable transformation. As we find his experiments neither in the transactions of the Royal Society nor in his book, we beg to state that the experience of other chemists does not corroborate what he willingly takes for granted.

On page 246 the absence of water is recorded as one proof of the moon's youth, whilst on page 237 the preponderance of water in the Southern hemisphere of the earth indicates that in its birth from the sun this part was the last to appear and therefore the youngest!

As an example of pure nonsense we may quote, among other passages, the following. "Bread made from corn is one of the most approved articles of diet; showing that there is a nutritive relationship between bread (corn) and the human tissues. Whiskey is the essence of corn, produced by distillation like

other essences. Hence the rapidity with which corn (or bread) finds it way into the system when the ordinary impediments (or solid portions) are removed" (pp. 172-3).

As Mr. Ward rejects Newton's law of gravitation as an unfounded hypothesis, we may be excused the discussion of his own laws of creation: but that our readers may judge for themselves, we quote the first. "Law I. *Circumstances govern the creation of things, and therefore all things exist by virtue of their circumstances*" (p. 45).

Before closing it may be well to state that, beyond the acknowledgment of a ruling Deity, Mr. Ward's theory seems to have no pretensions to a religious basis. He acknowledges none in the Bible, as is evident from the following extraordinary passage. "When in the name of science we seek to reduce truth to a positive shape, it more often takes the form of human conceit than healthy knowledge. When we do the same in the name of religion it becomes superstition. Why has the Bible become a sealed book to many of the most earnest searchers after truth? Because some of its friends have claimed for it an authority which is nowhere claimed in its own pages. It is a book written by human hands, translated by human hands, and printed by human hands. It is moreover a book to be read and understood by human beings. How, then, can it be the medium for conveying absolute knowledge? Absolute truth can only be communicated to and understood by absolute wisdom. Such a book can only be produced by a miracle, and every reader who, with absolute success, consulted its pages, though such readers might be more numerous than the sands of the sea-shore, would also be a miracle. The inspiration of the Bible consists, not in the exactitude of its language, but in the spiritual truths which it communicates to those who are willing to understand them" (p. 28). Either we do not grasp Mr. Ward's meaning, or this passage contains grave errors. Absolute truth, that which is true universally and eternally, can be apprehended by a finite intellect. Such truth in spiritual things is conveyed to man by God in the Bible. But we are not concerned with Mr. Ward as a theologian. Whilst, however, we agree with him in thinking that the primary end of the Bible is a spiritual one, the more we study its science the more are we astonished at its accuracy. In more instances than one have scientific dicta of the nineteenth century after Christ been anticipated by the Mosaic writings. Even Mr. Ward would have done well to meditate on the words of Solomon, "All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again" (Eccles. i. 7), before constructing his aërial water-manufactory. We have, in the above lines, given a fair index of the value of Mr. R. Ward's discoveries and reflections. The issue

of such a book in the interests of religion and science is an affront to both. Had it come from the pen of the late "Artemus," we could have understood it.

Taylor's Nature's By-paths.

Nature's By-paths, a Series of Recreative Papers in Natural History. By J. E. Taylor, Ph.D., F.G.S., &c., Editor of "Science Gossip." David Bogue. 1880.

