

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



*Buy me a coffee*

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

# THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1886.

---

## ART. I.—WILLIAM CAREY.

1. *The Life of William Carey, D.D.* By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., C.I.E. London. 1885.
2. *William Carey.* By JAMES CULROSS, D.D. London. 1881.
3. *The Life and Times of Carey, Marshman and Ward.* By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. London. 1859.
4. *Farewell Letters to a few Friends in Britain and America on returning to Bengal in 1821.* By WILLIAM WARD, of Serampore. London. 1821.
5. *Periodical Accounts of the Baptist Missionary Society.* Vols. I. to VI.

FOR more than half a century the world has waited for an adequate life of William Carey, the father of modern missions and the Wycliffe of Asia. Dr. Smith's work now leaves nothing to be desired, and is worthy to take its place by the side of his lives of Duff and Wilson. Long residence at Serampore as editor of the *Friend of India*—a paper originally established by the Serampore missionaries—and great aptitude for research, made Dr. Smith the fittest person for the work. His large volume is manifestly the work of an enthusiast, and few will read his pages without feeling the contagious glow which has animated him throughout. But it is nevertheless a solid and valuable contribution to the history of Christianity in India.

Carey has been called the father of modern missions, and in a true sense he was so. For forty years before he became—in an opponent's phrase—"an apostate from the last," the missionary spirit had been growing, but it had as yet shown itself more in aspiration than in action. The closing of the fourth, and the beginning of the fifth, decades in the eighteenth century, was a period of religious revival, the effects of which have never died out. In England the work of the Wesleys and Whitefield was bearing more blessed fruit than even they had ventured to hope. In Scotland a vast quickening had spread over almost all the parishes of the West, rousing to a new life both ministers and people. In New England a similar revival broke out, and touching Yale College fired the heart and consecrated the life of David Brainard. Jonathan Edwards' *Humble Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People in Extraordinary Prayer for the Revival of Religion and the Spread of Christ's Kingdom on Earth*, published in the middle of the century, fell more than thirty years afterwards into Carey's hands, and powerfully stimulated, not him alone, but all the ministers of the Northamptonshire Baptist Association. In 1784 this association had issued an invitation to the public to join them for one hour on the first Monday in every month in prayer for the effusion of the Spirit of God. Elsewhere the same fire was burning. The saintly Samuel Pearce, of Birmingham, was teaching his flock that it "was the duty of all Christians, not only to pray for the universal establishment of Christ's kingdom, but actively to seek its accomplishment." Dr. Coke, fired by his recent visits to America, was preaching everywhere from his favourite text, "Ethiopia shall soon stretch forth her hands unto God;" and the Wesleyan Missionary Society, through the work carried on in the West Indies, was—unconsciously to its founders—struggling into birth. Dr. Haweis, who afterwards took an important part in the formation of the London Missionary Society, was planning with the Countess of Huntingdon a mission to Tahiti. John Thomas, who subsequently became the first medical missionary, was labouring with erratic zeal amongst the Hindus of Bengal; and from the same country Charles Grant was trying to rouse the

English Church to action by appeals to Wilberforce and Simeon. "The Spirit of Missions must Christianize the Church before the Church can Christianize the world," wrote Ward forty years later. The Spirit of Missions had already gone forth, and had Christianized to some extent almost every section of the Church. Many hearts were, in part at least, prepared for Carey's appeal—"Why do we only pray and hope? Let us organize and act." To us, as to Carey, this appeal may seem as Scriptural as it is reasonable, but it did not so appear to the Northampton ministers. Their doctrine of Free Grace weighed them down. They would pray, but they must also wait. When Carey pressed as a subject for discussion the question, "Whether the command given to the Apostles to teach all nations be not obligatory on all succeeding ministers to the end of the world," the elder Ryland is recorded to have cried, "Young man, sit down. When God chooses to convert the heathen He will do it without your help or mine." But Carey could not sit down. Perseverance was the most prominent trait in his character. In after years the villagers amongst whom he was bred remembered that, as a boy, whatever he began he finished. To him the Church's duty was the plainest corollary from its faith, and he paused not in his efforts till he had won even Ryland to his side, and made the zeal of the Northampton Association gloriously consonant with its prayers.

It is just a century since Carey asked his pregnant question. He was then twenty-five years old, and had been minister and schoolmaster at Moulton for almost a year. To eke out a scanty living he had often to return to his last. At twenty he married, unwisely and unhappily, and at the same time voluntarily undertook the support of his late employer's widow. He had few books and few opportunities for leisure. And yet amid all these difficulties he laid broad and deep the foundation of his future linguistic acquirements. Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Dutch, and French he had studied in his cobbler's shed, and before his ordination to the Church at Moulton had formed the habit, which he ever afterwards kept up, of reading a chapter in the Hebrew Bible in the morning,

and one in the Greek Testament at night. Nor had languages engrossed all his attention. Natural history was his delight, and he eagerly devoured every scientific book that he could procure. Cook's voyages had also early begotten in him a love of travel and geography.

"I remember," says Andrew Fuller, "on going into the room where he employed himself at his business, I saw hanging up against the wall a very large map, consisting of several sheets of paper pasted together by himself, on which he had drawn with a pen a place for every nation in the known world, and entered into it whatever he met with in reading relative to its population, religion, &c."

Such a man was not likely to ask a thoughtless question nor to be discouraged by a snub. The subject of missions had lain long upon his mind. "He was always," his sister tells us, "remarkably impressed about heathen lands and the slave-trade. I never remember his engaging in prayer without praying for those poor creatures." Though disappointed by the reception his question had met with at the ministers' meeting, we have it on Fuller's authority that he introduced the subject again and again. "He would not give it up, but would converse with us one by one till he had made some impression upon us."

In 1789 Carey left Moulton for Leicester, to take charge of the church afterwards made famous by the eloquence of Robert Hall. Two years later he renewed his appeal on missions at the ministers' meeting at Clipston, after Fuller had preached a sermon on the pernicious influence of delay "with a power and directness which nevertheless failed practically to convince himself." He was again put off, but this time with a promise that "something should be done," and that he should himself preach the sermon at the next year's meeting. Before that meeting came round he had published his *Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens*, which he had written five years previously. From this pamphlet Dr. Smith gives several pages of extracts. We wish he had republished it entire as an appendix, for though it was reprinted in 1822, only three copies are known to have survived the lapse of time. It is a

document of marvellous ability and force, written in a polished style, and considering the part it played in the genesis of missionary enterprise, it has now a permanent historic value. It closes with a definite and practical suggestion. Let a society be formed, catholic if possible, if not, then Particular Baptist, composed of "men of serious religion, and possessing a spirit of perseverance," with an executive committee, and supported by "subscriptions from rich and poor of a tenth of their income, or at least an average of one penny or more per week from all members of congregations." This was the first scheme that had ever been propounded in England for a definite organization for the evangelization of the whole world as a necessary part of the Church's activity. It staggered even the praying ministers of Northampton. They could not reply to Carey's arguments, but neither could they as yet thank God for the village cobbler's faith and courage. They were filled, as Fuller said, with much fear and trembling.

But the triumph of the divine call over human misconception was at hand. In 1792 the ministers' meeting was at Nottingham, whence had gone forth eight years before the call to prayer. Carey seized and used his opportunity. His text was Isaiah liv. 2 and 3. "In his discourse," say the *Periodical Accounts*, "he pressed two things in particular, as expository of lengthening our cords and strengthening our stakes—viz., (1) That we should expect great things; (2) That we should attempt great things." Under these now famous maxims he poured forth all the accumulated passion of his enthusiasm, till even Fuller was afraid. "If all the people," says the younger Ryland, "had lifted up their voices and wept, as the children of Israel did at Bochim, I should not have wondered at the effect. It would only have seemed proportionate to the cause, so clearly did he prove the criminality of our supineness in the cause of God." When the sermon was over, it seemed as though action was still to be delayed. The ministers were awed, but made no sign, and one by one they left the room. "Seizing Fuller's arm with an imploring look, the preacher, whom despair had emboldened to act alone for his Master, exclaimed, 'And are you after all going again to do

nothing?'" But Carey and missions had won. The much fear and trembling passed away, and there and then those who had hitherto opposed and withstood him sat down and put their hands to a resolution from which they never looked back—"That a plan be prepared against the next ministers' meeting at Kettering for forming a Baptist society for propagating the Gospel among the heathen." Such was the supreme moment of Carey's triumph, such the birth of English missionary enterprise.

At the meeting at Kettering plans were discussed, a Committee was appointed with Andrew Fuller as its secretary, and subscriptions towards the work were asked. The sum of £13 2s. 6d. was contributed on the spot—the first missionary collection. The second was at Samuel Pearce's church in Birmingham, and amounted to £70. At a committee meeting held at Northampton exactly six weeks after Carey's great sermon it was announced that Mr. Thomas was trying to raise in London a fund for a mission to Bengal; and Carey, fearing that the two attempts would clash, suggested an amalgamation. Mr. Thomas was asked to write an account of himself and his work, and of Bengal as a mission field, to be read at the next meeting. This he did in a fervid, but somewhat incoherent, document which is preserved intact in the *Periodical Accounts*. It proved, however, satisfactory to the Committee, and induced them to make Bengal the field of their first mission. Thomas was accepted as an agent of the Society, and on June 13, 1793, Carey and he sailed for Calcutta in the *Princessa Maria*, a Danish East-Indiaman. They were to receive from the Committee for the first year £150, "to be divided equally between them," and this was to be continued till they acquired independent means of support, but no longer. Thomas was a surgeon, and hoped to live by the practice of his profession. Carey looked to agriculture. But the first year of his life in India was one of more grinding poverty than any he had known at home. His association with Thomas, who, in spite of his piety, zeal and generosity, was careless and prodigal, and whose debts had ruined his reputation in Calcutta, was rather a hindrance than a help, and it was not until he undertook the manage-

ment of an indigo factory at Mudnabatty belonging to Mr. Udny, a civilian, and a firm friend of missions, that Carey was able really to begin his mission work. By that time he had almost mastered Bengali, into which language he had translated a large part of the New Testament, and had obtained that practical acquaintance with Hindu systems and the native character which was the first condition of success. Mr. Thomas had taken charge of a similar factory at Moipaldiggy, sixteen miles from Mudnabatty, and these two villages now became, and continued for four years, the headquarters of their mission. Elementary schools were established, preaching tours were made into the surrounding country, and Carey pushed on with heart and soul in his work of Bible translation. In 1796 they were reinforced by the arrival of Mr. Fountain. By the close of 1798 the New Testament was ready for the press, but the cost of printing in Calcutta being greater than their funds could bear, the missionaries purchased an old press for £40, and prepared to print it themselves. So far their work had been successful, and Carey now projected a scheme which, happily for the continuance and success of the Mission, was defeated by the unfriendliness of the British Government.

Under the Charter which gave the East India Company its power, the Indian Government was authorized summarily to deport any "interloper" who had not obtained a licence from the Court of Directors. At the renewal of the Charter in 1793, an attempt had been made by Wilberforce and others to obtain the insertion of a clause permitting the residence of missionaries, but without success. When Carey and Thomas left England, so strong was the opposition at headquarters to the introduction of Christianity into India, that they found it impossible to obtain a licence. It was this which led them to embark in a foreign East-Indiaman, as the Company would allow no unlicensed person to travel in its ships. So far they had been unmolested; but their security had been owing partly to their obscurity and partly to the protecting friendship of Mr. Udny. But Carey was fully alive to the fact that difficulties with the Government would be the inevitable consequence of success in their mission, and



in his correspondence with Fuller he more than once referred to the necessity which might arise for them to seek an asylum in some Native State where they would be beyond the reach of British intolerance. But he had no desire to leave the field then occupied before an absolute necessity arose. He contemplated the formation of a Brotherhood after the Moravian pattern, and in a letter to Fuller proposed that seven or eight families should be sent out to join him with this object. They would live in straw huts, have a common table and a common purse, and the proceeds of their labour, after the simple necessities of life had been provided, would be devoted to the extension of the Mission. A Christian society, he thought, might thus be formed, well adapted to gather in the harvest of which he already saw promise. Every convert from heathenism would become a member of the Brotherhood, which would develop in time into a Christian settlement from which light and truth would radiate. In this Carey was putting into concrete form his fundamental principle, that the missionary must be one with the people to whom he is sent. Fuller approved of the plan, and secured the men; but we may well be thankful that before they arrived in India circumstances had arisen to upset the scheme. It would have been death to the men and destruction to the Mission, especially if carried out in the feverish swamps of Malda.

On October 12, 1799, the new missionaries anchored off Calcutta. They were four in number, Daniel Brunson, William Grant, Joshua Marshman and William Ward. The two first died within a year of their arrival; the two last lived long enough to rival even Carey in the greatness of their services to Indian missions. They brought with them a letter of introduction from the Danish Consul in London to Colonel Bie, the Governor of Serampore; and therefore, avoiding Calcutta, proceeded at once to that settlement, hoping there to obtain boats to take them into the interior. Colonel Bie received them with great cordiality, and offered them every assistance in his power, but warned them at the same time of the probable hostility of the British Government. His predictions soon proved too true. The day after their arrival they were summoned to appear at the Calcutta Police Court. The

Governor-General, Lord Wellesley, yielding to the popular prejudice, had determined to expel them from the country, and laid an embargo upon the *Criterion*, the vessel that brought them out, until Captain Wickes would sign an agreement to take them back again. But for the friendship and protection of the Danish Government of Serampore, Carey's Mission would now have been crushed, and the three men, whose work has made that little settlement for ever famous, would in all probability have sought refuge in Burmah. But Colonel Bie was firm. The missionaries had come out accredited to him, and they should enjoy to the full the protection of his flag. Against this nothing could be said, and Lord Wellesley was too wise to persist in his demands. Captain Wickes was allowed to trade, and the new arrivals were recognized as Danish subjects, with all the rights of Danish citizenship. This left but one course open to Carey. If his colleagues could not come to him, he must go to them. Colonel Bie offered him protection, inviting him to make the Danish settlement his head-quarters, and promising to hand over to the Mission a church which he had recently built. Carey consented, and on January 10, 1800, arrived at Serampore, where ever afterwards he lived, and where his dust now reposes. Thus were the missionaries led by a way that they knew not.

In the whole of the Gangetic delta, no place could have been found better adapted than Serampore to the purposes which Carey had at heart. Within easy reach of the metropolis, of which it formed almost a suburb, healthily situated on the right bank of the Hugli, and surrounded by a dense population, Serampore offered facilities for mission work infinitely superior to those afforded by Malda. Under the friendly protection of the Danes, Carey was able to develop, "without let or hindrance," the three lines of activity on which he had already determined—the translation and publication of the Scriptures, the education of the young, and the proclamation of the Gospel in the vernacular. Nor did he find it necessary to give up his favourite scheme of brotherhood, though straw huts happily gave place to houses of brick and mortar. A month after his arrival premises were

purchased for £750, which afforded moderate accommodation for all the mission families, a hall for public worship, out-offices which were soon fitted up as a printing-press, and a couple of acres of land which were "handed over to Brother Carey for a botanic garden." In this house the missionaries, with their wives and children, constituted a single family.

"This week," says Ward in his Journal, "we have adopted a set of rules for the government of the family. All preach and pray in turn; one superintends the affairs of the family for a month, and then another; Brother Carey is treasurer, and has the regulation of the medicine chest; Brother Fountain is librarian. Saturday evening is devoted to adjusting differences, and pledging ourselves to love one another. One of our resolutions is that no one of us do engage in private trade; but that all be done for the benefit of the Mission."

This Brotherhood survived the death of its great founder. It was made possible only by the entire consecration of each member to the work to which he believed himself divinely called—a consecration which was never regretted or in any measure revoked, and which continued complete and whole-hearted when, twenty years afterwards, they smarted under the suspicion and mistrust of the Committee at home. "Let us give ourselves unreservedly to this glorious cause," wrote Ward in the *Form of Agreement* drawn up in 1805, which they resolved solemnly to read together three times a year, "let us never think that our time, our gifts, our strength, our families, or even the clothes we wear are our own. Let us sanctify them all to God and His cause . . . . Let us for ever shut out the idea of laying up a covey for ourselves or our children." In all this the apostles of Serampore went as far beyond the wishes of the Committee at home as beyond the example of their predecessors in India. They were expected to support themselves by their own labours, but others had done the same, and had yet grown rich. Schwartz left a fortune behind him, and Gerické before his death had saved £5,000. It would have been easy for Carey and his colleagues to have saved together more than ten times that amount. They made as much, and more, but they freely gave it to the Mission, and died as poor as they had lived.

The establishment of the Brotherhood at Serampore was

followed by six years of peace and progress. During the greater part of that time Lord Wellesley continued Governor-General, and as he was not personally unfavourable to the work of the Mission, no further obstacles were thrown in the way of its extension. The development of the press was the first object to which Carey and Ward gave their attention, for they felt that little could be done in other departments of the Mission till the New Testament was published in Bengali. For a while they were crippled through lack of funds; but Marshman and his wife commenced a school for European children, which, before the end of the year, brought them in a monthly profit of £36, and soon yielded them £1,000 a year. For the rest they boldly appealed to the public of Calcutta, asking subscriptions of Rs. 32 for the whole Bengali Bible. This appeal brought them in Rs. 1,500. Soon after this Carey was appointed Professor of Bengali and Sanskrit in the College of Fort William, which had just been established by Lord Wellesley for the education of the junior officers of the Government, an appointment which he held for twenty-nine years, on a salary of at first £750, and afterwards £1,500 *per annum*. The Mission thus became comparatively rich, and Ward, who had been a printer in England, was enabled so to develop the printing establishment that in a few years it was by far the most complete Oriental press in India. Some idea of its efficiency may be formed from the record of the fire in 1812, preserved in the *Periodical Accounts*. There we learn that the following founts of type were destroyed:—4 founts of Chinese, 45 of Sanskrit, 14 of Telugu, 6 of Sikh, 8 of Mahrathi, 7 of Tamul, 12 of Bengali, 12 of Burmese, 18 of Persian, 8 of Arabic, 6 of Ooriya, 1 of Kashmeri, 5 of Greek, 1 of Hebrew, and 88 of English; 235 in all, in no fewer than 15 languages! In course of years a large type foundry was established in connection with the press, which continued till 1857 to be the chief manufactory of Oriental type in the East, and a paper mill at which was erected the first steam-engine ever used in India. It was this mill that supplied, in 1857, the greased cartridge paper of Mutiny notoriety. This marvellous growth was due chiefly to the indefatigable energy of Ward. He had for the most part to

educate his own printers, and for a while to be his own compositor. Yet with such zeal did he and Carey work, that nine months after the press was opened the Bengali New Testament was ready for circulation. Early in February, 1801, the whole mission family with their converts were summoned to the little church, where, with solemn gratitude, the first bound copy was presented to the Lord. It was the van of a noble army!