Dr. Taylor does not claim to be original. He is not a Huxley or a Wallace; still, work like his has its place as an educational agent, and is even more widely appreciated than more formally scientific writing. The Papers (some of them reprints) are of unequal value; we do not see why "Old Wine in New Bottles" was printed at all. But all those relating to geology are full of instruction arranged in a very attractive form. The chapter on "Subterranean Mountains" reminds us of Kingsley. "It can be proved," he says, "that a chain of buried mountains, of whose rocks the carboniferous series forms a part, runs under our eastern and south-eastern counties;" and then he gives Mr. Godwin-Austen's theory that the French and South Welsh coal-fields are only outcrops of one continued area, both having the same "strike" or run of their rocks; the Somerset hills and those of the Ardennes only being discontinuous so far as surface appearance is concerned. This theory was confirmed by the sinking of a deep well in 1871 in Kentish Town, London, during which at 1,800 feet the borer brought up Devonian rock, a formation which lies below the coal. Here, therefore, coal had been, but was stripped off. At Harwich they actually got fossils of the carboniferous strata, showing that to find the true coal they would have to go somewhat northward, judging from the dip of the Harwich beds. Certain it is that at Calais coal is found just underneath the chalk, the secondary strata being absent, as they are under Harwich and London. It is to be hoped that the want of success of the Wealden boring, where unfortunately the oolite proved of vast thickness, may not discourage future enterprise. Coal, proved by its associated plants to belong to the Bristol and Forest of Dean field, has been found immediately under the oolite at Burford, in Oxfordshire; and Hunstanton is indicated as the best place for tapping the East Anglian chalk with the view of making it yield its combustible treasure.

Most of us have heard of the Wealden boring; but very few are aware how much of our mineral manure comes from the phosphate beds of South-eastern France. The formation here is oolite, washed into gorges and caves, like those in Yorkshire and Derbyshire, by denudation. But instead of the drift, which in England is due to the "great ice age," are these fillings in of phosphate,

dissolved bones of midtertiary mammals, who perhaps crowded here to avoid the increasing cold. These have got washed into the limestone caves, just as the hæmatite beds near Whitehaven are really masses of stalagmite formed when the iron-bearing carboniferous sandstone was washed into the fissures of the oolite. Any one who notes what an amount of detritus a heavy shower will bring down the "swallow holes" of the Clapham caves near Ingleborough, will not wonder at the extent of these French deposits. The commonest bones are those of *palæotherium*, an old-world tapir; *anophtherium*, "the defenceless beast;" a sort of rhinoceros; and an ancestor of the hyæna. But bats are found, and serpents, and teeth of that half hog, half river-horse, the huge anthracotherium.

Of course we have our phosphate beds in England; the rocks at Cromer, almost a mass of what are wrongly named coprolites (how they came there in such abundance who can tell?). For centuries we were "flinging our bread into the sea" by letting this precious manure be washed away. There are beds too here and there in the green sand, and in the Suffolk red crag. Coprolites, by the way, are not "fossil dung," but are the phosphorus of the soft bodies of creatures—fishes, molluscs, cuttle-fish, &c., whose shells, bones, &c., are found with them. This phosphorus combines with lime, and forms by segregation little nodules of phosphate of lime. The coprolites, by the way, belong not to the crag in which they occur, but to the much older London clay.

Very interesting, too, are Dr. Taylor's chapters on the geological distribution of animals, taking us back to the days when India was joined to Africa, and when Australia and the prolongation of the further Indian peninsula approached quite near to each other. The giraffe is found in India in a fossil state in the Sewalik deposits; so, too, is the camel; while Indian and Cape buffaloes and antelopes present striking features of resemblance. America we call the New World, but the peculiarities of its fauna and flora show that it has been dry land for vast ages—that it (especially its southern part) is in reality the old continent. Of course, Australia was cut off long before the Malayan archipelago was sundered from India. The elephant and other recent forms are found alike in Borneo and in India; and the sea around Borneo, Java, and Sumatra rarely exceeds a hundred yards in depth. On the other hand, between Bali and Lormbok, the water is very deep, and the presence in Australia of no creatures save birds and marsupials, shows that the connection was broken off much earlier. The subject is well worked out in Dr. Taylor's pages. One remark deserves to be borne in mind by the geologist. Wherever an organism is very widely distributed or found equally in opposite quarters of the world, it is very old. The *rhynconella* (serpent head), for instance, is found on both sides of the Atlantic,

and in the Chinese and South African seas. So of the tapir, now existing in South America and the Malay Archipelago, but everywhere dispersed during the eocene, or early tertiary times. But we must close. Dr. Taylor's chapter on the County Palatine is one of his best. It calls attention to the wonderful way in which cloggers and cotton-workers, and other wholly self-educated men, have devoted themselves to natural history, and have, like Richard Buxton, made great progress in it, and added much to the general stock of knowledge. Besides an amusing chapter on the Colorado beetle, Dr. Taylor gives a good account of a very little known part of England—the Norfolk "broads." Indeed, throughout, his book is well worth reading, and is sure to lead the reader on to explore for himself some one of the many scientific fields which it opens up.