When Carey had been six months in India, and had begun the translation of the Bible into Bengali, he said that if he should live to see it completed, he could then say with Simeon, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace." But soon his aspirations took a wider range, and before he settled at Serampore he yearned to give the Bible in their mother tongues to all the peoples of India. The arrival of Ward, and his own appointment to the College of Fort William, quickened his hopes by bringing their accomplishment within the sphere of possibility. He was surrounded in his Sanskrit chair by the most learned *pundits* in the country, and enjoyed facilities for a study of all the chief languages of India possessed at the time by no other man. To this study Carey applied himself, and the dogged perseverance which had helped him in his cobbler's shed to master Greek and Hebrew, soon made him at home in the languages of the East. His first object was to complete his translation of the Scriptures into Sanskrit. As this was printed, sheet by sheet, he put it into the hands of competent native scholars, who translated it into their own vernaculars. This plan has often been attacked, but those who have condemned it seem to have forgotten that every version thus made was revised and re-revised, either by Carey or by one of his colleagues competent for the task. Carey himself would have been the first to acknowledge that, *ceteris paribus*, Christian translators are preferable to heathen, but he also held that it would be criminal to withhold the Word of Life until Christian translators were raised up, that a competent native scholar would make a simpler and more idiomatic version than he or any other European, and that when such a version had been critically revised and compared with the original Greek or

Hebrew, it would be more likely to satisfy the demands of scholarship than if produced in any other way. Certain it is that but for the use thus made of native pundits, it would have been physically impossible for Carey to accomplish one-half of his great scheme. That scheme he thus explained to Ryland in words which deserve to be remembered :—

“ We have it in our power, if our means would do for it, in the space of about fifteen years to have the Word of God translated and printed in all the languages of the East. Our situation is such as to furnish us with the best assistance from natives of the different countries. We can have types of all the different characters cast here; and about 700 rupees per month—part of which I hope we shall be able to furnish—would complete the work. . . . On this great work we have fixed our eyes.”

To conceive such a scheme was a miracle of daring, but he set himself to accomplish even more than this. He knew better than the severest of his critics that he was only preparing the ground for future labourers, and he looked forward to the time when his own translations, tentative and imperfect as he always held them to be, would be superseded by others more worthy to live. For this he sought to prepare the way.

“ I have of late,” he writes in 1811, “ been much impressed with the vast importance of laying a foundation for Biblical criticism in the East, by preparing grammars of the various languages into which we have translated, or may translate, the Bible. Without some such step they who follow us will have to wade through the same labour that I have, in order to stand merely upon the same ground that I now stand upon. . . . The necessity which lies upon me of acquiring so many languages, obliges me to study and write out the grammar of each of them, and to attend closely to their irregularities and peculiarities. I have therefore already published grammars of three of them—viz., the Sanskrit, the Bengali, and the Mahrathi. To these I have resolved to add grammars of the Telinga, Karnata, Orissa, Punjabi, Kashmeeri, Goojarathi, Nepalese, and Assam languages. Two of these are now in the press.”

Had we sufficient space it would be interesting to follow Carey in this great work, and to trace the history of each translation; for each, as Dr. Smith well says, has a “ spiritual romance of its own.” Suffice it to say, that before his death Carey had, with the help of his brethren, issued from the

Serampore press the whole Bible in Bengali, Ooriya, Assamese, Sanskrit, Hindi, Mahrathi, and Chinese; and the whole of the New Testament in twenty-one other languages, amongst which were Nepalese, Goojarathi, Kashmeeri, Telugu, Kanarese, Persian, Malayalam, and Singhalese. Truly, as Dr. Smith remarks, when stripped of the extravagance of statement into which they have grown in the course of half a century, the facts are more remarkable than the pious myth which has accreted round them.

We have already noticed the power which the Government of India possessed of excluding from the country any one not officially connected with the Company or licensed by the Court of Directors, and of summarily deporting those who in any way made themselves obnoxious. When to this we add that religion of any kind was tabooed by the majority of Indian civilians, and that the stability of the British Empire in India was believed to depend upon the respect paid to native prejudices, it becomes easy to understand, on the one hand, the Government patronage of Brahmanism, and, on the other, the violent antagonism with which all Christian effort was assailed. The wisdom and prudence of Lord Wellesley, and the respect which he paid to Christianity, kept these forces in check, and under his government the Serampore Mission grew in spite of its openly aggressive character. In 1803, and again in 1805, it was strengthened by the arrival of new labourers from England, and at the close of the latter year new premises were secured at a cost of £3,000. But trouble was at hand. The same year their friend and protector, Col. Bie, died, and Lord Wellesley resigned the Governor-Generalship and returned to Europe. He was succeeded by Lord Cornwallis, who had left India twelve years previously in robust health, but who now returned at the age of sixty-six a dying man. He survived only two months, and at his death the reins of government passed into the hands of his senior councillor, Sir George Barlow, a man of peaceable disposition, but weak and timid. During his tenure of office the prejudice against missionaries was revived, and those who fomented it had an excellent argument to their hand in the Vellore Mutiny. On the night of July 10, 1806, the native garrison at Vellore rose

and massacred their English officers to a man. The cause was undoubtedly in part religious. The emissaries of the dethroned family of Tippu had stirred up disaffection by spreading the report that a recent change in uniform was merely the precursor of an enforced change of religion. The mutiny was soon suppressed, and its cause forgotten; but it provided the enemies of missions with a telling argument. While the news of this outbreak was still fresh, the *Criterion* anchored in the Hugli with two new missionaries on board. Captain Wickes was commanded to land his passengers in Calcutta, and though the missionaries were bound for Serampore, they were at once summoned to the police-station, and ordered to leave the country; and an embargo was a second time put upon Captain Wickes. A Government Order was at the same time communicated to Carey practically forbidding the whole work of the Mission. By the kindly intervention of Mr. Brown, a Government chaplain, this order was soon modified, but it still prohibited street preaching, the despatch of native converts from Serampore on evangelistic tours, and the distribution of tracts. After vigorous protest on the part of Captain Wickes the embargo was also removed from the *Criterion*, but not until it was represented to Sir George Barlow, that to persist in the course he had adopted would embroil his Honourable Masters with the Governments of Denmark and the United States.

Seriously as the orders of Sir George Barlow crippled the operations of the Mission, they were soon found to be but the beginning of troubles. In July, 1807, Lord Minto arrived in Calcutta as Governor-General, Sir George Barlow being removed from his acting appointment to the Governorship of Madras. Lord Minto had been President of the Board of Control, and was deeply imbued with current prejudices. Soon after his arrival a tract against Muhammadanism, which had been issued at Serampore, roused the ire of his Council; and though the missionaries offered to suppress the tract and to submit to Government for approval anything that they might print in future, Lord Minto issued a peremptory order for the discontinuance of public preaching and the removal of the press to Calcutta, where it might be under effective police supervision. Col. Freyling, the new Danish Governor, was naturally



indignant; nor was he soothed by receiving next day what was little better than an arrogant demand that he should himself assist in carrying out the obnoxious order. He assured the missionaries of his determination not to allow the press to be removed, and declared that if the British Government adopted any measures of compulsion, he would strike his flag, and leave the settlement in its possession. Carey and Marshman were inclined to leave the whole matter in his hands, but not so Ward. He penned a protest against this line of conduct, which shows almost better than anything else the gentle spirit of the man :—

“I have a great deal of hesitation in my mind respecting our remaining in sullen silence after the English Government have addressed us through Brother Carey and the Governor. As it respects ourselves, even if we are not compelled to go to Calcutta with our press, the having them as our avowed and exasperated enemies is no small calamity. . . . As it respects Col. Krefling, we ought to deprecate the idea of embroiling him with the English Government, if we can possibly avoid it. I think, therefore, we should entreat their clemency, and endeavour to soften them. Tender words, with the consciences of men on our side, go a long way. We can tell them that to take our press to Calcutta would involve us in a heavy and unbearable expense, and break up our family, and that we will give them every security they would wish. . . . If they listen to this we are secured, with all the advantages of their sufferance. If they are obstinate—we are still at Serampore.”

Ward's counsels prevailed, and Carey and Marshman determined to seek an audience of Lord Minto. They were assisted by that brilliant Orientalist, Dr. Leyden, whose memory Walter Scott has immortalized. Lord Minto was anxious to be just, and a few weeks after the interview the press order was officially revoked. Again the machinations of their enemies were defeated, and again the Brotherhood had rest. But it was only for a time.

Encouraged by the apparent change in Lord Minto's attitude, Carey wrote home to Fuller for more men, and in a short time two were on their way—Messrs. Lawson and Johns. They came by America, where they met with a party about to start for the East to establish a mission in Burmah. They were the outcome of a burst of missionary enthusiasm at Andover Theological Seminary, and Adoniram Judson, who

afterwards became the Carey of Burmah, was their leader. Judson and one of his companions embarked in the *Caravan*, and arrived in Calcutta on June 17, 1812. The remaining four, together with Messrs. Lawson and Johns, embarked in the *Harmony*, and arrived on August 15. All that the Americans desired was permission to reside in Calcutta till they could secure a passage to Burmah. This, however, could not be granted, and after endless vacillation the Government—to borrow Mr. Marshman's expression—succeeded in chasing them out of the country. Messrs. Lawson and Johns fared little better, and as Serampore was at that time occupied by the British, there was no friendly Governor to claim them as his subjects. At first permission was granted them to remain in the country till the will of the Directors should be known, but this permission was afterwards revoked. Mr. Lawson was ultimately allowed to remain, on the plea that he was needed for the Chinese printing then going on; but Mr. Johns' departure was insisted on. Mr. Marshman gives a full and particular account of these arbitrary proceedings, and his pages form as strange and shameful a chapter as ever marred the annals of a Protestant Government. We mention them now because they receive a historical importance from their connection with the battle fought in England on behalf of religious freedom in India.

The Serampore Brotherhood kept the Committee well informed of events in India, and it is not going too far to say that Andrew Fuller contributed more than any other man towards bringing about that change of feeling which at the renewal of the Charter in 1813 opened India to missionary effort. Carey clearly saw that their only hope was in the passing of the "Pious Clauses" which had been thrown out in 1793. His letters to Fuller are full of exhortations to agitate: and Fuller was not slow to obey, for even Carey's heart was hardly more in India than his. With precisely the same self-sacrificing spirit in which Carey gave time and strength to the work of translation, did Fuller give time and strength to the more wearisome task of informing the public mind and rousing the public conscience. He preached and lectured through the length and breadth of England and

Scotland, interviewed public men of all schools, and was ever ready with his pen to answer each new pamphleteer. His quick perception and relentless logic, combined with his strong Saxon style, made Fuller one of the ablest controversialists of his own or any age.

In this great controversy, which united the whole of evangelical Britain, and the history of which has not yet been written as it deserves to be, the missionary movement was assisted, more than its leaders were aware of, by an agitation then proceeding for the grant of an Ecclesiastical Establishment to India. The chief mover in this was Dr. Buchanan, who had been one of Carey's Calcutta friends.

Buchanan is now best known as the author of the *Christian Researches in Asia*; but from his return to England in 1808 up to 1813 he was a prominent public man, and was hardly less abused and misunderstood than Fuller himself. It is to him that the Ecclesiastical Establishment in India owes its existence. Appointed to a chaplaincy in Calcutta, in 1796, he found that with the exception of Mr. Brown, whom we have already mentioned, Indian chaplains had been more noted as merchants than as ministers of the Gospel. These two devoted men, with their successors, Martyn, Thomason and Corrie, changed all this, and made the Church of England a spiritual power in Calcutta. Buchanan, like Martyn, was more a missionary than a chaplain, and laboured with strenuous earnestness for the establishment of what seemed to him the most likely agency to bring India to Christ. How mistaken he was we need not now stay to inquire. The Indian Establishment has never become the missionary Church which Buchanan hoped it would, but none the less may we recognize and admire the labours of the saintly man who, had he so willed, might have been the first Indian Bishop, but who "hoped for nothing in this world but bitter repentance with many tears, and the grace of God at last." It was in 1805, while still in India, that Dr. Buchanan wrote his *Memoir of the Expediency of an Ecclesiastical Establishment for British India*. It was published in London in the autumn of that year, and was one of the causes which led to the war of pamphlets in 1807, the others being

the establishment of the Bible Society and Lord Minto's order respecting the Serampore press. The brunt of this earlier controversy fell upon Mr. Fuller and Mr. Owen, the latter of whom was for many years the indefatigable secretary of the Bible Society. They were nobly supported by Wilberforce, Robert Hall, John Foster and a host of others whose names belong equally to the history of the Church and of the Nation. When, in anticipation of the renewal of the Charter, the controversy broke out afresh, Dr. Buchanan was in England, and took as active a part as his failing health would allow. And yet Fuller and Buchanan seem to have worked in almost complete separation. Buchanan's "Churchy" tendencies had not pleased the Serampore Brotherhood, and Fuller regarded him as more of a politician than a missionary. He feared, too, lest an establishment should be granted as a sop to the public conscience, and the wider and more catholic scheme fail through the success of the narrower. Of this, however, there was no real danger. In spite of separation and distrust Buchanan and Fuller were labouring for a common end, and the work of each supplemented and enforced that of the other. Buchanan's demand for an establishment was expressly based on the obligation that lay upon England to Christianize the millions of India. To grant this, and yet to refuse to throw India open to missionaries of all denominations would have been to return to the principles of the Clarendon Code—a contingency which Fuller need not have feared. Buchanan, too, influenced circles in which Fuller's voice was hardly heard, while Fuller moved the people as Buchanan could never have done. It is to Fuller's labours more than to any other cause that we must ascribe the torrent of petitions—900 in all—which, when the great debate began, broke upon Parliament, and, overwhelming all opposition, threw India open to the Gospel.

We must now return to Serampore. We have said that Carey's plans were threefold :—(1) The publication of the Scriptures in the languages of the people ; (2) The proclamation of the Gospel by vernacular preachers ; and (3) Education. The progress made in the first of these branches we have already seen. The remaining two require brief notice.

From the first Carey felt that European preachers were at best but a makeshift till Christian natives could be raised up, who would bear the climate and speak the language better than Europeans could ever hope to do. This conviction determined his whole mission policy. Europeans, he foresaw, would long be needed, but more for supervision and guidance than for direct vernacular work. They must speak the language and be one with the people, but unless they were surrounded by a sufficient number of native helpers the Mission could never maintain itself and grow.

"My plan has been," says he in 1819, "to fix European brethren at the distance of 100 or 150 miles from each other, so that each one should occupy the centre of a circle of 100 miles diameter, more or less; and that native brethren should be stationed within that circle as preachers, schoolmasters, readers, &c., at proper distances as circumstances may make convenient; and that he, as a brother, not a lord, should visit and superintend them."

This method of work has received the approbation of missionaries of every denomination, and where it has been most fully carried out success has been most rapid. The earnestness with which Carey and his associates pressed their converts into Christian work led sometimes to difficulties. But the principle which underlay their action was sound. Every man, taught Carey, whose soul Divine love has touched must be a witness-bearer, to his own family and friends at least, to the Church if God call him. Ward held this even more strongly than did Carey, and would fain, as we learn from his *Letters*, have cultivated the power to speak for God by establishing among the converts something similar to the Methodist class-meeting. But while they recognized the fact that the simplest and most uninstructed disciple had a distinct place and duty in the Church, and might be called by God and fitted by experience of His Grace to bear witness with power, no body of men were ever less open to the charge of undervaluing literary attainments or of thrusting into the ministry men unfitted for the work. It was their desire to avoid this danger which led them in 1818 to concentrate their work around a collegiate institution in which successive generations of native ministers might be trained. In a letter written

to the Committee in 1827 they thus trace the evolution of their plans:—

"As our private income gradually increased so as to exceed the necessities of the three families, we expended the surplus in the formation of missionary stations around us. . . .

"With the multiplication of the stations the efficiency of missionaries raised up in the country became more apparent, and we determined to bend our attention chiefly to this object. The native Christian population had also increased, and required increasing care. We therefore determined in 1818 to establish a college, which might in its gradual development provide means for more extensively diffusing religion and knowledge in Hindostan. . . . The course of circumstances has thus led us first to the establishment of means for our own support—then to the employment of a portion of our surplus income in the extension of the cause by missionaries raised up in the country—after this, to provide for the education of native Christian youth—and, finally, to concentrate every plan in one institution, in the hope that it might survive the transient circumstances of our private union."

For the completion of this college the Brotherhood raised, without aid from home, the large sum of £15,000. From 1822 onwards, it was regarded as the heart of their Mission, and from it young men were sent to reinforce the ten country stations in connection with it.

The third of Carey's agencies, elementary vernacular education, he developed with an energy which is only now beginning to be imitated. His object was to give to as many children as could be gathered together the rudiments of learning, with the fundamental precepts of morality and the elements of Christian truth, in the firm faith that if fruit was not seen by him it would be garnered by his successors. Ward gives us the following interesting account of these schools:—

"The great object of these schools is to supply the children with the elements of knowledge in history, astronomy, geography, natural history, &c., which is done by means of what are called scientific copy books. Each copy contains in two, three, or four lines some popular facts in reference to these subjects. Reading and writing are thus secured; and by having the copies committed to memory, which is an essential part of the plan, the mind becomes stored with knowledge. . . . Passages of Scripture suited to meet the particular errors of the Hindu system make a part of these copies."

By 1818 they had established 126 such schools, in which were gathered not fewer than 10,000 children.

Such was some of the work of the Serampore Brotherhood. By what they accomplished, as well as by what they were, Carey, Marshman and Ward earned the title of "the Apostles of India." It is impossible to read their story, as told by Dr. Smith and Mr. Marshman, or as it gradually unfolds itself in the *Periodical Accounts*—in those priceless letters and journals which Sydney Smith thought fit to sneer at—without feeling that if their work was great the men themselves were greater. Carey became not only the first Orientalist of his age, but an accomplished naturalist and the founder of the Agricultural Society of India. Marshman for a dozen years gave every minute that he could spare from severe scholastic and evangelistic labours to the study of Chinese, and has the honour of having been the first to translate the Bible into that most difficult tongue. Ward, though he perfected with immense rapidity a vast Oriental press, found time in the first six years of his Indian life to compile his *History, Literature and Mythology of the Hindus*, which, in all but its section on Philosophy, is still a standard work. And yet it is not their industry that most impresses us, but their childlike simplicity, moral heroism, and boundless faith. When the great fire destroyed the press, and Marshman and Ward, having done all they could to save it, stood by and watched the flames go up, "steady as the flame of a candle to heaven," "a solemn serenity," Marshman tells us, "filled their souls with strength." They wept for "Brother Carey who has thus lost many valuable MSS.;" but though the loss represented the accumulated work of years, he, comforted himself and them by the simple thought that it would "doubtless be advantageous to go over the ground again." "There have never been many men at Serampore," said Bishop Wilson, who visited Carey on his deathbed and knelt to receive his benediction, "but they have all been giants."

To make the Brotherhood complete we must add the name of Andrew Fuller, though he never crossed the seas. What Fuller did for the Baptist Churches of England is well known; but he possesses an almost greater claim to affectionate memory for what he did for Serampore. "We will go to the

ends of the earth," said Carey to him after the ministers' meeting at Northampton, "but you must hold the rope." He held it for nearly a quarter of a century, and held it nobly. If Carey set a noble example to missionaries, Fuller set an equally noble example to missionary secretaries.

In 1815 Fuller died. Only Ryland was left. In 1823 the circle was broken in India by the death of Ward, who was struck down by cholera. "It is only the survivors who die," Marshman had written to a bereaved friend ten days before, and now he sadly experienced the truth of his own remark. For eleven years more Carey was spared, and he and Marshman steered the Mission through difficulties almost greater than any it had yet encountered, ending with the commercial crisis of 1833, in which all its funds were lost. As Carey lay dying he was visited by Alexander Duff. At the close of one of their interviews, the aged apostle said, "Mr. Duff, you have spoken much of Dr. Carey; when I am gone speak only of Dr. Carey's Saviour." In the same spirit he directed that these words, and these alone, should be cut upon his tombstone:—

**"WILLIAM CAREY.**

Born August 17, 1761; died —.

'A wretched, poor, and helpless worm,  
On Thy kind arms I fall.'

From June 9, 1834, Marshman was left alone. His friends wished him to seek rest and change, but he refused, and on December 5, 1837, he passed away from the house in which he had lived and worked. The dust of these three great men thus consecrates the scene of their heroic toil. Lovely and pleasant in their lives, in their death they were not divided.

The record of the lives and work of these three men is a precious legacy, which will be read with increasing interest as the evangelization of India proceeds. And yet of Carey, the founder of the Brotherhood, and the greatest of the three, there is no monument or public memorial. Carey's College at Serampore has fallen, we believe, to the standard of an ordinary high school, and yet it is a chartered university with power to confer academical degrees. The charter was granted by the King of Denmark in 1827, and is secured in perpetual



validity by Article VI. of the Treaty of 1845, which transferred Serampore to the English.

The powers thus conferred have never been exercised, but there is no reason, so far as we can discover, why they should not be exercised. India has now four universities, but in none of these is there a Divinity Faculty. For the growing Church of India there is great need for a university granting degrees in Divinity, both on the basis of examination and in recognition of distinguished services to the cause of religion. No locality would be so suitable for such a university as Serampore. If the Baptist Missionary Society would develop a plan for the resuscitation of Carey's University sufficiently liberal to unite the Nonconforming Churches at home, it would, we believe, be received with auspicious favour by the Churches of India, and would command an amount of support that would suffice to ensure its efficiency and permanence. Such a university would be a monument to the memory of the Father of Modern Missions, worthy alike of the man and of the great Society which he was instrumental in founding.

## ART. II.—TAINE'S REVOLUTION.

1. *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine.* Par H. TAINE. L'Ancien Régime. 1875.
2. *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine.* Par H. TAINE. La Révolution. Tome I. 1878.
3. *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine.* Par H. TAINE. La Révolution. Tome II. La Conquête Jacobine. 1881.
4. *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine.* Par H. TAINE, de l'Académie Française. La Révolution. Tome III. Le Gouvernement révolutionnaire. 1885.

**M**. FRANCISQUE SARCEY, the critic, has lately given us, in his *Souvenirs de Jeunesse* a particularly bright and pleasant picture of the brilliant band of young students who were being trained as schoolmasters, at the Normal School of Paris, during the years 1848, 1849 and 1850. Com-

petitive examination had brought them together ; and seldom has the goddess of competitive examinations bestowed at one and the same time so many crowns prophetic of future distinction. M. Taine passed into the school first of his year. Edmund About, the witty, clever novelist and publicist, came second. M. Sarcey himself was fourth. Paul Albert, the literary historian and critic, was among the number. Prevost-Paradol, the swift rapier of whose pen was afterwards to draw blood so often in his battles with the Empire—Prevost-Paradol entered the year following. A goodly fellowship, happy in the fresh morning of life and youth's sunny promise, not subjected to any very rigid discipline, but free pretty much to study as they pleased and talk as they liked—holding, in fact, a tournament of tongues, where the lists were always open and the jousting incessant—so Sainte-Beuve, speaking of course from hearsay, described them many years ago, when reviewing in the inimitable *Lundis* M. Taine's first books. So M. Sarcey, looking back at the scenes of his early manhood with the wistfulness of later middle age, has described them again. And among the bright figures which memory brings back to him, there is one that evidently occupies an exceptional place. *Cacique*, or chief, was the name by which M. Taine was familiarly known among his companions. Mainly, no doubt, he owed that name to the fact that he was the first student of his year. But he was looked up to on other grounds as well. "Though we took a pleasure in sometimes teasing him," says M. Sarcey, "in real truth we entertained for him a feeling that was more than mere liking. We regarded him with mingled admiration and respect. That incessant passionate labour of his which detracted in nothing from the breadth of his intellect, the liveliness of his imagination, the amenity of his character, filled us with astonishment. He was a living encyclopædia which we consulted incessantly, an encyclopædia that suffered us to turn over its pages with the most liberal and friendly good-nature. . . . Everything in his face and person bore witness to a steady undaunted tenacity of character. No one has ever *willed* more ardently and patiently than he."

Such was the youth ; and such is the man who, with the

same tenacity of purpose, the same unfaltering will, has set himself to wring from the French Revolution its secrets of origin and purpose and results. Enough and to spare has already been written on that great theme; but he has applied himself to his task as if it had never been treated before, and he were studying it from the beginning. He has gone back to first sources, published and unpublished, unpublished more particularly. He has toilsomely, painfully, gone through the vast mass of manuscript records of the time lying in the public Departments and Library of Paris—reports of every kind never intended for publication. Two at least of the great historians of the Revolution, Thiers and Mignet, largely founded their histories on the recollections of men who had themselves been actors in the great drama, and who looked on the now distant past through a distorting mirage of self-exculpation. Other historians, as Michelet and Louis Blanc, looked at that past through the mirage of their own political passions. M. Taine has determined, with all the doggedness of his nature, to endeavour to see it with his own eyes, for himself, and unprejudiced. Whether such entire impartiality of vision as he claims is yet possible—whether any Frenchman at least can so far detach himself from a very unsettled present as to write of the Revolution “as if his subject were the revolutions of Florence or Athens,”—this may be doubted. But M. Taine has spared no effort to that end. For twelve years or more he has been at his self-appointed task. For twelve long years he has, as it were, been living in the time of which he has undertaken to write the history. Twelve years of the Reign of Terror; twelve years of hopeless social disorganization and brutal anarchy, of foul crime and greed and lust; twelve years of companionship with men of whom so many had lost every attribute that separates man from the beast; twelve years of this—one can almost fancy that M. Taine must bear visibly upon him the marks of the ordeal through which he has passed, as Dante of old seemed to bear in his look and on his brow the scorching memories of hell.

Nor has M. Taine's long labour brought him to the conclusion of his task. Barely has he reached the end of the Reign of Terror.

The ultimate conclusion at which he will arrive is still shadowy, doubtless even to himself. Not yet can we study as a whole the results of his inquiry into the great upheaval from which France is even now quivering. But though the first four volumes of his book are no more than an instalment, yet they bring us to a most definite point. We are already quite in a position to judge whether M. Taine has been able to throw any new light on his subject, or present it in a manner markedly different from his predecessors. We can appreciate his methods, enter into his spirit, see how far he has succeeded in keeping his promises of impartiality, test the value of his conclusions with regard to the measures that led to the rule of blood, and the men who played their part in that terrible tragedy.

And first it must be premised that the book before us is not at all, in the ordinary sense, a history. We have here no connected and clear narrative such as flows, bright and translucent as a stream, from the Attic pen of Thiers. Neither have we Mignet's artistic grouping of events according to their chronological sequence, or Michelet's passionate evocation of the past, or Carlyle's lightning-flash illuminating a consecutive series of ghastly and terrible pictures. The aims of M. Taine are quite other. His object is not to tell the story of the Revolution. That has been done many times before. With him narrative is quite subservient to argument. He does not produce facts in view of their intrinsic interest or novelty. Facts, for him, are either links in a demonstration, or the proofs of a theorem. They are always, like a well-drilled soldiery, being marshalled and manœuvred in view of the conquest of some logical position, or paraded after the victory in sign of triumph. With a puissant hand he presses them into his service; and the task which he assigns to them is to establish what were the causes of the Revolution, what its aims, avowed and ostensible or real, what the secrets of its success, what the value of its achievements.

The causes of the Revolution? In searching for these M. Taine draws for us a picture of the France of Louis XVI. ere the Revolution broke out. It is a picture that has often been drawn before, and yet scarcely ever fails of its effect, so

striking and varied are the constituent elements, so lurid the light thrown on them by the final flare of that old world as it goes shrivelling into the blackness of night. There is a king, well-meaning indeed and honest, but deplorably incapable and weak. There is a Court, extravagant, gay, giddy, intriguing, totally blind to the peril of the times. There is a Government, despotic in form, yet essentially impotent and devoid of even that poor justification of efficiency which despotism sometimes urges on its own behalf. There is a nobility, cultured, sociable, bent on the enjoyment of the hour, removed by habitual absenteeism from all healthy local duties, and living as a parasite upon the monarchy. There is a clergy, curiously cankered in its higher orders by worldliness and unbelief. There is a middle class, the *Tiers Etat*, that has been slowly growing in wealth and intelligence, and now quivers with indignation at the privileges and pretensions of those whom it no longer consents to call its betters. There is a proletariat bearing on its poor galled and bent shoulders all the burdens of the State; taxed almost beyond the point of starvation; crushed by fiscal rapacity and ineptitude; hopelessly, intolerably miserable. And added to all the elements of disorganization inherent to such a state of society are the doctrines which Rousseau had preached with such eloquence, and the age had drunk in so greedily—the doctrines that all men are naturally good, equitable, kindly; that it is only necessary to wipe out the baneful effects of civilization and return to a state of nature in order to restore men to their first condition of excellence and happiness; that freedom and equality are the inalienable heritage of mankind; that all governments rest upon a social contract, expressed or implied, between the governed and their governors—a contract which the governed are at full liberty to annul whenever they may think it desirable to resume possession of their natural rights.

The point of view of the eighteenth century differed *toto cælo* from the point of view of the latter half of this nineteenth century of ours. To Rousseau and his disciples, man appeared as a kind of abstract creature who could be divorced from his past and his surroundings, and treated as essentially the same under whatever varying conditions,

and always essentially reasonable. If you could convince him that a certain course of action was prudent and right, he would follow it without question. Did not Godwin give a last fantastic touch of folly to this theory by maintaining that there was no criminal, however abandoned, whom you could not reform by argument—by a judicious exposition, as one supposes, of the utilitarian scheme of morals? But to M. Taine, to all of us, this charming simplicity of belief is no longer possible. So has the theory of development entered into our modes of thought, that we can hardly help regarding man as having *become* what he is at any given time or locality. His past, as we all acknowledge, is in a more or less degree responsible for his present. They cannot be altogether dissociated. It were ill for us to dissociate them if we could, considering how much of what is good comes to us by inheritance, and how greatly we are indebted to the efforts of our common ancestors. M. Taine, accordingly, can scarcely express sufficient scorn of the elaborated theory of the abstract natural man and his inalienable rights. When he looks back into history, he sees, not an assemblage of estimable individuals uncontaminated by civilization, striving to make each other happy, and establishing a social contract with those whom they select to be their rulers, but a harried, huddled mass of human creatures, scantily able to subsist from generation to generation in the face of continual rapine and wrong, and only too glad to place themselves at the disposal of any man strong enough to afford them some decent measure of protection. It was not because kings were wickedly ambitious, and nobles greedy, and priests cunning, that they had acquired privileges which, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, had become an abuse. Their privileges were the price of great national services rendered in past times. To the kings France owed its unity; to the nobles, some amount of relative order in times of utter disorganization; to the clergy, the public recognition of a higher law than that of brute force. No doubt the privileged classes had ceased, for one reason and another, to render the old services. Times had changed. Privileges, once in themselves useful, had come to be noxious. The diffusion of education and wealth demanded an extension of the area of

power. But still, speaking broadly, it was the upper classes who alone had any traditions of government, and any large measure of culture. Their spirit, whatever the past deficiencies may have been, was growing to be admirable. "Never," says M. Taine, "had the aristocracy been so worthy of power as at the moment when power was about to slip from their hands." "Never," he says again, "had the aristocracy been more liberal, more humane, more entirely converted to all useful reforms." The notion that anything like a decent Government could be obtained by at once discarding their influence and co-operation, and relying on the emancipated masses, was absurd. The emancipated masses, in so far as they represented the natural unsophisticated man, represented nothing but natural savagery. To think that every institution which had grown up with the nation's growth must be suddenly declared rotten, incapable of all further service, was suicidal. Even the poor treasure of civilization which existed in France on the eve of the Revolution had been amassed slowly, sadly, toilsomely. It was the price of long ages of blood and tears. It was the legacy left by those who in the past had been great and brave and good.

And how gleefully, how like a prodigal just come into his inheritance, with what immeasurable self-confidence and delight did the young generation of 1789 insist on squandering all that its ancestry had hoarded. Scarcely can we realize, in these more prosaic days of disillusion, the thrill of passionate hope that quickened every pulse at the meeting of the States-General and the taking of the Bastille.

"Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,  
But to be young was very heaven,"

so rhapsodized, in after years, even the philosophic Wordsworth, remembering his own youthful enthusiasms, and the scenes of his journey through France when a Cambridge undergraduate.

"Not favoured spots alone, but the whole earth  
The beauty wore of promise,"

so he tells us again. It is the purpose of M. Taine's three last volumes to show how the dawn became overcast and

lurid before it had passed into the morning, and how the beauty of the promise became hideous in the realization.

We take the various books successively. Their very titles are eloquent. First comes a series of chapters on the *Spontaneous Anarchy* which broke out through the breadth and length of France as the old Government became more and more paralysed. Next follows a book on the *Constituent Assembly and its Work*—an Assembly, for the most part, “presumptuous” and “incapable,” which sowed perhaps some good seeds—so M. Taine allows in his clemency—but which, “in everything that relates to political institutions and social organization, operated like an Academy in Utopia, and not like a legislature of practical men,” “following to their last conclusion” the principles of “Rousseau,” “dissolving and disendowing” every existing body or corporation, ruining the rich, placing all power in the hands of a small “minority of fanatics or men of ambition”—creating, in short, a constitution that was “the *chef-d’œuvre* of speculative reason and practical unreason,” and only served to turn the pre-existing “spontaneous anarchy into legalized anarchy.”

Then comes a book on the *Application of the Constitution*, followed by a long and terrible book—it occupies a whole volume—describing the *Jacobin Conquest* of France. After this we have a short book on the *Establishment of the Revolutionary Government*, on the essentially socialistic and despotic *Jacobin programme*, and then one, unsparing in its analysis, and terrible in its invective, on the *Rulers*. Here the portraits of the men who had made themselves masters of France are painted with a brush of terrible and tragic power, sparing no blemish, slurring over no fault, never so arranging the light as to let it fall kindly, extenuatingly on any ugliness of feature or expression. They are portraits that seem painted as if with blood for a vehicle. And a terrible gallery they form. As we turn from one to the other we seem to be in the chamber of horrors of mankind. There, first and foremost, is Marat,

“who is on the border-land of insanity, who exhibits the main characteristics of madness—a wild exaltation, continuous frantic excitement, feverish activity, an incessant incontinence of the pen—the intellect being



rendered automatic and the will immovable by the dominion and pressure of one fixed absorbing thought. Moreover, he has all the ordinary physical symptoms of mental derangement—sleeplessness, leaden dulness of complexion, hot feverishness of the blood, want of cleanliness in habits and person, and, towards the end, during the last five months of his life, sores and itchings over the whole body."

In short, he is suffering from "homicidal monomania."

Next we turn to Danton. "There is nothing of the madman about him." He is perfectly clear-headed, has signal political capacity, is the natural leader of the ruffians whose strong filthy hands pull down the old social edifice. Taine's Danton differs from John Morley's.

"By temperament and character he is a barbarian, and a barbarian born, like some chief of the sixth century, or some baron of the tenth, to exercise dominion over his brother barbarians. His form is colossal. He has a 'Tartar's' head, all seamed with small-pox, terribly, tragically ugly. The face is the face of a bulldog convulsed with anger and growling. The small eyes are sunk beneath the enormous folds of a forehead that moves and menaces. His voice is thunderous. He has the gestures of a prizefighter. He seems as in a perpetual ebullition of hot blood and wrath and energy. His outbursts are volcanic, like the outbursts of some illimitable force of Nature. The tones in which he declaims know neither restraint nor measure. They are as the roarings of a bull, audible through closed windows fifty yards away. The oratorical images of which he makes use are out of all proportion, immense. When sincere he is so with a tremendous emphasis. His quiverings and cries of indignation, of vengeance, of patriotism, would rouse savage instincts in the most peaceful, and waken some generous emotion even in the most degraded. There is in him a cynicism, not monotonous and assumed like that of Hébert, but spontaneous and natural; a coarseness which is really appalling, and worthy of Rabelais, a large amount of jovial sensuality and rough good-nature. In manner he is often cordial and familiar, frank, and full of good-fellowship. Briefly, both from character and appearance he is qualified in the highest degree to obtain the confidence of a Gaulish and Parisian populace—everything conspiring to crown him with an effective enthusiasm of popularity, and make him the '*grand seigneur de la sans-culotterie*,' the great lord of the mob."