Kingsley's Works. Vol. XVIII.

The Works of Charles Kingsley. Vol. XVIII. Sanitary and Social Lectures and Essays. Macmillan. 1880.

Canon Kingsley did a great work, we do not mean theologically, but as a social and sanitary reformer. This, we think, will be his chief title to be gratefully remembered by posterity. Though to raise such a doubt will scandalise the host of his admirers, we dare to question his greatness as a writer. His sermons, like Falstaff's wit, are oftener the cause of thought in others than in themselves deeply thoughtful. This, indeed, may by contrast with sermons in general be held to be the perfection of a sermon—to make people think; but this end may be gained in better ways than by floating a number of strong phrases in a muddle of eclecticism. No doubt Kingsley wrote a good poem or two; and some critics say that his novels will survive. But whether or not, the impulse that he gave to "woman's work," to the teaching of physiology in schools and to women, to sanitary effort—will last, and will be useful, as indeed it has already been. Such a man, extreme in his views, reckless in his way of stating them, was wanted to rouse us to the duty of sanitation. It is an ugly fact that, though half-civilised despotisms—the old Tuscan kings of Rome, the dynasty of Akbar in India, even the Peruvian incas—seem to have managed their drainage successfully, with free communities all the world over it has generally been a failure. There are so many interests to be consulted; in Kingsley's words, "the feelings of ten-pound Jack must not be hurt, nor those of the local attorney who looks after Jack's vote." Kingsley faced this difficulty in the most effectual way. To rouse an interest in the subject, to spread information, to shame men into trying to set things right, to convince them of the danger as well as the sinfulness of *laissez aller*—all this was needed, and he did it all. The

biting satire of "A Mad World, my Masters" (which appeared in 1858 in *Fraser*), is balanced by the affectionate warmth of the speech delivered the year after in St. James's Hall, in behalf of the Ladies' Sanitary Association, and of the lecture at Bristol on the influence for good and evil of great cities. No one ever saw more clearly the difficulties of sanitary legislation; how the reformer is paralysed by vested interests, by the nature of the property for which, in country no less than in town, enforced improvement is most needed. Who does not know some hamlet in which there are half a dozen houses "run up" on a bit of freehold, perhaps on a strip of waste, which are simply fever nests, because the floors are always damp, the roofs always leaking, the sanitary arrangements the worst possible? That the owners of such property had to a great extent the representation of the country in their hands, was Kingsley's opinion; and to this he attributed the comparative failure of our sanitary legislation. His cry was, "the people of England are not properly represented." "The tail of the middle class," he said, "has no more intellectual training than the simple working man, and far less than the average shopman. It has lost, under the influence of a small competence, that practical training which gives to the working man, made strong by wholesome necessity, his chivalry, endurance, courage, and self-restraint." Since he wrote, however, even this "tail," on which perhaps he would, in his calmer moments, have owned he was a little hard, has vastly improved in information, in breadth of thought, in general intelligence—one of the broadening agencies being the writings of Kingsley himself.

Kingsley rightly complains of the backwardness in sanitary agitation of the clergy of all denominations; he is grimly humorous on the impossibility of a preacher astounding his respectable pew-renters with "You, and not 'the visitation of God,' are the cause of epidemics; and of you, once fairly warned, will your brothers' 'blood be required.'"

Of course he expected no help from political economists; their bugbear is over-population; and they never attempt "to conquer nature, 'but simply to obey her'"—as if every scientist did not obey nature in order to conquer her.

The whole of this "Mad World" is still full of teaching, though recent political changes have taken out the sting of some of it. No less valuable is "Nausicaa in London"—the contrast between the grand physique of the old Greeks and the pinched-in, underfed, unhealthy beings whom one meets in shoals in our cities. There is still great room for change here; our daughters in the middle class are still ill-cared for (even ill-fed), the consequence being in the long run the certain degeneracy of the race. On drunkenness the Canon writes with judgment. It is an effect quite as much as a cause—the effect of bad air and foul lodging.

His is a grand ideal; and, as is usual with such ideals, there is plenty to be said on the other side, just as there is about the Canon's notion of a special "representation of the educated" to be a power in modern politics as the clergy were of old. But, chimerical as he is now and then, Kingsley is always worth reading. He brings out truths that we are too apt to forget—as when he says, "Nature for some awful but good reason is not allowed to have any pity;" and, when he reminds us how easy it is to be chivalrous in this nineteenth century, his glowing words give a fillip to the blood, which lasts all through the day's worry. We are sorry this volume does not exactly coincide with the "Health and Education" of 1874. It is a misfortune for those who bought here and there a volume of Kingsley's works as they came out, not to be able now to complete their set.

Brunton's Pharmacology and Therapeutics.

Pharmacology and Therapeutics; or, Medicine Past and Present. The Goulstonian Lectures delivered before the Royal College of Physicians in 1877. By T. Lauder Brunton, M.D., F.R.S., &c. London: Macmillan and Co. 1880.

We are glad Dr. Brunton has at last published these lectures in a separate form, as all have not access to the medical journals in which they have already appeared. A more interesting account, in a concise form, of the methods of medical research it would be difficult to find. In these days of undoubted progress in the healing art, it is well for one versed in its various branches to take a wide view of the subject, and endeavour to ascertain the part played by each special method of inquiry, in order that the most promising may receive special attention. We are not surprised that Dr. Brunton insists on the debt which modern medicine owes to the new science of pharmacology—the physiological action of drugs on the system. Though entirely the result of a method of inquiry at present much decried, it is impossible to ignore the fact that under its fostering influence the science of therapeutics has developed both in precision and extent to a wonderful degree. With the introduction of animal experimentation, physiology, pathology, and pharmacology, the bases of practical medicine have made such rapid strides, that the text-books in these branches are no sooner published than they are out of date. It is impossible for one unacquainted with the details of medicine to comprehend how completely this method of research has changed the aspect of medical science. Though a few illustrations can convey but little idea of the results obtained, we venture to bring forward one or two, as the total inutility of the

method is so persistently maintained by some well-meaning but misinformed persons.

Animal experimentation aids practical medicine in the following ways. In order to understand the complicated phenomena of disease, it is imperative that the physician should have a knowledge of the construction and working of the system in health. A watchmaker must be acquainted with the mechanism of a watch before he attempts to deal with one that is out of order. Without any hesitation, we venture to affirm that almost all exact knowledge in physiology has come through animal vivisection. Take, for example, a few facts from the nervous mechanism of the heart. This organ will, under certain circumstances, continue beating for hours after removal from the body, and when divided the different parts go on beating if they contain any of the nerve ganglia found in its substance. Amongst other things this tells us that the mechanism governing the heart's action lies in the heart itself. Certain nerves, however, pass to the heart from the central nervous system. One of these is termed the vagus. If this be severed, the heart immediately begins to beat much faster than before, whilst if the peripheral end of the nerve be now stimulated, the beating heart can be brought to a complete standstill. Thus along this nerve run fibres which act as most delicate reins to the heart's action. According to the needs of the system the driver in the medulla draws up or looses the reins, so that all the parts of the body may harmonise.