We come to Robespierre, the "sea-green incorruptible," the man whose soul was like small beer, as Carlyle has it.

"If you wish to understand him," says M. Taine, "you must look at him in his proper place, in the position which he really occupied.

At the ultimate stage of a moribund intellectual movement, on the final twig of the eighteenth century, he is the last abortive product, the wizened fruit which has not had strength to come to maturity. Of the old exhausted philosophy he has kept only the mouldy and decayed residue, the formulæ got by rote, the formulæ of Rousseau, of Mably, of Raynal, jargon about the *people, nature, reason, tyrants, faction, virtue, morals*—a ready-made vocabulary consisting of vague general terms which had only a very indeterminate sense when used by the masters, and the sense whereof evaporates altogether when used by the disciple."

In the end, what with vanity, adulation, the intoxicating effects of power on a nature essentially acrid and mean, the dominion of one fixed terrible thought—he, too, loses his hold on sanity, and becomes, "physically as well as morally, a second Marat." "Ah, you would have voted as we did," said a member of the Assembly, excusing a vote given on a critical occasion, "if you had seen his green eyes." "His look had all the ferocity of a tiger-cat . . . he never spoke without foaming at the mouth," says another eyewitness.—"A great citizen," so does Michelet, in a moment of enthusiasm, describe Robespierre. We are far indeed from that standpoint with M. Taine.

Neither are we quite at the same standpoint when judging the Representative Assembly which nominally governed France during the Reign of Terror, and gave show of legality to the terrible acts of the terrible Jacobin faction. According to Michelet, "no Assembly ever contained so many living forces, so many men resolved to die for duty." "It was," he says again, "a great Assembly, always bearing fruit even in the midst of its misfortunes and mistakes." Its "beneficence was infinite." It made "an immense effort to realize fraternity." It was, in short, "a majestic Assembly, sovereign among all assemblies, founding, organizing, representing above any other human force the inexhaustible fecundity of Nature." To listen to M. Taine, after listening to these lyrical outbursts, is something like listening to Mephistopheles breaking in on the hymns of the archangels—the tone is so different. According to *him*, this "majestic Assembly" lived from day to day in a state of abject terror, voted habitually at the dictation of the mob in the galleries, abased itself in speech and dress

to the level of the lowest populace, was subjected constantly to degrading and grotesque indignities. Let us take one scene out of several. A drunken band, masquerading in church vestments, had been admitted by the Convention to its morning sitting, and sung various songs to the accompaniment of a brass band, and also danced the *Carmagnole* for the Convention's edification. Thereupon—

"the Convention decrees that it will assist, in the evening, at the Feast of Reason, and, as a matter of fact, it does so assist and proceeds thither in a body. Behind the actress, short-kirtled and red-capped, who represents Liberty or Reason, march the deputies, also in red caps, shouting and singing till they reach the new temple—a temple of planks and pasteboard erected in the choir of Notre Dame. They are accommodated with front seats; and the goddess who, 'with all the pretty demi-reps of the opera,' had formerly been a frequenter of the little suppers of the Duke de Soubise, exhibits before them all her fine opera graces. The 'Hymn of Liberty' is sung; and as the Convention had decreed, on that very same morning, that this hymn should be sung by the members, I am entitled to assume that they sang it. Dancing follows. Unfortunately there is no documentary evidence to show whether the members danced also. At any rate they assisted at the dancing, and gave the sanction of their presence to orgies of a unique kind—not a popular fair like those of Rubens, held publicly and in the open air, and healthy, if coarse, but an irruption of low night revellers in Carnival time, a Shrove Tuesday masquerade of lean, half-epileptic town scoundrels. In the nave, 'the dancers, half undressed, with necks and breasts bare, and arms unsleeved,' execute a dislocated kind of dance, stamp with their feet, and 'howl the Carmagnole.'"

What takes place in the side chapels is even less reputable.

Such were the scenes that attended what Mr. John Morley solemnly describes as "the first appearance of dogmatic atheism in Europe as a political force." And Mr. Morley, who is not without an occasional touch of very unconscious humour, regards that first appearance as making the winter of 1793 "one of the most remarkable moments in the Revolution, just as it makes the Revolution itself the most remarkable moment in modern history."\* This highly remarkable moment was, it must be admitted, strangely heralded and accompanied.

But to return to M. Taine and the Convention. "Never,"

---

\* See Article on Robespierre in Second Series of *Critical Miscellanies*.

he says, "never in the Rome of the Emperors, even under Nero and Heliogabalus, did any senate degrade itself to such depths."

What of the governed when such are the governors? Alas! the poor governed—to whom M. Taine devotes his next book—they are in evil case. From the top to the bottom of the social scale all are ruined. For here comes one of the saddest aspects of the whole thing: not even the poor in whose interests all this misery has ostensibly been inflicted, not even they have profited by it. The landowner has been despoiled; the vast property of the Church confiscated; the capitalist ruined. Every effort has been made, directly by spoliation, and indirectly by fiscal measures, to reduce the wealth of individuals to a certain low maximum. The State, by unlimited issues of worthless paper-money, has repudiated its liabilities. Socialism has been preached and practised. And the masses, so far from deriving any advantage from what the others have lost, are starving. In the absence of all security the farmer either hides such corn as he possesses, or finds it not worth his while to grow more. Of foreign commerce there is none, for the Republic is at war with the rest of Europe, and the English cruisers are masters of the seas. So the food procurable in France itself is quite insufficient, and none comes from abroad. And the result is, as we have said, starvation.

"'At Bordeaux,' reports a Government agent, 'for three months past the people have slept at the doors of the bakers' shops in order to obtain, at a very high price, some very bad bread, and as often as not they can't obtain even that. . . . There has been no baking to-day, and to-morrow half a pound of bread will be doled out to each person. This bread is made of oats and dried beans. . . . On the days when there is none, they distribute beans, chestnuts, or rice, but in very small quantities. . . . Four ounces of bread, five ounces of rice, or of chestnuts.' Elsewhere matters are even worse. 'In the district of Cordillac,' says Tallien, 'there exists at the present moment a condition of absolute want; the citizens in the country places are quarrelling over the grass of the fields. I have myself'—poor epicure—'eaten grass bread.'"

Nor is Paris, the queen city, in better plight. Through "the fourteen months of the Revolutionary Government" there are long lines of hungry wretches waiting, as early as three o'clock

in the morning, and in all weathers, for the chance of purchasing a dole of bread, meat, groceries, or fuel. The scenes that accompany these distributions of the first necessities of life are disgraceful. A free fight generally places those who have come last in as good a position as those who have been waiting for long hours. Thus society seems to be going back to a very elementary condition indeed, though scarcely such as Rousseau had quite contemplated. General pauperism and starvation with a physical struggle for existence—it is hard to realize only this instead of that regenerated world which the Revolution, at its outset, had dreamed about so happily.

And so we come to what is, at present, the last book of M. Taine's work. It is entitled *The End of the Revolutionary Government*, and contains a sketch, for it is scarcely more, of the events that followed the fall of Robespierre, and preceded the establishment of the Consulate under Napoleon. To analyse that sketch here is scarcely necessary. Rather will it be better if, as a conclusion to our general account of the contents of M. Taine's work, we quote from the ingenious apologue in which he speaks of the Revolutionary Government under the image of a crocodile, and after describing the worship of that voracious reptile, summarizes his own purposes as a historian thus :—

“This volume, like those that have preceded it, is written only for those who have a taste for moral zoology, for the naturalists of the mind, for the seekers after truth, the lovers of texts and proofs—for them only, and not for the public. For the public has its settled conviction, its ready-made opinion with regard to the Revolution. That opinion began to take form between the years 1825 and 1830, after the disappearance or death of those who had been eye-witnesses. When these had disappeared, it became possible to persuade the worthy public that the crocodiles were philanthropists, that several of them possessed genius, that those whom they devoured were nearly always guilty, and that if occasionally they ate a little too much, it was quite against the grain and in their own despite, or else from pure self-devotion, from a spirit of self-sacrifice to the common good.”

Now, of course, there are publics and publics, and the British public, whether worthy or otherwise, has not been brought up to the worship of the crocodiles, and is in no great danger of falling a prey to that particular form of superstition. On the contrary, we are rather in danger of not making due

allowance for the crocodile nature and the crocodile temptations. We have some difficulty in sufficiently remembering that the crocodile had been really a good deal tormented and ill-used before he took to gratifying his natural appetites. M. Taine's standpoint, therefore, is not calculated to produce on us such an effect of strangeness as he evidently considers it is calculated to produce on his French readers. In fact—and here, after analysing his book, we begin to criticise it—in fact, his standpoint is mainly the general English standpoint. We would, all of us, accept the conclusion to which his laborious researches have led him, a conclusion emphasized by italics, "*that a human society, especially a modern society, is a something vast and complicated—a something which it is consequently difficult to know and understand, and therefore difficult to handle and work to any good purpose.*" We are, in our bovine way, as a high authority has assured us, sadly impervious to ideas. We have a rooted distrust of the application of pure abstract theory to complex social and political problems. We prefer to tinker and patch, even at times somewhat exasperatingly, rather than run the unknown risks of something brand-new and symmetrical. The conception of a continuity in national life, of "freedom" as

"broadening slowly down

From precedent to precedent,"

and not as conquered by sudden outbreaks and fundamental innovations—all this is almost the commonplace of English thought. M. Taine has arrived at similar conclusions by the application of the doctrine of development to the study of a great social and political revolution. But it is worthy of remark that, so far as politics are concerned, and using the word politics in its fullest sense, we English, in our dull, unconscious, plodding, illogical manner, had anticipated the results of that doctrine, and have built up our national life slowly on the foundations of the past. Thus it happens that M. Taine and general English thought are pretty well at one. His standpoint is nearly the same as that from which the eagle spirit of Burke looked down on contemporary events. Nay, it is not so markedly different from that of Alison. Save that he would extend to the whole revolutionary party what is said

by Macaulay of the Terrorists alone, he would applaud to the echo Macaulay's declaration that there was "nothing great about the Terrorists but their wickedness," and that their policy, so far from being "daringly original," was only "the policy which has always prevailed, and still prevails, in savage and half-savage nations, and is the chief cause which prevents such nations from making advances towards civilization."

Of course the question remains whether or not M. Taine's standpoint is the one from which the Revolution ought to be judged. And the English student is all the more concerned, perhaps, to examine such a question narrowly because his natural bias will probably be so strongly in favour of the affirmative reply.

The problem, briefly stated, is this: Given the political and social institutions which existed in France in 1789, were all essential and desirable reforms possible without such a Revolution of blood and iron as actually took place—could those reforms have been realized by pacific means?

To this problem Mr. John Morley gives unhesitatingly a negative solution. As "a student uncommitted to a theory," he has examined the history of Turgot's dismissal from office, and bases thereon a

"conviction that a pacific renovation of France, an orderly readjustment of her institutions, was hopelessly impossible. . . . Prudence itself was impossible. The Court and the courtiers were smitten through the working of long tradition with judicial blindness. . . . It was one long tale throughout from the first hour of the reign, down to those last hours at the Tuileries in August, 1792; one long tale of intrigue, perversity, and wilful incorrigible infatuation."

Turgot's dismissal took place in 1776, and to us, as students also uncommitted to any theory, it appears, we confess, that what may or may not have been possible if judged by the light of 1776, was quite possible if judged by the light of 1789. The evidence is overwhelming that during the interval a force of reforming enthusiasm had been amassed, not in one class alone, but in every class, sufficient for any purpose—a force so great that even if legitimately employed it must have swept away all wrongful privilege and abuse—a force so terrible that

any wise statemanship should have been directed to restrain it from wasteful ruin.

But that was precisely what the revolutionary party were quite incapable of understanding, even when they meant honestly. Instead of using all their efforts to keep the desire of change in check, they did just the reverse. They encouraged it by every means. They applauded its worst excesses. Carried away, as M. Taine has abundantly shown, by an ignorant belief in the original goodness of man's nature, they did not fear to employ for political ends that brutish element which exists in all civilizations, nay, in each individual man. And thus the country lost an invaluable opportunity and invaluable means of political education. Even liberties, otherwise valuable, proved to be worthless when so gained. Self-restraint, moderation, the faculty of seeing that there may be two sides to a complicated social or political problem, the morality of public life—all these are more valuable than any individual measure, nay, than any series of measures—all these the revolutionary party set on one side in their folly and culpable haste. They had some fair materials ready to their hands, and motive power to an extent practicably illimitable. They could scarcely have used either to worse purpose. And France, alas ! has now, through nearly a century, been paying the price of their miscalculations and evil deeds, till one wonders sadly what will be the end thereof, and when the debt will be liquidated.

Nor did these men always mean honestly—far from it. Mr. Morley tells us of the "intrigues, perversity, and wilful incorrigible infatuation" of the Court and nobility. Were the intrigues, perversity, and wilful infatuation all on one side ? If the Court, as events were ripening to rottenness, developed a reactionary spirit, and possibly assisted reactionary movements, it might at least plead in justification the particularly terrible aspect of public affairs. If it believed that the country was going headlong to ruin, the prophecy was scarcely one to which subsequent history has given the lie. But the revolutionary party ? M. Taine shows pretty conclusively that Danton organized the September massacre of innocent prisoners for the purpose of making all reconciliation



between the old and the new France impossible. Did not Brissot, the Girondist head of the Diplomatic Committee, admit that in opening that terrible series of wars which deluged Europe with blood for more than twenty years, he "had in view the abolition of royalty"? What kind of intrigues shall we call these? What kind of intrigues were they, within the party itself, which successively led the Girondists, Dantonists, and Robespierre himself to the scaffold? What "perversity," what "wilful incorrigible infatuation" was it that led an assemblage of human beings to believe that a millennium was to be obtained by an appeal to mob passion and the free use of the guillotine? Do we wish for a measure of the political morality of the party? Madame Roland was unquestionably one of its noblest representatives. Her character has on it the displeasing marks of an inordinate self-esteem and of envy, just as her memoirs are defaced by confessions, which the example of Rousseau explains only and does not excuse. But with all deductions, she walks across the stage of history to her tragic end, a stately and heroic figure. Yet she enthusiastically praises a certain Grangeneuve who had formed the project of getting himself killed by a friend in such a way as to throw the odium of the murder on the Court.\* And Madame Roland, as we have said, was one of the finest spirits of the better section of the revolutionary party.

That this book, or in fact any book of M. Taine, would be striking and original in its style, may be taken for granted. Some gifts of style he unquestionably does not possess. M. Sarcey, in the volume to which we have already referred, seems to hint a doubt whether naturally he possessed any gift as a writer at all, and whether he has not conquered such qualities of expression as are now his, by dint of sheer doggedness. Be that as it may, there is a whole group of literary qualities which he has either not received from boon nature, or failed to acquire by his own efforts. Grace, gentleness, playful ease, subtlety, tenderness, charm, the faculty of rendering delicate shades of meaning or of feeling, of insinuating a view of a case so as not to rouse opposition—all this is foreign

---

\* See note on Grangeneuve in the *Portraits and Anecdotes* written during her captivity.

to his pen. He himself has told us, in a page of "self-examination," prefatory to his book on Italy, that what has from the first, and above all, produced the strongest impression upon his mind is "heroic or unbridled power." And this we can well believe. For power, though certainly not unbridled power, is the main characteristic of his writing. Vigour is what the French would call its master quality. In many ways he always reminds us of Macaulay. There is the same clearness, the same faculty of grouping facts both for artistic effect and also in proof of any definite proposition, the same fertility of illustration, the same love of concrete definite statement, the same pleasure in hard hitting, the same general violence of tone and want of relief. Both are too fond of leaving a strong unblurred impression on their reader's mind to trouble him much with the thousand doubts and perplexities that gather round a complicated series of events, or with the subtler shades in human character. Both willingly leave out of count the considerations that make for any other view of a case than that which they wish to establish. And perhaps in some respects because he is not too diffident, M. Taine certainly has given us in this, his latest work, passages upon passages, nay, whole chapters and books, that are, in an eminent degree, striking and full of power. The account of social life under the old *régime*, in the earliest volume, is masterly, and masterly in a highly interesting way. There is in the second volume a really poignant description of Minister-of-the-Interior Roland sitting in his apartment, a fortnight after the opening of the Convention, and examining seriatim and methodically—for he was a methodical and somewhat pedantic old gentleman—into the condition of the various departments of France nominally under his care. The picture as thus presented, the terrible features of it being thus synchronized and brought into one view, is simply appalling. But indeed there is vigour of brush everywhere. For complete artistic effect, we desiderate some little relief.