Supposing one of these mechanisms is disturbed, the physician cannot, like the watchmaker, open the case and rearrange the spring or wheels. His power is wholly indirect: therefore he must appeal to pharmacology. Experiments show that certain drugs, such as digitalis and casca, act on the heart, decidedly strengthening the beat whilst they reduce its frequency, through affecting the inhibitory mechanism. They also cause contraction of the small arteries. In certain cases of heart disease the muscle becomes quite unable to do the work thrown upon it. Beating faster and faster, it still fails, and dropsy comes on. In such cases, if the system has any recuperative power, the administration of such a drug as digitalis quickly removes the symptoms. It strengthens the beat, moderates and regulates the action, and removes the dropsy. But other drugs are known which render the pulse slow, and amongst these aconite takes a prominent place. Formerly this was classed with digitalis, and recommended in like states of system, but experiments on animals show that it actually weakens the heart's action, and is the very antidote of digitalis! As such it has since been successfully used. The exact cardiac action of numerous other medicines, such as belladonna, nicotine, curari, &c., have been carefully worked out, and await their use as therapeutical agents.

The physician's task is by no means an easy one. From a few symptoms and physical signs he has to infer the exact abnormal condition of body present—a slight fibrinous deposit on a heart-valve, the character and exact situation of a brain tumour, &c. Having made a diagnosis, he may find that therapeutics has no remedy at command. Instead, therefore, of waiting till chance shall supply what is needed, he asks himself whether an experimental examination of the mode of origin and life-history of the disease may not yield important information, either as to its prevention or cure. In this respect the study of pathology has been remarkably aided by experiments on animals. Indeed, the opponents of vivisection must, in the interests of truth, take other standpoints in defence of their opinions than the inutility of animal experimentation. Experiments must be made if the science of medicine is to advance, and if animal experimentation be disallowed, the old crude human experimentation must be resumed. Every sensible man must see the advantage of the exact teachings and suggestions of pharmacology over a chance empiricism. If Dr. Brunton succeeds in convincing the public that the scientific use of animal life has furthered not only theoretical but practical medicine, he will have rendered no small service to those who shall fall into the hands of the physicians of the future.

Richards's Chronology of Medicine.

A Chronology of Medicine, Ancient, Mediæval and Modern. Edited by John Morgan Richards: Illustrated by the Typographic Etching Company. London and Paris. Baillière, Tindall and Cox. 1880.

Mr. Richards dedicates his book to the Hon. Demas Barnes of New York, to whom, he says, he owed his first success in life. His aim is to trace the growth of the healing art, showing its gradual triumph over ignorance and superstition. For a long time it seemed as if superstition had won the day. Old Egypt had its witches and its talismans; but it also had the clinical lectures of its priests, doctors, and its official pharmacopœia, neither of which England can claim till the 17th century. In our author's language, "it was only when other sciences waited on medicine, that she opened her heart and disclosed chemistry, the handmaid for whose coming healing had waited thousands of years." Medicine among the Egyptians (of which Jeremiah speaks), among the Jews, in old Greece and Rome, and in mediæval Europe, all furnish interesting chapters; and the rest of the volume deals with our own country, "medicine in the State papers" opening up a subject which might with advantage be pursued further.

Of quacks Mr. Richards has some curious anecdotes. One man advertised "water from the Pool of Bethesda," to be taken only when it became "troubled." The buyer of a half-guinea bottle came to complain that he had had it some months without the water showing any signs of agitation. "Oh," was the reply, "in a little bottle like that the movement is so slight as to be scarcely visible: buy a five-guinea bottle and it will be apparent to everybody in the house." Mr. Richards's cuttings from old newspapers show that, though advertising had not yet become a science, yet it used more than a hundred years ago to be practised with success in puffing the strangest nostrums. His notes of celebrated medical men, from Linacre (about whom he has got some new facts) to Liebig, are well worth reading. Of course there are the stock anecdotes about Abernethy, who gave back the shilling out of his guinea to a lady patient to buy her a skipping-rope; but the story of Dr. Mamsey and the bank-notes which he rescued, first from the hiding which he had placed them in behind the grate, forgetting to forbid his servants to light a fire, and then from the river into which their charred remains blew as he was taking them to the bank, will be new to most readers.

Robinson's British Bee Farming.

British Bee Farming. (*Farming for Pleasure and Profit.*) By James F. Robinson. Chapman and Hall. 1880.
The Bee-keeper's Manual. By Henry Taylor. Revised by Alfred Watts. Seventh Edition. Groombridge. 1880.

Bee-keeping, the newspapers have been assuring us, is to be the salvation of the British labourer. By it, says Mr. Robinson, he can earn a great deal more than by the sweat of his brow. It is a work which needs little skill and less exertion; indeed, the maxims in both these books may be summed up briefly: "Keep your hives clean; don't kill your bees when you take the honey; get hives of a new construction, Woodbury or Pettit's cottage." (Mr. Robinson shows the value of the bee-farmer's hive as compared with the old straw skeps); above all, says he, weigh your hives in September, feed the deficient ones, not in driblets, but at once, up to about 18 lbs.; watch well against mice, &c. in winter; that is nearly all that has to be done. Of course it requires care and nicety: "no such thing as luck is known in bee-keeping; it is care and forethought," but such thought as is not beyond the power of any ordinary peasant.

Mr. Robinson's book is, like all the volumes of the series, ably and pleasantly written. He dilates on the advantages of the bar-frame hives, with which alone "the extractor" can be used. "Never use a hive," he says, "over which you have not perfect

control, so that you may be able to change your bars, shifting your drone-cells to the end of the hive when drones are getting too numerous, &c." In this way the bee-keeper is gradually led up to the science of his craft, so as to be able to manage successfully fifty hives—a result which, if attained by many, will surely diminish profits by bringing down the price of honey. Any one, Mr. Robinson says, can keep bees without the aid of a book (many, we can assure him, lost theirs last year, in spite of much book-knowledge); yet, he adds, nobody in an age of progress can afford to miss the experience of those who have given years to the work. "Attend to me and you'll find bee-farming, in proportion to the capital invested, the most profitable business known; but to succeed, you must be as busy as the bee itself," such "business" not being in the least laborious, but calling forth judgment and skill and nicety of manipulation. Few can hope to equal Read of Carluke, who got from one hive in one year 328 lbs. (old stock 92 lbs., first swarm 160 lbs., second swarm 76 lbs.); and who, another year, from ten stocks got 400 lbs.; but other results are encouraging enough, though there is the *per contra* of failures, even in spite of all the best appliances. Failures are often due to the bigness of the hives; fourteen inches diameter, fifteen to eighteen in height, is too large; swarms are stopped, and the bees discouraged. Disappointment, again, often comes from going in for *super* honey; if you mean to take this and sell in the comb, well and good; but, remember, it will stop swarming and diminish the general supply. The extractor is of great value, for by means of it you can use the same combs time after time, and thus save the great amount of honey which is employed in making wax. On the bee-sting Mr. Robinson has an interesting chapter; fortunately bees before swarming gorge themselves with honey, and so become inoffensive. Cleanliness, and the absence of bad smells, are essential in dealing with bees; never attempt to go near them when you are hot and perspiring. But we must leave Mr. Robinson, whose book concludes with some interesting notes of Australian and American bee-hunters. Both he and Mr. Taylor speak much in favour of Ligurian bees; and both agree that the destruction of the bees before taking the honey is a needless waste: "Smoke your hives and then take the outside combs," says Mr. Taylor. His book is very practical; the appendices about American honey, German bee-keeping, &c., are well worth reading, especially one on "Bees and their Counterfeits," from the *Intellectual Observer*. The book has, what Mr. Robinson's wants, an excellent index. Between the two we do not pretend to decide. Read both, is our advice; and study them well *before* you buy your stock, not after you have begun bee-keeping.

De Laveleye's L'Italie Actuelle.

L'Italie Actuelle, Lettres à un Ami. Par Emile de Laveleye. Librairie Hachette. 1880.