The plan of M. Taine's book, in some respects unfortunate, does not lead him, as he would have been led by the plan of an ordinary chronological history, to give full detailed descriptions of all the important events of the Revolution. Where

he has to narrate, however, he does it well. Of course, this is a matter in which he must needs "come after the king," or rather after several kings, for several men of high genius have treated the same subject before. Even so, however, in such descriptions as that of the taking of the Bastille, or the king's flight from the Tuileries, he holds his own without discredit. It is very instructive, and even amusing, to read what he says on these or similar topics, after reading what has been said by his predecessors. It is interesting to compare their narratives. Take the fall of the Bastille, for instance. Thiers' account is brief and very clear, sufficiently graphic for literary pleasure, but free from exaggeration and false emphasis. Himself of singularly sane and lucid intellect, and with nothing of the seer, he was evidently not prepared to ascribe to the events of the Revolution that "Apocalyptic" character which some have claimed for them. He writes of the taking of the Bastille as he would write about anything else. Mignet enters into somewhat fuller detail, weighs more heavily on the turpitude and evil designs of the Court, but is still well within the tone and manner of ordinary history. With Carlyle we enter at once into a different atmosphere. Here the detail is very much fuller—not that it crowds out the general lines of the composition, Carlyle is far too great an artist for *that*,—but it becomes living, palpitating, frenetic with the frenzy of the time. We seem to be in the midst of the smoke and blood, the clangour of arms, the fury of wild hate and fear, the ghastly state of suspicion, the distracted counsels, the horrible reprisals. Carlyle himself urges on the combatants as it were, and mingles his voice with the common clamour—not taking sides so much as drunk with the wild wine of the fray, glad almost to see the ordinary commonplace institutions of life writhing and melting in the fierce caldron of change. And viewed in this temper, it is nearly inevitable that men and facts should be magnified somewhat, and their features be a little distorted. It is not with impunity that an artist works on the heroic scale. And Michelet, to whom we come next, works on a very heroic scale indeed, and unfortunately with much less of central sanity, and power of presenting consecutive events, than Carlyle, and with a most distracting bias. He,

too, throws his voice into the fray, but shrieks approval and encouragement to the one faction and hurls execration at the other. In his view, the 14th of July, 1789, must "remain for ever one of the eternal high days of the human race, not only as the first day of deliverance, but as superlatively the day of concord." It was the day when "the whole battle of the future" was fought and won. The glory of it belongs to no man alone. It belongs to "the people," who had "devotion," "strength," the "faith" that takes the "impregnable." Did not "the immortal sentiment of justice impart a temper of adamant to the fluttering heart of man?" Did not "Justice" speak to "the lower orders," and "Humanity, and Mercy," and "that still small voice which seems so weak and overthrows towers?" Did not those same lower orders possess a kind of instinctive omniscience, "always knowing things that their leaders did not know?" And, when all was over, and several particularly brutal murders had been committed, did they not acknowledge virtue in the form of a "sentiment," and weep those "big tears" of sensibility which the eighteenth century held so dear? As to the Court and King, of course they meant everything that was bad; and as to De Launay, the governor of the Bastille, it is needless to say that *he* was venal, corrupt of life, and an unutterable scoundrel. How cowardly and cruel to fire on a patriot people who were attacking a fortress committed to his charge.

M. Taine's account of these transactions is scarcely written in quite the same spirit. According to him the movement began with pillage and drunkenness and ended in anarchy and blood. As he presents the facts, the Government were more than justified in all that immediately preceded the outbreak. They were simply doing their duty in resisting a state of mob-anarchy which had already grown to be intolerable; and if they failed it was because the army was unfortunately just as much demoralized by subversive opinions as the rest of the country. The orders given to the troops were only too humane and kindly.

"At the Bastille, from ten in the morning till five in the afternoon, the mob keep firing at walls forty feet high and thirty feet thick, and it is quite by chance that one of their shots hits an *invalid* on one of the

towers. The defenders humour them like children, and try to hurt them as little as possible. At the first summons the governor orders the cannons to be removed from the embrasures; he makes the garrison swear not to fire unless attacked; he invites the first deputation to breakfast; he allows the delegate from the Hôtel de Ville to visit the whole fortress; he suffers several discharges to pass without reply, and lets the first bridge be taken without burning a single cartridge. Finally, when he fires, it is at the last extremity, to defend the second bridge, and after having warned the assailants that they will be fired upon. In short, his longanimity, his patience, are excessive, in conformity with the humanitarianism of the time."

As to the assailants, so far from possessing any omniscient instincts, they are simply imbecile in their methods of attack, just as they are drunk with every evil passion after its success. There is a horror of general ineptitude, misrule, and blood about the whole thing. In conclusion, instead of the sentiment and tears at which Michelet wipes his sympathetic eyes, we have the ghastly jest of Dr. Launay's head made to do obeisance three times by the howling populace before the statue of Henry IV. on the *Pont Neuf*.

Now, in our quality of impartial critics, we may be prepared to admit that M. Taine's view of the taking of the Bastille, its circumstances and results, is more just than the view of Michelet. Nay, we may go much further, and be ready to concede, as in fact we have conceded, that his view of the Revolution as a whole, is, in its main lines, correct. We have no wish to dispute that Rousseau's doctrines exercised a most pernicious effect, though possibly not so much effect as M. Taine, himself a thinker and not a man of action, has attributed to them. We grant that the rage of wholesale demolition which inaugurated the movement was disastrous, as also the vain dream that humanity could altogether get rid of its past, and govern itself by abstract reason alone. We allow the utter childishness of the conception that man was naturally an altogether virtuous being who could safely be trusted to love the right and do justice when once delivered from the corrupting influences of kings and priests. We concur heartily in the opinion that it was in the last degree unstatesmanlike, even when done honestly, to employ mob-passion and mob-lawlessness as a means of government, and that the inevitable

results of such a policy were to place power in the foul hands of the most brutal and ignorant. In short, with the experience of the Revolution full in our view, we are willing to accept what the Revolution teaches. But the generation which M. Taine judges so severely had not perforce the advantage of that experience. Should they be judged as if they had?

And this points to what we would say finally, by way of objection—for the critic is a born objector—to a book in which we yet find much to admire. Shall we confess that in reading it we were not unfrequently reminded of a description in Michelet's prose-poem on the Sea? It is a description of the great storm of October, 1859, and of the effect upon himself of the incessant tumult of waves and wind. He tells how he was pent up, for five days and five nights, in a small house on a low shore, within a few yards of the tempest-tortured Atlantic; how during that time the storm raged without rise or fall, sea and sky and earth being filled with one monotonous unvarying roar; and how, striving to maintain his writer's work in the storm's despite, he experienced first a failure in his sense of verbal harmony, and then, his nerves being unstrung and his imagination over-excited by noise and want of sleep, how as he looked out on the sea the waves "produced on him the effect of a frightful *mob*, a horrible populace, not of men, but of barking dogs,—a million, a million million of mastiffs in wild chase, desperate, mad; and yet no, they could not be called dogs, mastiffs, not that. They were execrable nameless phantoms, creatures with neither eyes nor ears, but only blind foaming mouths."

Is it fanciful to think that a somewhat similar effect has been produced on M. Taine's spirit by living so long with the din of the revolutionary tempest in his ears, and its terrible vision in his eyes? When he wrote his first volume he saw, no doubt, that the philosophy of the eighteenth century rang hollow and false, and that the ways of the coming change were treacherous and evil; but he still saw clearly how much there was in the old world that called for reformation, how much there was that might seem to justify the reformers in their own eyes. But as he has stood longer and longer

watching the rise of the revolutionary storm, has felt its fury increase, has noted hour by hour, and day by day, its horrible wreckage, this larger vision and equity of spirit seems in a great measure to have deserted him. In despairing horror he has noted how those who had sown the wind went on sowing it even after they had begun to reap the whirlwind. In growing wrath and disgust he has felt, as it were, upon his cheek, the breath of their crimes and impurity. Could contempt be too strong for such madness, indignation too scathing for such turpitude? Why try to find excuses for the inexcusable? Brand it and let it go. Such seems to be the temper of mind which his twelve years' study of the Revolution has produced on M. Taine.

But, as we have already suggested, this is not quite the final temper in which the Revolution should be judged. Even the inexcusable may fairly put in a claim to equitable explanation. No doubt looking back at the past with the added knowledge for which we are indebted to the past itself, we can see plainly enough that the cause of democracy was already in 1789 so strong that its ultimate triumph could only be a question of time. The past of privilege was doomed to death anyhow. Neither king nor aristocracy, by any course of treatment, could do more than retard its end. No intrigues on their part, if so be that there were intrigues, could ultimately avail anything. It should have been the duty, therefore, of wise statesmanship to smooth the path from the old to the new—foreseeing that the real dangers ahead came from the new and not the old. The popular party should have possessed their souls in patience.

Yes, we can see all this clearly enough. But could the generation of 1789 be expected to see it? Nurtured under a Government possessing all the outward seeming of a powerful despotism, knowing that the whole civilized world, with the exception of the United States and the half exception of England and Scotland, was governed despotically also, were they so much to blame if they did not at once perceive that despotism was moribund? Could they be expected to see that a change to liberal institutions was possible without a fundamental revolution? Such clearness of vision was

scarcely possible save to the very fit and few who see not as the crowd sees. And when the noblesse, goaded, as we admit freely, by terrible wrongs, and the foreign Powers, as we admit also, not without provocation, began to gather in arms upon the frontier, what wonder if the revolutionists thought that to the success of their own cause was linked the future of humanity? M. Taine dwells much, and rightly, on the dishonest self-seeking among the revolutionists. But looked at from the point of view of their own time, the case is not such that we are perforce compelled to deny the possibility of honest enthusiasms. Nor, indeed, is it possible to doubt that such enthusiasms existed in abundance.

It is because M. Taine has neglected to bring out this aspect of the question, that we fear his book will not finally take rank as more than an admirable partisan essay. One side of the Revolution he brings out with superb power. And it is a true side. The work which he has done so effectually needed doing. It was right, especially in France, that there should be this counterblast to such histories as that of Michelet. But though the side here brought out be true, nay more, though it be the most important, still it is not the only side. M. Taine has hitherto prided himself as a critic and historian, on showing how each man or generation of men was the product of circumstances, surroundings, and antecedents. There are clearly antecedents, circumstances, and surroundings here of which he has taken too small account.

A "partisan essay," does that seem a hard saying? Let us at once add that it is an essay of which no one who henceforth treats the subject of the Revolution at all seriously will be able to disregard the conclusions.

And now one final word. Many years ago, before he had entered on his laborious Revolution studies, M. Taine wrote an article on Carlyle. In the course of that article he had occasion to speak of Carlyle's *Revolution*, and deeming that Carlyle had unduly depreciated the great political rebellion in France as compared with the great Puritan rebellion in England, he expressed himself as follows:—

"Generosity and enthusiasm abounded with us as they abounded with you. Acknowledge them in a shape which is not yours. Our revolu-



tionists devoted themselves to abstract truth in the same way that your Puritans devoted themselves to divine truth. They followed philosophy as your Puritans followed religion. They had for aim and object the salvation of all, as your Puritans had for aim and object personal salvation. They combated evil in society as your Puritans combated evil in the soul. They were generous as your Puritans were virtuous. They, too, had a heroism, but sympathetic, sociable, ready for the making of disciples—a heroism that reformed Europe, while your heroism was of benefit to yourselves alone."

Would M. Taine express himself in this way now? Scarcely, we imagine. "Generosity," "enthusiasm," "heroism," "devotion to abstract truth," and abstract truth effective to "combat evil" and "reform Europe"—these be strangely at variance with his later utterances. But it is from no puerile or mischievous wish to make merriment over an inconsistency that we quote the words. Rather is it to emphasize what has struck us as a truth while reading M. Taine's book—viz., that in the terrible uncertainties of political life, and amid all its temptations to do harm for the sake of ultimate good—which was the temptation to which the revolutionists yielded—the one guide that will not betray us is personal rectitude. In its absence neither "generosity," "enthusiasm," "heroism," nor "devotion to abstract truth," will avail anything. Probably M. Taine may be more disposed to acknowledge now than formerly that the combating of evil in the individual soul is not, after all, such an unnecessary element in the reformation of the world.

---

## ART. III.—ANNE BOLEYN.

1. *The Reign of Henry VIII., from his Accession to the Death of Wolsey.* Revised and Illustrated from Original Documents by the late J. S. BREWER, M.A. Edited by JAMES GAIRDNER. Two Vols. London: Murray. 1884.
2. *Anne Boleyn: a Chapter of English History, 1527-1536.* By PAUL FRIEDMANN. Two Vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1884.

THE history of the reign of Henry VIII. has yet to be written. No period has suffered more from the blind bigotry of theological partisanship and the shameful confusion in which our national archives were until recent years allowed to remain. Much might have been accomplished by Mr. Froude, had not a passion for sensational effects, reinforced perhaps by the influence of Carlyle, led him to mistake mere violence for strength and to prostitute his really great abilities to the ignoble task of making the worse cause appear the better. The work accomplished by the late Mr. J. S. Brewer is not a history of the period with which it deals, but a review of so much thereof as is reflected in the State Papers which he was employed in arranging and abstracting, and as it was published in the shape of prefaces to the bulky volumes issued from time to time under the title of *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII.*, in which the abstracts of the original documents were contained, it remained almost a sealed book to the general public. Its republication in a more convenient form, under the editorship of his colleague, Mr. Gairdner, has therefore given it for the first time a chance of being read by all who are interested in the history of England. The merits of the book are of a kind to be more readily recognized than its defects. Possessed of an unrivalled knowledge of the diplomatic history of the period of Wolsey's administration and real genius for making dry bones live, Brewer produced a work which has all the fascination of a romance. His studies of the king as he may

have appeared at various stages of his career ; of Anne Boleyn as she may have been when she first came to Court ; above all, his elaborate portrait of Wolsey, his narrative of Henry's abortive expedition to France in 1513, of the Emperor's Italian campaigns, particularly the vivid picture of the sack of Rome in 1527, his masterly exposition of the precise meaning and effect of each move and counter-move in the game of diplomacy and intrigue which throughout his administration Wolsey played so adroitly with France, the Empire, and the Pope—elements such as these, and much besides that space fails us to indicate even in outline—combine with a mass of curious incident, rich in picturesque detail illustrative of the pomp and pageantry of that gorgeous age, to form a whole of the most various and enthralling interest. If the brilliance of Henry and his great Minister somewhat dazzled Brewer, rendering his critical insight the less keen to detect the errors of their policy, it is hardly to be wondered at, though none the less to be deplored, and such we believe to have been the case. During the first few years of Henry's reign it might have seemed to a superficial observer that the spirit of chivalry had revived. The portrait of Henry, as painted by contemporary writers, foreign as well as native, seems to realize the ideal of a perfect knight—strong, handsome, dexterous in all physical exercises, accomplished in music and the *belles-lettres*, nor without a tincture of graver learning, frank, generous to profuseness, and genial in manner even to familiarity, yet every inch a king. Under his auspices the Court gave itself up to jousting, feasting, masquing, dancing, lovemaking, or playing at lovemaking, in unparalleled magnificence of costume, with the eager zest of lusty health and minds that had long fretted at the sombre gloom of the preceding reign. The dream, too, of recovering the lost French provinces, so long entertained by Henry, was as much in harmony with the ideas of chivalry as it was foreign to the sober policy of his astute father, and the war by which he designed to realize it (1513) was conducted on the part of the English in a fashion which savoured rather of the tiltyard than of the scientific principles of the new strategy which the French had learned from Gonsalvo in Italy. But though

little of a general Henry was still less of a paladin, and, discovering that he got nothing but glory by fighting, he became heartily sick of the war and was easily persuaded by Wolsey that his policy lay in waiting until some signal advantage gained by the Emperor over France should enable him to intervene with effect. This policy, which was hardly heroic, is much extolled by Brewer, on the ground that it made Henry the arbiter of Europe. Doubtless it made him an object of much solicitude both to France and to the Empire, but its practical results were hardly of a kind to justify Brewer's language.

The battle of Pavia, in 1525, gave Wolsey the opportunity which he awaited. Defeated and taken prisoner by the Emperor, Francis was released only on the terms of leaving his children as hostages in Charles' hands. Then was it, if ever, that Henry held the balance of power. Francis sought his alliance, and Henry, by Wolsey's advice, sold it to him (1527), and with it the hand of the Princess Mary, then a girl under fourteen, for an annual tribute of salt, an annual pension of 50,000 crowns, and 2,000,000 crowns payable by the king at his convenience. The alliance seems to have been a mere temporary shift to raise money, which, owing to the stubborn attitude of Parliament, had become Henry's most pressing need, and as such must rather have lowered than exalted England in the scale of nations; but it was certainly both the most brilliant achievement and the most solid result which can be credited to the foreign policy of Wolsey, that "grand policy" by which, according to Brewer, "Henry had been transformed from a third-rate and precarious monarch into the head of a grand nation and the arbiter of Christendom."

We see no grandeur, but much hard and even sordid common-sense, in Wolsey's foreign policy. He was simply bent on preserving the neutrality of England as long as possible, and meanwhile realizing whatever pecuniary advantages were to be extorted from the necessities of either party during the various vicissitudes of the war. His policy, in short, was to be bought off as often as possible by either side, and as, if the king were free to marry, his hand might be expected to fetch

a high price in the continental marriage market, Brewer's theory that Wolsey was originally opposed to the project of divorcing Catherine seems as improbable as the older view which made him the author of it. On this question we entirely agree with Mr. Friedmann, who takes up the history in 1527, when the idea of the divorce first came to be seriously entertained.

"In the spring of 1527 Henry consulted some of his most trusted councillors about the legality of his marriage with his late brother's widow. Fully understanding in what direction the royal wishes lay, they immediately showed great scruples. Wolsey himself seems to have been eager to please the king; he was perhaps not aware that Henry had some other motive than a simple dislike of Catherine and the desire for a son and heir. That Lord Rochford, Anne's father, was in favour of the divorce, awakened no suspicion, for he was a French pensioner, decidedly hostile to the Emperor. The notion that Anne might profit by the intrigue, or even that she had anything to do with it, would have seemed preposterous. Wolsey thought that Anne had become Henry's mistress, and as he knew from long experience that in such cases the king was tired of his conquest in a few months, he confidently expected that long before the divorce could be obtained Anne would be cast off. In that case he hoped to make a good bargain by selling the hand of his master to the highest bidder."

How, when he discovered the true state of the case, he was reluctant to proceed further in the matter, but compelled to do so by the king, with whom Anne had become omnipotent; how nevertheless the king distrusted him, and sent a special embassy to Rome without his knowledge, which entirely failed; how the exclusive conduct of the negotiations then reverted to Wolsey; and how, on his failing to obtain the necessary powers from Clement, he was discarded, degraded, and despoiled, may be read in the pages of either author; but it is from the latter that we learn for the first time that after his retirement to York he kept up a secret correspondence with the Imperial, French, and Papal ambassadors, with the view of throwing obstacles in Henry's way, and that it was a bold attempt to regain his influence over the king that led to his arrest and death. Here Mr. Friedmann's researches in the Vienna archives stand him in good stead.

Mr. Friedmann's book, as the author is careful to explain

in his preface, does not profess to be a life of Anne Boleyn, but "a sketch of some events in the reign of Henry VIII., with which the name of Anne Boleyn is intimately connected ;" not a history of the divorce, but merely an attempt to clear the ground for the fuller treatment of the subject. Credit, however, must be given him for having wrought a large mass of hitherto unused material into intelligible shape, clearly indicating at the same time the bearing of the new data upon the various questions relating to the policy of Henry VIII., which still remain *sub judice*. His style, which is clear, terse, and scholarly, though somewhat stiff, gives few indications of his foreign nationality. The work opens with a slight but firmly outlined sketch of the political and economical condition of England in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, and of the character of Henry VIII. England, we are told, was then a third-rate power, with an insignificant trade largely in the hands of foreigners, and next to no effective military and naval strength ; and Henry's attempts to raise the country in the scale of nations were only very partially successful. The abilities of Henry, Mr. Friedmann does not rate high. He credits him with a certain natural shrewdness, rendered almost nugatory by his inordinate vanity, which made him the dupe of all who chose to flatter him, and a certain breadth of mind, which, however, never developed into statesmanship owing to the want of systematic training in "the methods of administration, finance, politics and war." His ignorance of these matters was but ill compensated by a superficial acquaintance with the liberal sciences, theology, and the *belles-lettres*. In an age when deceit was regarded as one of the legitimate engines of statecraft, he had not, according to Mr. Friedmann, the discrimination to use it only against his foes, but played the hypocrite to his friends and his Ministers ; "a liar to his own conscience," he could not even indulge his sensual passions without trying to cheat himself into the belief that he was doing right. In short, Henry's picture, as painted by Mr. Friedmann, may well hang as a pendant to Mr. Froude's absurdly flattering portrait. We find it as difficult to believe in the fidelity of the one as of the other. Judged by his policy, Henry does not seem to us to have been

either a very strong or a very weak man, but a decidedly mixed character, as the majority of men are. However tortuous his methods may have sometimes been, the ends he sought to achieve were extremely simple. He wanted a revenue independent of Parliament, and he saw in the Reformation the means of obtaining it; he also wanted a son to succeed him; he was tired of his wife, and for a time really in love with Anne. This view of his motives seems to us adequate to account for the attitude which he assumed towards the Church, without crediting him with extraordinary folly, wisdom, or innate wickedness. The ends themselves are neither exalted nor base: they are eminently natural and human, and however open to censure many of Henry's acts may have been, they were usually remarkably well adapted to further his designs. As regards the charge of hypocrisy, we are not acquainted with the evidence by which it can be substantiated. That he was capable of self-deception may be admitted; in that respect Henry was very like the bulk of mankind, who can seldom detach themselves sufficiently from their interests to take a really fair view of their own case; but that "bluff Harry" was a hypocrite and a casuist, with whom cant took the place of conscience, and that is what Mr. Friedmann's charge amounts to, will hardly be accepted by Englishmen as an article of their historical faith on Mr. Friedmann's authority. In the matter of the divorce at least, Henry cannot fairly be taxed with casuistry, as he could not be expected to adopt the Lutheran construction of the disputed text in Leviticus, and the authenticity of the Papal brief of dispensation of December 26, 1503, was certainly doubtful.

We have dwelt thus upon the question of Henry's character because the estimate formed of it by Mr. Friedmann has evidently coloured all his work. The vanity of the king led, he says, to his being systematically deceived by his own agents, who sought rather to flatter him than to tell him the truth. "Whole series of negotiations came to nought because Henry never understood the real state of the case." This is categorical, but it rests simply on Mr. Friedmann's *ipse dixit*, against which must be set the hardly less decided statement of Brewer, who assigns, as a principal cause of the zeal and

devotion which Henry inspired, the fact that "in his general impartiality, in the coolness and strength of his judgment, except where his passions were concerned, whenever his Ministers tendered advice they were sure of receiving that most grateful of all recognitions to those who volunteer advice—a full, patient, and unbiassed attention." Mr. Friedmann proceeds not merely to accuse Henry of issuing "garbled accounts of events" in official documents of a public character—in that he was in no way singular—but positively to charge him with not infrequently playing a game of hide-and-seek with his own confidential agents. The last statement is almost incredible, and should not have been made without specific reference to the evidence upon which it is based. In lieu of such evidence we are apparently expected to be content with Mr. Friedmann's general assurance. "Even Henry's secret despatches," he says, "were frequently so misleading that his agents abroad found it most difficult to obey his orders."

Hence Mr. Friedmann attaches extremely little importance to the English State Papers of the period. At the same time the correspondence of the French ambassadors at the English Court has for the most part perished or disappeared, and as the Papal archives were not opened to the public in time to allow of Mr. Friedmann's consulting them, he was driven to rely chiefly upon the reports of the Imperial ambassadors. Of these the most important is the correspondence of Eustache Chapuis, a Frenchman in the Imperial service, who was accredited ambassador at the English Court on September 24, 1529, where he continued until 1539. Abstracts of many of Chapuis' despatches have appeared in the Calendars of Mr. Gairdner and of Don Pascual de Gayangos. Mr. Gairdner's last volume, however, does not bring us down beyond the spring of 1535, while Don Pascual de Gayangos has not carried his Calendar beyond 1533. Hence, for the last two years of the history, the extracts given by Mr. Friedmann from Chapuis' despatches are absolutely new to the public. In all cases, however, he assures us that he has gone behind the Calendars, and sometimes even behind the decipher, when the document in question was originally



written in cipher, and he animadverta with some severity on the inaccurate and confused manner in which, as he alleges, M. de Gayangos has done his work. As, however, Mr. Friedmann's work is avowedly based mainly on the Chapuis correspondence, its value will clearly depend not so much on the qualities of the historian as on the degree of credit which is to be given to Chapuis' statements. It is, to say the least, somewhat startling to learn that the most trustworthy authority for a narrative of events in England between 1529 and 1536, is the correspondence of the ambassador of a foreign and hostile prince. Mr. Friedmann urges that "the agents of Charles V., knowing that to flatter their master by deceiving him as to current negotiations would not serve their interests, spoke the truth, or what they believed to be the truth." This may readily be granted. But the question remains, how can we be sure that they knew the truth? Mendacity among diplomatists and statesmen being the order of the day, it seems highly questionable whether the Spanish ambassadors at the English Court, with the best intentions in the world, would succeed in conveying to their master anything like an accurate account of most events that were not matters of common notoriety. Their evidence may be of the highest value in corroborating other accounts, but we fail to see how their sole authority can ever be safely relied upon, except so far as they report what they actually saw or the substance of conversations had with themselves. Not only, however, does Mr. Friedmann accept the unsupported authority of Chapuis for matters of fact, but sometimes he positively converts into a statement of fact what Chapuis gives as a mere *on dit*. Thus we read in the text that, in 1530, "the Duke of Suffolk had been so enraged by the slight put upon his wife at the banquet given by the king on the 9th of December, 1529, Anne occupying Catherine's place, and by subsequent acts of insolence of Anne and her brother, that he dared to tell the king that the woman he destined for the throne had been the mistress of one of his gentlemen." In Chapuis' despatch, quoted in the footnote, the words are—"Sire il y a longtemps que le duc de Suffocq ne s'est trouve en cort et *dit lon* quil en est banni pour quelque temps a cause quil revela," &c. If what Chapuis

reported as hearsay is to be repeated at all, we think it should be repeated as hearsay. Again, the statement that the Duchess of Norfolk told Anne that her pedigree was a fabrication, rests upon one of Chapuis' *lon ma dicts*. So private conversations between Anne and the king, resting solely upon the authority of Chapuis, and therefore the veriest gossip, are gravely stated as matters of fact by Mr. Friedmann, as though the ambassador had been present at the interviews (vol. i. pp. 132-4).

It is only where Chapuis' statements are confirmed by independent authority that, in our opinion, they are admissible as evidence. The question of the date of Anne Boleyn's marriage is a case in point. Opinion was divided on the matter in the sixteenth century, Holinshed referring the ceremony to "the 14th day of November, and the Feast of Saint Erkenwald," 1532; Stow dating it on "the 25th day of January, being the Feast of St. Paul's," in the following year. A letter from Cranmer to Hawkyns, dated June 17, 1533 (calendared by Mr. Gairdner), gives about St. Paul's Day last as the date, at the same time contradicting the report of Cranmer's having been present on the occasion, and averring that he knew nothing of it for a fortnight afterwards. A despatch of Chapuis, under date May 10, assigns the day of the Conversion of St. Paul, January 25, as the reputed date, thus confirming Stow's statement. We agree with Mr. Friedmann that this must be taken as settling the matter, for the mere fact that St. Paul's conversion was also commemorated on the Feast of St. Erkenwald seems to us to weigh very light against the explicit statements of both Cranmer and Chapuis, while the adoption of the earlier date may very easily be explained by the natural desire to avoid admitting the existence of a stain on Elizabeth's birth. The estrangement between Henry and Catherine, Mr. Friedmann dates from 1513, the year when Wolsey first obtained the royal confidence. As early as 1524 there had been rumours that he intended to divorce her, but it was not until some years after the first appearance of Anne Boleyn at Court, that Henry began to think seriously of the matter—i.e., about 1527.

Anne Boleyn herself is clearly no favourite with Mr. Friedmann.

"For some time," he says (i.e., in 1526), "Anne kept her royal adorer at an even greater distance than the rest of her admirers. She had good reason to do so, for the position which Henry offered her had nothing very tempting to an ambitious and clever girl. Unlike his contemporary, Francis I., unlike some of his successors on the English throne, Henry VIII. behaved rather shabbily to those of his fair subjects whom he honoured with his caprice. The mother of his son, Henry Fitzroy, had been married to a simple knight, and had received little money and few jewels or estates. Mary Boleyn had not even fared so well; her husband remained plain Mr. Carey, and the grants bestowed on her were small. Nor had these or the other ladies who had become royal mistresses ever held a brilliant position at Court. Their names are scarcely mentioned in contemporary records, and they would all have been utterly forgotten had not a few of them been otherwise remarkable. Under these circumstances, it cannot be considered an act of great virtue that Anne showed no eagerness to become the king's mistress. She certainly was at first rather reticent, for we know from one of Henry's letters that she kept him in suspense for more than a year. She was pleased to have the king among her admirers, but she wished for something better than the position of Elizabeth Blount or her sister Mary.

"Still, if a more brilliant prospect had not opened before Anne, it is highly probable that after having secured what seemed to her a fair equivalent, she would have put aside her scruples. For whatever her good qualities may have been, modesty did not hold a prominent place among them. Sir Henry Percy was not the only man with whom she had an intrigue. Thomas Wyatt, her cousin, though already married, was her ardent admirer. She gave him a golden locket, and, if we may believe their contemporaries, he received from her very different treatment from that which she now accorded to Henry."

The contemporaries in question are those from whom Chapuis heard the story about the Duke of Suffolk, already mentioned.

Cranmer is represented by Mr. Friedmann, on the authority of some ambiguous words of Charles' foreign secretary, Granvelle, written in 1535, as a consummate hypocrite and schemer, deliberately feigning antagonism to the divorce during the brief term of his embassy at the Imperial Court in 1532, in order to throw dust in the eyes of Charles and his Ministers. Granvelle, however, does not say that Cranmer then professed to think Henry's case bad in point of law, but only that "*il blasmoit mirablement ce que le Roy d'Angleterre son maistre et ses autres ministres faisoient en l'affaire du divorce*

encontre les dictes Royné et Princesse," which may merely mean that he expressed disapproval of Henry's behaviour towards the two ladies. Catherine had shortly before (July 1531) been banished from Court, and separated from Mary, and this cruel treatment it is not improbable that Cranmer "blasmoit mirablement," and with perfect sincerity; nor do we see any reason for doubting that he really believed the marriage to be invalid. However this may be, he, in May 1533, having been created Archbishop of Canterbury for the express purpose, so declared it the same year. Mr. Friedmann acquits him of having officiated at the secret marriage of the 25th of January, 1533. The manner in which the coronation was viewed by the populace is clearly indicated in the following passage: \*—

"Anne's triumphal progress was not without its little annoyances. The merchants of the Steelyard had not been able to obtain the same favours as the Spaniards, and had been obliged by the Lord Mayor to erect a pageant at Gracechurch, near their home. They chose to represent Mount Parnassus, on which sat Apollo with the Muses. The fountain of Helicon ran with Rhenish wine, to the great delight of those who were permitted to drink of it. When Anne arrived before this pageant and halted in front, the Muses addressed her, singing verses in her praise. But just opposite to her was that part of the pageant by which the German traders avenged themselves for having been forced to raise the structure. Parnassus was appropriately adorned with coats-of-arms, and above all others, in the most honourable place, was a great Imperial eagle, bearing on its breast the emblems of Castille and Arragon, the arms of Anne's hated rival. Lower down came those of Henry, and lowest of all the coat which the heralds had made out for the Boleyna. Anne was well versed in heraldry, and detected at once the insult offered to her. For the moment she had to submit, for there was no doubt that the Emperor was of higher rank than the great-granddaughter of good Alderman Bullen. But we learn from Chapuis that she deeply resented the slight, and that on the following day she tried to induce the king to punish the obnoxious merchants.

"The English, less secure in their position than the mighty traders of the Steelyard, were more cautious in their marks of disloyalty. Still they, too, contrived to do some unpleasant things. The merchants of the Staple had erected a pageant at Leadenhall, and on it sat St. Anne and Mary Cleophas with four children, of whom one stepped forward to com-

---

\* Vol. i. pp. 206-8.

pliment Anne. The child delivered a long oration, saying that from St. Anne had sprung a fruitful tree, and expressing a hope that the like would be true of this Anne also. As the mother of the Virgin never had any children but that one daughter, and as Anne desired above all things to have a son, this was not a very kind thing to say, and it can scarcely have helped to smooth her ruffled temper."

And a month later, on the removal of Catherine to Bugden, we read—

"that great numbers of people flocked together to see her pass. Notwithstanding her escort, they loudly cheered her, calling out that she was still their queen, and that they would always hold her to be so. And her popularity was shared by her daughter, who, according to Anne, was treated in the villages through which she passed as if she were God himself, who had descended from heaven."\*

The history of the fruitless negotiation carried on through Francis I., in February and March, 1534, to obtain a Papal recognition of the new marriage in exchange for a match between Clement's nephew, Alexander dei Medici and the Princess Mary, and of Henry's ill-judged and half-hearted intervention in the quarrel between Lübeck and Denmark, in the wild hope of obtaining a commanding position in Germany (1533-4), is told by Mr. Friedmann with as much brevity as is perhaps compatible with clearness, but this portion of the book is necessarily of less interest than either that which precedes or that which follows.

Pope Clement appears, in Mr. Friedmann's pages, as by no means the weak, vacillating person he is represented as having been by Mr. Froude; but, on the contrary, as a far-sighted statesman and a perfect master of diplomatic fence, very much more than a match for the Cardinal du Bellay, who represented Henry's interests at Rome in 1534. His policy was to play off the Emperor against Henry as long as possible, and to avoid committing himself absolutely in favour of either party, in the hope that some happy turn of events might enable him to "re-establish much of his lost authority." Hence—

"he lied and shuffled a good deal; he did not stand up boldly for that which he thought to be right. But he was influenced much more by

regard for the welfare of the Church of which he was the head than by fear for his personal safety, or by apprehension of another sack of Rome. And in one respect he was successful. Though the north of Germany was lost to Rome, though England was alienated, Clement contrived to retain the allegiance both of the Emperor and of the King of France. By sacrificing a part of the dominion of the Church he saved the rest and consolidated its power."

How near England came to a foreign invasion in 1534 has not hitherto been fully understood. After the coronation of Anne, disaffection grew so rife, particularly in the north, where Catholicism was strongest and the bonds of feudalism tightened by the proximity of the Scots, but also in the midlands and western counties and throughout the country, that a regular conspiracy was formed for introducing the Imperial forces. Here the despatches of Chapuis are of the highest value, as the overtures of the malcontents were, in the first instance, made to him, and by him reported in detail to the Emperor. The conspirators, of whom Lords Darcy and Hussey were the most active, proposed that Charles should send a fleet to the mouth of the Thames and land a small force in the north. The northern counties would then rise, and with the help of James V. of Scotland, who was to be rewarded with the hand of the Princess Mary, the king would be deposed, and England and Scotland united under James and Mary, beneath the Imperial suzerainty. The Emperor, however, had the Turk on his hands, and knew that an invasion of England would involve him in immediate hostilities with France; he therefore instructed Chapuis to keep the English lords in play without committing himself to anything definite, and the conspiracy continued to smoulder until 1536, when it broke out into the sudden flame of insurrection known as the "Pilgrimage of Grace," and was promptly extinguished, Darcy, Hussey, and others being taken and executed. That the Council were entirely ignorant of the existence of the plot is extremely improbable, for Cromwell's spies were everywhere, and their reports may have hastened the passing of the celebrated Act of Supremacy (November, 1534), and the supplementary measure for enforcing obedience to it, by which it was immediately followed. Disaffection, however, continued to spread, and Chapuis was busily employed in negotiating with the

conspirators during the spring of 1535; then followed the execution of the recusant Carthusians and of Fisher and More. To these high-handed acts Clement's successor, Paul III., was anxious to reply by passing sentence of deprivation against Henry. The Emperor, however, who was then engaged in the conquest of Tunis, was not ready to execute the sentence, and it was postponed *sine die*.

The story of Henry's intrigues in North Germany shows how ambitious, how adventurous, and yet how vacillating his foreign policy could be. In August, 1533, three merchantmen, flying the Spanish flag, were seized at the Nore by a squadron of line-of-battle ships from Lübeck, under the command of one Marcus Meyer. On the 18th Meyer landed at Rye, was there arrested on a charge of piracy, and sent to London. There he had an interview with Henry, and suggested to him the idea of an offensive and defensive alliance with Lübeck, to be strengthened by the accession of Denmark, on the throne of which—then vacant by the death of King Frederic I.—an ally of Lübeck was to be placed. Henry was fascinated by the scheme, and sent Meyer back to Lübeck to put matters in train. Negotiations went forward during the winter, Wullenwever, the leader of the Lübeck democracy, asking for a subsidy to enable the town to make war on Denmark. Henry, however, began to draw back, and required a regular embassy to be sent him (March, 1534). In the following month the Lübeckers invaded Holstein, and despatched their embassy to England. At first the republic was successful in the field, but Henry did not furnish any active support, and as the year advanced they steadily lost ground, and in the spring of 1535 were driven out of Denmark and Jutland. Henry now conceived the idea of mediating between the belligerents, an intention abandoned almost as soon as formed in favour of an expedition to relieve Meyer, who still held out in the Castle of Warberg. Two ships were actually got ready for this purpose, but did not sail for fear of the Danish fleet (September, 1535). Thus Henry's magnificent scheme of a northern confederacy came to less than nothing.