M. de Laveleye's book is timely, because it deals with the land difficulty, and with the almost equally "burning question," What is the proper relation between Church and State in Roman Catholic countries? We may learn much from the sparkling pages of the Belgian political economist. Small farms, replanting the mountain-sides, planting *Eucalyptus* in the marshes (what has been planted has not been half thick enough), organising emigration—these are some of M. de Laveleye's remedies for the deep poverty with which five-sixths of the Italian provinces are stricken. It is time to do something when such a number of small properties are seized every year for taxes; and this proves that no remedies will avail unless accompanied by strict economy. Italy is vastly overtaxed, and the taxes are recklessly wasted on public buildings, on sumptuous fittings to Government offices, on useless ironclads. He wavers between peasant proprietorship, of which he saw the good side at Capri (his account of the island is charming), and the *metayer* system, under which the landlord gets half the crop, and pays land-tax, and finds the working capital. This system works fairly well in Tuscany, where (as in parts of France) it is of very old standing. The evil of peasant-ownership is the danger of ruin in bad seasons. Of Popery our author has a deep distrust. Belgium, we know, is the scene of constant battle between Ultramontanes and Liberals. He thinks there is no immediate danger of a Romanist reaction, simply because the country clergy are too uneducated, and those in the cities unprepared for a struggle. It will come, when an Italian Maynooth has done its work; and the only way to success is for Government to take up the higher education of girls. If this is not done, the women will remain the slaves of the priesthood, and will throw their influence into the scale of bigotry when the war begins. At present the country priest is simply a good neighbour, "un paysan qui s'est un peu frotté de Latin;" but in the seminaries they are preparing a race of militants, and Government played into their hands when it wiped out theology from the University course. Naturally, M. de Laveleye would fain look forward to some purer religion; he speaks of the success of the Vaudois, especially in educational work; but such success must be slow, while the Jesuits are already arming for the battle, and their dismissal from France will set many at liberty to begin the campaign in Italy. The present evils, however, are over-taxation and absenteeism; for the farming of whole districts of the Campagna

and the Abruzzi, our author borrows the expressive word *Raubcultur*. It pays at present better than good farming would; but, though financially profitable, the system is ruining the country. Allotments, such as the Swiss common-lands are so generally divided into, are M. de Laveleye's remedy; they are safer than peasant proprietorship; "the present state of things will make Italy a second Egypt." As a subsidiary remedy our author names the rabbit; we smile, but his Ostend fellow-countrymen make this little creature a source of large income. Anyhow, taxation must be lowered and devoted to good objects; at present, while State money is spent like water, State teaching is miserably ill-paid, country schoolmasters being absolutely half-starved. One thing our author finds hopeful; Italy has escaped centralisation. By choosing for her capital a city uninhabitable during a large part of the year, she has secured a Washington rather than a Paris.

Jeffries' Round about a Great Estate.

Round about a Great Estate. By Richard Jeffries, Author of "The Gamekeeper at Home," "Hodge and his Friends," &c. Smith, Elder and Co. 1880.

Mr. Jeffries has won himself a place among the prolific writers of our day. And his books improve as they are multiplied; just as *John Caldigates*, the last work of another prolific writer, is in no way inferior to *Phineas Phinn*, or *The Small House at Allington*. Sympathising with the future of rural life, he stereotypes some phases of the former state of things before it passes away entirely. The farmer of the olden times, old Hilary Luckett, as he was always called, less with reference to his age than to his ways, is a sketch from the life. Though he is a landowner as well as a tenant, he cannot resist the pleasure of a little poaching. Well matched with him is the miller, who tells wonderful tales of the strength and powers of the men of his boyhood, who brought their own flour to the mill and lived on "whole meal" bread. Notes of natural history are not wanting—sometimes common things which nobody thought of writing, till this modern White of Selborne put them on record, sometimes rare occurrences, like a swimming rabbit, and the march along a road of a little army of stoats. Tree-felling Mr. Jeffries holds, with Mr. Gladstone, to be one of the most inspiriting of pursuits. "The pleasure of it is never lost; in youth, in manhood—so long as the arm can wield the axe—the enjoyment is equally keen. As the heavy tool pases over the shoulder the impetus of the swinging motion lightens the weight, and something like a thrill passes through the sinews. Why is it so pleasant to strike? What secret

instinct is it that makes the delivery of a blow with axe or hammer so exhilarating? The wilder frenzy of the sword—the fury of striking with the keen blade, which overtakes men even now, when they come hand-to-hand, and which was once the life of battle—seems to arise from the same feeling. Then, as the sharp edge of the axe cuts deep through the bark into the wood, there is a second moment of gratification. . . . But the shortness of man's days will not allow him to cut down many trees." Nor are the beautiful bits of local colour which we admired in the former books wanting in this; nor the minute details which mark the careful observer. Take this for instance: "In the spring the young foliage of the black poplar has a yellow tint. When they cut down the alder poles by the water and peeled them, the sap under the bark as it dried turned as red as if stained."

Our Own Country.

Our Own Country, Descriptive, Historical, and Pictorial. Second Part. Cassell, Petter and Co.

We heartily recommend this admirable series to all who care to roll away that reproach, which so justly lies at the doors of too many English people, of knowing every part of Europe better than they do their own country. It is well got up and well illustrated; but the letter-press lifts it far above the level of the average drawing-room book. The ordinary reader can take it up with pleasure; but it contains much which will be new even to scholars. Thus, *à propos* of Exeter, we have a brief sketch from Mr. Freeman of the points in which this city differs historically from all other English cities. So, again, Chester and Birmingham and Cork are described, not superficially, but so as to give the reader an insight into their distinctive features, original records being constantly and appositely quoted. Nor is this volume confined to cities; Exmoor, Skye, the coast of Fife with its anciently famous towns, Charnwood Forest, that strange volcanic mass in central England, come in along with Derbyshire and its dales, Bedford and John Bunyan, the Wye, and Hatfield House. We do not know of a better specimen of succinct description than that of the Cuchullin Hills, and Loch Corrisk. These hills used to be considered metamorphic; a few years ago, however, Professor Judd proved that they are crystalline, made up of augite and felspar, and due to the volcanoes of the tertiary period, which vomited first trachyte, then basalt.

The illustrations are as abundant as they are good; and the work, if it goes on as it has begun, will be well worthy of the fame of the enterprising firm which has done so much for the indirect, as well as for the direct, education of the country.

Seguin's Country of the Passion Play.

The Country of the Passion Play: The Highlands and Highlanders of Bavaria. By L. G. Seguin, Author of "The Black Forest," "Walks in Algiers," &c. London: Strahan and Company, Limited. 1880.

Miss Seguin has given us a very beautiful and attractive volume. Nothing can surpass the vividness of her word-pictures; but we cannot quite say the same of all the pictorial illustrations included in her book. Some of them appear to us to be blurred and blotted in no ordinary degree. But her descriptions of scenery, and of the old-world customs of the people with whose country she deals, are enchanting. Of course the central point of interest, in her view, is the passion play, which has so wonderfully, and as by a leap, emerged into prominence. On this subject we have no embarrassment in expressing our opinion. Notwithstanding all that our authoress says, with a view to vindicating the reverence of the actors in this play, we cannot look upon it as otherwise than profane. She gives us a picture of "The Crucifixion Scene." Had it been merely a painting, we should have demurred to it, however excellent as a work of art it might have been pronounced. But when we know that the crucified Christ is represented by a living man extended upon a cross, every instinct of our hearts is alienated beyond expression; and the details, showing how it is done, are to us revolting in the extreme. Apart from this, the book is full of most interesting information. The odd ceremonies attendant upon weddings, baptisms, and burials, will charm every reader.

PRINTED BY BEVERIDGE AND CO., FULLWOOD'S RENTS, HOLBORN.