Meanwhile the Emperor had driven the Turk out of Tunis. The news arrived in England about September 1. One of

Chapuis' servants, who was present at the Council when the despatches were read, reporting that the king and Cromwell looked as thunderstruck "as dogs tumbling out of window." Francis at once abandoned the idea he had entertained of invading the Imperial possessions in Italy, demanded a large subsidy from England in the event of his making war upon the Emperor, and proposed an alliance between the Dauphin and the Princess Mary. These terms being brusquely rejected, Francis signified to Paul III. his willingness to join with the Emperor in executing the Papal sentence of deprivation. Charles, however, entertained so profound a distrust of Francis that he hung back until the death of Catherine (January 8, 1536) deprived the project of all interest for him.

Mr. Friedmann expresses a very decided opinion that Catherine was murdered by order of the king, and with the privity and concurrence of Anne and of the Council; but the evidence which he adduces, if evidence it can be called, seems to us of the most unsubstantial description, consisting as it does entirely of certain statements of Chapuis, and one or two suspicious circumstances.

In November, 1535, Chapuis reports to the Emperor that he had been informed by the Marchioness of Exeter that the king had been heard to say that "he would no longer remain in the trouble, fear and suspicion in which he had so long remained on account of the queen and princess, and that at the next Parliament they must rid him of them;" and Chapuis added, as of his own knowledge, that "the concubine, who has for some time conspired and wished for the death of the said ladies, and who thinks of nothing so much as of how she may have them despatched, is the person who manages, orders and governs everything, and whom the king does not dare to oppose." This estimate of Anne's influence seems to have been unduly high. As early as the spring of 1534, the ardour of Henry's passion towards her had begun to abate.

"Eighteen months of possession," writes Mr. Friedmann, "were a long time for so fickle a lover, and he had begun to pay marked attention to a young and very handsome lady at Court. Who she was I have not been able to discover; neither Chapuis nor the French ambassador mention (*sic*) her name in the despatches which have



beau preserved. The only thing certain is, that she was not Anne's later rival, Jane Seymour."

It is true that Anne's influence had somewhat revived of late, the king having again begun to entertain the hope of having a son by her; nevertheless, it is extremely improbable, that in November, 1535, she had the complete ascendancy over Henry that Chapuis ascribes to her; and, according to Mr. Friedmann, Henry's principal reason for desiring Catherine's death, was that he would thereby be enabled to "separate his fortunes from those of Anne." Early in December Catherine fell ill, the symptoms being "violent pains in the stomach, flatulence, vomiting and general weakness;" but towards Christmas her condition sensibly improved, and Chapuis became easier in mind. After Christmas she had a relapse, and Chapuis obtained from Cromwell an order to visit her. He reached Kimbolton on January 1, and had a brief audience of her. He saw her again for a considerable time on each of the next three days, during which she seemed to improve. On the 5th he asked her physician, De Lasco, "whether he had any suspicion of poison." De Lasco shook his head, and said he feared something of the kind, for after the queen had drunk of a certain Welsh beer she had never been well. "It must be," he added, "some slow, cleverly composed drug, for I do not perceive the symptoms of ordinary poison." Chapuis then returned to London, and on the 8th he learned that Catherine had died the day before at two o'clock in the afternoon. During the night of the same day the body was opened and embalmed by the Chandler and two assistants, no one else being present; and as soon as the embalming was completed, it was enclosed in lead. The Chandler reported to the queen's confessor, the Bishop of Llandaff, that all the intestines had a perfectly healthy appearance, but the heart, which he cut open, was quite black throughout, and had a round, black lump adhering to it. The results of the *post-mortem*, therefore, give no support to the hypothesis of death by poison. They point rather to some affection of the heart; and it is on the "indecent haste made at Kimbolton to have Catherine's body embalmed as quickly and as secretly as possible," coupled with the fact that both

De Lasco and the Bishop of Llandaff were detained in England against their will, and the statement of Chapuis that Henry and Anne exhibited much relief at the death of the queen, that Mr. Friedmann mainly relies. It must be admitted that no adequate reason is assignable for the secrecy and haste with which the embalming of the body was effected, or for the detention of De Lasco and the bishop. On the other hand, Chapuis' account of Henry's behaviour on receipt of the news, does not accord with other accounts which represent him as affected to tears. Mr. Friedmann's last item of evidence is Chapuis' report of a little incident that occurred on May 2, the date of Anne Boleyn's arrest :—

"That same evening, when the Duke of Richmond, Henry's bastard son, was saying good-night to his father, the king burst into tears. 'The Duke and his sister, the Lady Mary,' exclaimed Henry, 'might thank God for having escaped the hands of that damned poisonous wretch who had conspired their death.' And shortly afterwards, at the trial of Anne, the royal officers laid it to the charge of the prisoner that she was strongly suspected of having caused the late princess dowager to be poisoned, and of having intended to do the same by the Lady Mary. A scapegoat having been found, Henry's Ministers did not deny that Catherine had been murdered."

This seems to us a very perverse construction to put upon events which are susceptible of a very simple one. If the little scene with the Duke of Richmond really occurred, it seems to make very strongly against the supposition that Henry was privy to the murder. Englishmen do not weep unless they are very strongly moved, and therefore it is impossible to suppose that he was playing a part, as he must have been if, having plotted the murder in conjunction with Anne, he had then determined to make her the scapegoat.

Mr. Friedmann proceeds :—

"With so formidable a mass of evidence it cannot but seem likely that Catherine met with foul play. If such was the case the poison was probably administered twice in small doses, at the end of November and shortly after Christmas. Poisoning by repeated low doses was thought by the great toxicologists of the sixteenth century to be preferable to every other method. Usually the victim did not die of the direct effect of the poison, but of exhaustion caused by frequent illnesses ; so that, as

a rule, no traces of the drug were found in the body, and the course of the disorder did not present those strong and characteristic symptoms which might otherwise have appeared."

After this it is difficult to say what evidence Mr. Friedmann would not consider formidable. We say with confidence that, not only has he produced no evidence which would weigh with an English jury, but that he has literally produced none at all, only a little gossip and a few suspicious circumstances.

Chapuis' despatches throw no light upon the question whether Anne was or was not guilty of the crimes for which she was executed. We therefore think the sentence with which Mr. Friedmann concludes his examination of the question might well have been spared. He observes:—

"But while I am strongly of opinion that the indictments were drawn up at random, and that there was no trustworthy evidence to sustain the specific charges, I am by no means convinced that Anne did not commit offences quite as grave as most of those of which she was accused. She may have been guilty of crimes which it did not suit the convenience of the Government to divulge. At the subsequent trial some hints to this effect were thrown out, and although proof was not adduced they were likely enough to have been true."

Vague speculations of this kind are readily indulged in when once it has become a habit to suspect the worst, but they are altogether out of place in a grave historical work. The historian, like the judge, is bound to presume no man guilty and to listen to no mere hearsay evidence. Unless these simple maxims are observed, we fear that the process of overhauling all the available materials for history, now going forward so briskly in Europe, will only lead to increasing confusion and uncertainty. Imperfect as may be the materials for the history of England in the sixteenth century afforded by our own archives, we are hardly likely to mend matters by accepting the uncorroborated statements of foreign ambassadors, or the dark hints by which the authors of an act which wears the sinister aspect of a judicial murder sought to eke out the weakness of their case. Mr. Friedmann's work exhibits much painstaking research in reference to points of detail; but its value is, in our opinion, greatly impaired by his neglect of the two simple canons of evidence to which we

have referred. Had he observed them, much of his book would not have been written, or would have assumed a very different shape.

The general impression left upon the mind by the volumes we have been reviewing is by no means favourable to the English party of Reform in the sixteenth century. Neither Dr. Brewer nor Mr. Friedmann has a good word to spare for them. In truth, the English Reformation, as a political movement, seems to have been from the first under the direction of men intent, not upon elevating the life of the Church or purging its dogmas of error, but chiefly upon emancipating themselves from such restraints as even in its corrupt condition the Church still sought to impose upon the license of individual inclination, and the conversion of ecclesiastical property to secular uses. In short, during the sixteenth century it was the secular and political spirit that dominated the movement; it was not until the fan of Marian persecution had thoroughly sifted the wheat from the chaff that the Reformation acquired the lofty spiritual character that, under the name of Puritanism, distinguished it during the seventeenth century.

---

## ART. IV.—PAULINISM AND LEGALISM.

1. *The Hibbert Lectures*, 1885. *On the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity.* By OTTO PFLEIDERER, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. London: Williams & Norgate.
2. *Paulinism: a Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology.* By OTTO PFLEIDERER, D.D. Williams & Norgate. 1877.
3. *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Works, his Epistles and Teachings: a Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity.* By FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR, Professor of Evangelical Theology in the University of Tübingen. Second Edition. Edited by Dr. EDUARD ZELLER. Williams & Norgate. 1875.
4. *The Church History of the First Three Centuries.* By F. C. BAUR. Third Edition. Williams & Norgate. 1878.

IN the year 1835, just half a century ago, there appeared in Germany two "epoch-making" books, written by men who had stood in the relation of scholar and master to each other—the *Life of Jesus*, of David F. Strauss, and *The So-called Pastoral Epistles of Paul*, by F. C. Baur. It is well known what an immense sensation the former work produced, and how disastrous were its immediate effects. Yet, as it now appears, the famous *Leben Jesu* contained little of permanent significance. It was but the culmination of the spent wave of eighteenth-century rationalism. Strauss' daring was, after all, very like that of the reckless champion of a desperate cause, who is prepared to sacrifice everything for the sake of a momentary victory.

Baur was a man of very superior learning, and of a far more sober type of mind. In spite of his ingrained rationalism, he possessed a sympathy with Christian ideas and an appreciation for spiritual truth. He saw that it would no longer suffice to assail the authority of individual books of Scripture, or to explain away its supernatural contents by

whatever expedient lay readiest to hand. The books are there, and must be accounted for. The Primitive Church was a solid historical fact. By the end of the second century it presents itself to us, furnished with its new Scriptures, a world-wide community, already rooted in the past, and involved in close and manifold relations with the life of the world around. How has all this come about? If the Christ of Paul and of John be a myth, at any rate the Church of Irenæus and Tertullian is a fact—and facts rest on antecedent facts, not on mere fancies. Suppose the traditional view of the genesis of Christianity to be a superstition, what rational account of the matter can we render? This was the question. The older rationalists, Pfleiderer tells us,\* “possessed too little historical perception to be able to appreciate even approximately the significance of Paul.” And, indeed, Strauss and his predecessors left the Church of the early centuries completely hanging in the air. They destroyed the miraculous Gospel on which it claimed to rest, and made it a more stupendous miracle than any; the mightiest fabric of the ages, the loftiest in aim, the most effective in moral discipline of all human institutions—the historical Church of Jesus Christ—resting on a mere congeries of legends, of passionate dreams and fanatical illusions! The *Leben Jesu* was, for those who could see, the *reductio ad absurdum* of the older rationalism.

By this time, too, the historical conscience was awake. That revival of historical studies had commenced which is proving scarcely less fruitful in its influence on modern thought than the advance of physical science. Our traditional views of the *origines* of things political and national, of art and civilization, had to be revised. It was inevitable that religion and Christian tradition should pass through the same process, and that history would become the chief battle-field between faith and unbelief. Baur was amongst the first to perceive this fact, and to realize its importance. German rationalism had long been critical enough and to spare. It is his merit to have made its criticism *historical*. And in becoming historical it was bound to become constructive.

---

\* *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 7.

The preface to his *brochure*, *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus*, Baur's first essay on the New Testament Canon, contains the following pregnant sentences :—

"I, at least, cannot see how the question [of authorship] is to be decided otherwise than in relation to the historical phenomena of the entire period in which these Letters originated—that is to say, in the light of the history of the first two centuries. It is only after such inquiry that we shall be in a position to show where, in the course of these phenomena, the place of the writings in question is to be found."

Here Baur defines the principle and furnishes the programme of the Tübingen school. It subordinates the criticism of the New Testament Canon to that of the history of the Church. It substitutes for the isolated, irregular attacks previously made on individual books of Scripture, the attempt to arrive at a rationalistic theory of Primitive Christianity as a whole, to which all its literary documents should be made to contribute, and by which in turn the origin and significance of each of these writings should be determined. His *Paulus*, unquestionably his greatest work, is entitled "A Contribution to the Critical History of Primitive Christianity." He applied all his vast resources to work out a theory of the genesis of the Church, with which Rationalism might be able successfully to carry on the combat on the ground of historical fact, where revived orthodoxy, as represented by Neander and Gieseler, claimed to be master of the field. Baur's hypothesis is still that of contemporary rationalism. It has been prosecuted on the Continent by a host of learned and zealous disciples, amongst whom Zeller and Pfeiderer have been conspicuous; Renan is a powerful, but somewhat uncertain, ally. Dr. Samuel Davidson, and the author of *Supernatural Religion*, have endeavoured to naturalize it upon English soil. Its later advocates have retired, indeed, from the extreme positions of their master on such capital points as those of the relegation of the Synoptic Gospels to the second century, and the alleged spuriousness of all the minor Epistles of St. Paul. But whatever modifications have been made in detail—and such corrections Baur himself invited—the general principles of the Tübingen school remain unchanged, and are those of

all contemporary scholars of note who reject the supernatural in Christianity on grounds of historical criticism.

The Tübingen school has no more able representative than Professor Otto Pfleiderer, of Berlin, the Hibbert Lecturer of last year. His *Paulinism* displays critical acumen and philosophical insight of the highest order. The ease and lucidity of his style are rare indeed amongst German theologians. And the *Hibbert Lectures*, while necessarily slight and discursive in their substance, are marked by a candour and earnestness that bespeak for the author a respectful hearing. The outline furnished by Dr. Pfleiderer supplies a suitable basis for a review of the Tendency theory, which he so skilfully presents to the British theological public.

We will proceed to sketch the theory in question as it appears in this latest exposition.

Amongst the New Testament writings, four of the Epistles which bear Paul's name are accepted as incontestably genuine—*Galatians*, 1 and 2 *Corinthians*, and *Romans*.\* These documents afford us a starting-point and fixed historical data. They disclose, it is argued, a radical divergence existing in the midst of the Apostolic age between the Pauline Gospel and that of the Twelve. To this primitive antagonism Baur and his followers trace the entire development of the early Church. On the one hand is the universalism of salvation by faith; on the other, the particularism of a Jewish salvation by works of law. On the one hand, the earthly "Christ after the flesh," known by the first Apostles; on the other, a Christ after the Spirit, "the Lord from heaven," whom "it pleased God to reveal" in the soul of Paul. On this side, James, the brother of the Lord, and all the sacred prestige and conservative pride of native Judaism; on that side, Paul, with his newly awakened spirit, his daring and original genius, supported by the imposing array of Gentile Churches, which he himself had called into existence. Such is the situation which *Galatians* i. and ii. and the

---

\* Where Baur, however, rejects the last two chapters. Pfleiderer admits also 1 *Thessalonians*, *Philippians*, *Philemon*, with parts of 2 *Thessalonians* and *Colossians*, and a fragment of 2 *Timothy*.



Corinthian Letters indicate to us. And this opposition appears even under the veil of the official narrative of the Acts—an obvious *Tendenzschrift*—an irenical product of the second century, written on purpose to compose this difference, and to reconcile parties who still combated under the Petrine and Pauline standards. In regard to the Council at Jerusalem, Pfleiderer frankly admits (in opposition to Baur) the agreement of Acts xv. with Gal. ii. : “the two accounts,” he says (p. 103), “admirably complete each other.” A temporary compromise was effected between Paul and the Jewish Church, due to “the practical large-heartedness” of Peter. But the subsequent collision at Antioch brought this truce speedily to an end, and opened a violent conflict in which the full import of the Pauline principle became manifest in its contrast to the “other (legalistic) Gospel” of the First Church. Let us hear Dr. Pfleiderer :—

“The faith of the earliest Church differed from that of the rest of the Jews simply in this, that the former hoped to behold again in the Messiah the crucified Jesus, whom the latter abhorred as a criminal. It is true this *one* point of difference concealed within it a profound chasm, which required only to be thought out in its consequences to conduct to a complete separation between the Church of the disciples of Jesus and Judaism. But this is just what did not take place within the Primitive Church. On the contrary, in its thought and feeling, that point of difference was outweighed by what it possessed in common with Judaism ; and that common possession was not merely the general dogmatic axioms, but particularly the view of the Messianic kingdom as the terrestrial consummation of the national Judean theocracy on the basis of the perpetuated Mosaic Law.”—*Lectures*, pp. 17, 18.

This is cautiously and skilfully put ; but on such a view—far, indeed, from being that of “impartial historical inquiry”—the first Apostles remained totally unaffected even by the minimum of spiritual teaching which Jesus is supposed to have given them, and the rise of Stephen, and of Paul himself, within the Apostolic Church, becomes historically inconceivable. Pfleiderer’s definition of the creed of the Primitive Church is contradicted by his own principal witness. How could Paul speak of the Christian community at Jerusalem as “the Church of God” (Gal. i. 13, 22), and treat it with so much respect and consideration, if it held the “other Gospel,”

which he anathematizes? And does he not refer to Peter's ministry in terms equally exalted with those he uses regarding his own (Gal. ii. 7, 8)? His account of the dispute with Peter at Antioch implies throughout that the two men were in heart at one in their Christian convictions. 1 Cor. xv. 1-11 affords further proof, if proof were needed, that Paul believed himself to be in agreement with the older Apostles on the fundamental truths of his Gospel. He refers here not simply to the bare facts of the death and resurrection of Christ, but to the construction placed upon them, for this constitutes "the Gospel."

In Paul's inner experience Pfleiderer finds the key to his teaching. "His theology is the development, on the basis of the previous beliefs of his Jewish theology, of that faith in Christ which became a certainty to him at his conversion" (p. 47). This event is "psychologically explained" as the crisis of a struggle previously going on in his intense and deeply conscientious nature between his Pharisaic devotion to the Law, underneath which there lay a profound sense of his personal failure and of the failure of his nation to attain righteousness with God, and the impressions made upon him against his will by the words and bearing of the persecuted followers of Jesus, especially by the death of Stephen, "which powerfully affected the tender soul of Paul." Already, it appears, before this sudden change, Paul had discerned, as the older Apostles failed to do, that the acceptance of the crucified Jesus meant the abandonment of Mosaism. So that for him their Jewish-Christian attitude was impossible. He passed by a logical necessity from one extreme to the other. The vision of the glorified Saviour brought the inward conflict of the Apostle's soul to an issue, and introduced him to that spiritual knowledge of Christ which was henceforth the centre and spring of his life. Whether this manifestation had any objective reality or not, is a matter of little moment to us. It is enough that the Apostle believed he had "seen the Lord." In Gal. i. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 6, he seems to intimate that this revelation of Christ "was not an ordinary seeing and hearing with the physical senses, but an inward experience within his soul"

(pp. 31-33). Paul's doctrine of Salvation was the issue of his acceptance of a crucified Messiah, on the basis of his antecedent convictions respecting the law and sin. His Christology was the reflection of the vision of the glorified Jesus, by which he had been convinced of his Messiahship. "Not conferring with flesh and blood," nor allowing his mind to be occupied with those traditions of the earthly life of Jesus which belonged to the first disciples, he was able to idealize the Person of Christ the more freely, following "the spontaneous rise" of his own "religious intuitions, which remained, however, all along connected with the historical person of Jesus by means of the one fact of the crucifixion" (pp. 52, 53). So there was formed in "the pure and noble soul of the Apostle" a true conception of "the *spirit* of Jesus freed from all earthly elements," in its universal and transcendent significance, as at once the celestial, archetypal man, and the Image, the Son of God, so near to the Divine "that we need feel no surprise when Paul at length calls him without reserve 'God who is over all'" (pp. 54, 55). The Pauline doctrine of the universal, substitutionary Atonement is but the application in Pharisaic dogmatic form of this ideal view of "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."

Here we pause to observe how erroneous is the assumption that Paul ignored the earthly life of Christ and the traditions of His ministry. Such an attitude, in a man of so sane and practical a mind, is incredible. His ardent love for the Saviour would alone forbid indifference on this head. Something Paul must have known from common report, still more from the testimony of persecuted Christians, even before his conversion; or how would the words, "I am Jesus," have so powerfully affected his soul? And are we to suppose that afterwards he closed his ears to the stories about "all that Jesus did and taught" with which every Christian circle in Damascus and Antioch, as well as in Jerusalem, must for years have been rife? It was in regard to his apostolic *commission* and *message* that he claimed so confidently to be independent of all tradition, not in regard to the particulars of the Gospel narrative. Although the nature of his writings does not allow of detailed reference of this kind, yet the undisputed Epistles

afford evidence enough that it was the historical Jesus whom Paul preached as the ideal, heavenly Christ. The word *Jesus*, in the manner in which he uses it, connotes the earthly history. Allusions such as those of Rom. viii. 3; xv. 3, 8; 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12; xi. 23 (the reference to *the traitor*); xv. 1-11; 2 Cor. i. 5; v. 21; viii. 9; x. 1; Gal. ii. 9; iv. 4; vi. 2, indicate sufficiently the nature and extent of the knowledge which the Apostle and his readers possessed in common of the earthly course of Jesus.

But, so Pfleiderer proceeds, "the objective reconciliation of the world effected in Christ's death can, after all, benefit in their own personal consciousness only those who know and acknowledge it, who feel themselves in their solidarity with Christ to be so much one with Him as to be able to appropriate inwardly His death and celestial life, and inwardly live over again His life and death; those only, in a word, who truly *believe* on Christ, who connect themselves with Him in faith, in such a way as to grow together with Him into *one* spirit and *one* body. Thus the idea of 'substitution' in Paul's view finds its realization in the mysticism of his conception of faith; the idea of 'one for all' receives the stricter meaning of 'all in and with one'" (pp. 65, 66). This is finely and truly said: *O si sic omnia!* This consciousness of fellowship with God in Christ brings Paul, however, we are told, to "a different conception of God" from that with which he set out. "The God of the Jewish legal consciousness," demanding atonement, has given place to "the God of the Christian filial consciousness, as Jesus bore him in His heart." In the "oscillation" between these two conceptions consists the peculiar difficulty of Paul's theology—a difficulty, however, more theoretical than practical, existing for the theological thinker rather than for the believing Christian (pp. 68-70). Paul's "central idea of mystical fellowship with Christ" gave him the vantage-ground from which to meet the Judaistic charges of Antinomianism made against him. The ethical consequences of his doctrine of Salvation were a triumphant evidence in its favour. In the constraining love of Christ Paul had found a new, divine principle of life, "equally far removed from heathen licence and Jewish legalism," an "inward freedom

raised as far above the Jewish servitude of ordinances as it was above the heathen servitude of the flesh and worldly lust;" and a "uniting bond" which "made Jews and Greeks, slaves and free men, man and woman, one in Christ" (pp. 70-74). In such passages as these our author is at his best. His interpretation of the Apostle's moral teaching is necessarily limited and warped by the exclusion of the later Epistles. But we can find nothing to object to in his exegesis of the Pauline antithesis of "flesh and spirit" in the natural man, except that he calls it "the Pharisaic theory" (pp. 76-78). "In the body," he says, "the earthly and sense part of the natural man, evil desire has set up its seat, or, as it were, its citadel, whence, by means of the impulses and tendencies of the flesh in the members, it makes the will its servant, so that it brings forth all kinds of sin, not merely sins of a sensual, but also of a spiritual, nature, such as idolatry and selfish wickedness."

The new "life in the Spirit," which constituted the subjective side of Pauline Christianity, Pfeiderer goes on to show, rose above "the miraculous world of ecstatic feeling and apocalyptic phantasy," in which the faith and hope of the First Church loved to dwell. These it subordinated to itself and gradually transformed into "the moral kingdom of God of the Christian Church" (pp. 82, 83). Baptism and the Lord's Supper were raised to a higher significance, and "brought into the closest connection with the central idea" of Paul's theology, serving, along with his "dogmatic Christology," as an "outward shell" which should "protect and preserve," while "to the superficial eye it concealed the noble fruit within." That Paul "discovered, by reference to the central fact of salvation in the death of Christ, the means of satisfying the need, founded in human nature, of a mystical cultus, is," he adds, "one of those marvellous inspirations of genius on which history itself has set its seal, and which we, therefore, ought not to criticize with cold Rationalism, but to honour with thankful and reverent piety." In the light of the indwelling Spirit of Christ, "Paul finally obtained new and profound insight into the counsels and ways of the Divine government of the world. He sketched a new

philosophy of religious history, which served as a magnificent historical setting to his theological ideas" (p. 87). In this grand theodicy, the origin of human sin, the purpose and scope of the Mosaic Law in its relation to the Promise, the dealing of God with the heathen, the national rejection of the Jews, the future development of the Kingdom of God on earth, and its consummation in the Second Advent, all found a place; and the contradictions and misgivings to which Paulinism gave rise in the Jewish-Christian mind—first of all, no doubt, in the mind of the Apostle himself—were effectually dealt with. By his lofty intuitions and masterly dialectic they were transformed from stumbling-blocks into buttresses of the Gospel which he preached amongst the Gentiles (pp. 87–96).

We have dwelt somewhat at length on Pfeiderer's *résumé* of Paul's "doctrinal teaching," the subject of his Second Lecture, because we could not otherwise do justice to the breadth and precision which characterize it, and to the sympathetic earnestness with which he approaches the Apostle's central doctrine. Indeed we are bound to testify that Baur and Pfeiderer alike, where their critical theory is not at stake, and in the exposition of the evangelical teaching of *Romans* and *Galatians*, show themselves on many points excellent interpreters, and manifest a clear-sightedness, a power of looking directly into the thought of their author as it stands in his own pages, that orthodox theologians not unfrequently might envy. We are not surprised that Canon Farrar's *St. Paul*, in its construction of the Apostle's doctrine owes so much to Pfeiderer's *Paulinism*. Nor can any exegete afford to overlook the masterly exposition of the doctrine of Justification given in Baur's *Paulus*.

With the *Epistle to the Romans* Paul's theological development, on the Tübingen assumption, was suddenly arrested. The later doctrinal writings ascribed to him, though fragments of genuine Pauline letters may be found in them, are, in their canonical form, the work of Paulinists, successors of the Apostle, living under the influence of later theological ideas and applying their master's doctrine to altered circumstances. We may trace in them, on the one hand, the gradual infiltration into Paulinism of Gnostic metaphysics, and, on the other, its

growing approximation to Judaic legalism. The latter, meanwhile, had undergone a thorough transformation, in consequence of the downfall of national Judaism and of the continued action of Gentile Christianity upon it. The Catholic Church of the third century shows us Pauline theology wedded to a new Christianized legalism. Ecclesiastical is now substituted for Judaic law; baptism has taken the place of circumcision; the clergy are already a hierarchy; Rome has made herself the heir of ruined Jerusalem. In this union the advantage lay nominally with Paul, whose theology was officially accepted as that of the Ecumenical Church. But in reality Legalism was victorious. It had sacrificed its Jewish form only to gain, under a new dress, a wider supremacy. Yet in the teaching of Paul there lay dormant a principle of Divine sonship and liberty, ready at the appointed moment to awake to new life and to shake the Catholic system to its foundations. This analysis of pre-Nicene Christianity contains, we readily admit, a large element of truth, however much we may quarrel with the historical theory which is constructed to account for it.

The post-Pauline New Testament writings, Pfeiderer endeavours to show, had severally their share in bringing about this amalgamation. They mark successive stages in the gradual interpenetration of the Pauline and Judaic factors. On the Judaistic side (A.D. 68-69), appeared the *Apocalypse*. Baur holds this to be the one genuine work of the Apostle John, and finds in it the strongest witness for the antipathy of the Pillar Apostles to Paul, and for the non-Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Here Pfeiderer is at issue with him; for how, he asks, could one who had known Christ after the flesh conceive of him so highly as the John of the *Apocalypse*? He makes the suggestion—quite novel, so far as we know—that the writer was a Roman Jewish Christian, one of those referred to in Phil. i. 17, who had, however, profited by Paul's teaching, and had probably fled from Rome to Asia Minor in the Neronian persecution. This book is saturated with Paul's Christology, hardly less so with his doctrine of Salvation; in fact, it incorporates his theology wholesale—and yet covertly denies his Apostleship (Rev. xxi. 14), and

denounces him, along with licentious Paulinists, in the terrible language of Rev. ii. 2, 6! This astounding contradiction Pfeiderer explains as merely "another instance of Jewish party-tactics"! In truth, the *Apocalypse* alone is a sufficient refutation of the Tübingen hypothesis. If the date assigned to it by Baur be correct—and it finds increasing assent among New Testament scholars—then before A.D. 70, and within twelve years of the composition of the *Epistle to the Romans*, a theology identical in substance with Paul's is found in a writing the most Judaistic in its colouring that the New Testament contains. The inference is inevitable, that the ground-principles of "Paulinism" were common to Paul with the elder Apostles. They constituted the theology of the Church Catholic from the Day of Pentecost. The grounds on which hostility to Paul is attributed to John are fanciful in the extreme (pp. 156–8).

The *Epistle of James* is of course ranged on the Judaistic side. Yet it is free from the Jewish legalism and particularism which form the antithesis to Pauline doctrine. It is, as Pfeiderer admits, a "disfigured doctrine of faith," held by men who converted faith into "a mere matter of the understanding," against which this writer contends. On this showing, "the opposition between Paulinism and Jewish Christianity which still meets us in unmitigated intensity (!) in the *Epistle of James*" (p. 170), is reduced to a mere shadow, a simple misunderstanding.

But a "further reconciliation" is still deemed necessary. This was "accomplished partly in the field of theological Gnosticism," where "new ingredients" were found, "of sufficient combining power to unite the resisting elements, and partly and specially in the field of Gospel narrative." So the plot thickens as we advance. Mark, it appears, held a brief for Paul. In his narrative, "from the commencement, the profound contrast between the free spirit of the Gospel and the narrow legalism of Judaism finds expression" (pp. 171, 172). The obduracy of the unbelieving Jews, the stupidity and narrowness of the first Apostles—these Mark dwells on with avidity. The sequel of the Transfiguration unmistakably betrays this Evangelist's "tendency." It is



"an idealistic narrative, for which the *Apocalypse* and the Pauline Christology have supplied the elements," an "allegorical illustration of the utterance of Paul, 'their minds were hardened,'" &c. For this reason the first Apostles failed to "expel in Christ's name the evil spirits of Heathenism" (Mark ix. 18, 19); "whilst one who did not follow in their company"—Paul, to be sure—"cast out demons in His name, and is acknowledged by Jesus as a disciple, whom the others ought not to hinder. . . . This was the Pauline reply to the glorification of the Twelve in the *Apocalypse*, at the cost of the Apostle to the Heathen" (pp. 174-7). Who would have thought it? Professor Pfeiderer has indeed "deciphered a hieroglyphic" (p. 175), if this is what the story means. A theory which depends on such ingenuities as this—and the Tübingen exegesis of the Gospels teems with them—stands self-condemned. "Jewish Christianity, thus attacked with weapons from the arsenal of Gospel tradition, made its reply in the Gospel according to *Matthew*." Here Paul, as we are prepared to find, is "*the least in the Kingdom of Heaven*." That he is allowed a place there at all, shows that Jewish-Christian hostility had somewhat relented towards him. "Peter is represented expressly as 'the first,'" and receives "the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." While Paul is disparaged, the Antinomianism of his followers is denounced, as in the *Apocalypse*. Yet, like the *Apocalypse*, the First Gospel is "far removed from a narrow Jewish particularism." The call of the Gentiles is contemplated by Matthew, but under legal conditions (Matt. v. 18, 19; xxviii. 18, 19) which characterize his universalism as "still far removed from that of the Apostle Paul" (p. 185). Not to be outdone, the Paulinists before long produced the Gospel of *Luke*, the manifesto of "the popularized irenic Paulinism of the second, post-apostolic generation," now beginning to be "on good terms with moderate Jewish Christianity" (p. 185). "The third Evangelist," who was also the author of *The Acts of the Apostles*, "with an impartiality which has got beyond the region of sectarian strife, ungrudgingly accords to each of the two primitive Christian parties its peculiar pre-eminence

and its special historical position" (p. 193). "The beautiful story of the sisters Martha and Mary" is "obviously" an allegory, showing how entirely the writer himself regarded "Pauline Christianity, with its deeper inward life of faith, as the 'better part.'" Paul's "ideal conception of Christ the third Evangelist has, with incomparable skill, developed dramatically into a vivid historical picture, which, though it falls behind that of the two previous Gospels as regards strict historical reality, excels it in point of high ideal truth."

All this only shows how easy it is by the aid of "allegory" and "idealism" to play fast and loose with history. It is just Luke's faithful portraiture of the real Christ that explains Paul's "ideal conception," and accounts for its universal acceptance, and for the power with which in all ages it has impressed itself on the Christian heart.

Respecting the Fourth Gospel, all that Pfeiderer has to say is, that it carries further this "idealistic, dogmatic and didactic delineation of the life of Jesus, upon which Luke had previously entered," and that the conception of Christ it presents, "likewise exhibits the influence of the impulses which in the first instance proceeded from Paul" (p. 198). This is the only reference, beyond two mere allusions that the author makes to the Gospel of John; and the subject is equally ignored in his *Paulinism*. We can understand that the question of the Fourth Gospel has become an embarrassment for the Tübingen school. On any theory of development, the theological expansion which Paulinism owed to Gnostic influence reached its limit in the Johannine doctrine. It represents the latest type of New Testament teaching. Baur accordingly bends all his efforts to show that John's Gospel could not have originated earlier than the middle of the second century. The Gospel of John, he argues, is the theological (ideal) counterpart of that "development of the Christian consciousness" which had its practical realization in the Roman Church of the latter part of the second century. In it "the Jewish Christian and Pauline doctrines," by the aid of Alexandrine Gnosis, were at last "blended in a higher unity." Baur is quite consistent. On the Tübingen hypothesis, this document cannot be earlier than 150 A.D. But

external evidence positively demands an earlier date. As John's *Apocalypse* at the beginning, so his Gospel at the end of the imaginary "reconciling" process, bears effectual witness against it.

We have already indicated the part which Gnosticism is made to play in the theory under review. Pfeiderer devotes one of his ablest lectures to the subject. He begins by saying that "a Gnostic element lay from the very first in the Pauline Gospel of the revelation of God in Christ, a fruitful germ of theological gnosis or speculative theology" (p. 201). That is to say, there was an inner, profounder knowledge of "the deep things of God," of the Divine purposes and dealings in history and in creation, lying behind and within the doctrine of the Cross, which Paul had still in reserve, or allowed but partially to appear, in his earlier Epistles. This at least is how we would interpret Pfeiderer's admission. And we think that, allowing so much as he does, he is bound to consider more carefully than he seems to have done whether the doctrine of the rejected Colossian and Ephesian Letters is not the natural development, within the mind that conceived it, of this "fruitful germ of theological gnosis," contained in the four unchallenged Epistles. It must be remembered that the dualistic gnosis which gave birth to the heretical Gnostic Christianity of the second century, was not a thing that sprung up in a day. The Judaism of Alexandria, in the person of Philo, Paul's contemporary, exhibits it in a ripe stage of growth, and in a form in which it was ready at once to coalesce with Pauline Christianity. Undoubtedly Paul had to confront it in the Hellenistic circles of his mission, and it came fairly within his mental horizon. According to Pfeiderer, the Epistles to the *Hebrews*, *Colossians*, and *Ephesians* successively took part in the adjustment of Paulinism and Gnosticism in the second century. The *Epistle to the Hebrews* Pfeiderer associates with the apocryphal *Epistle of Barnabas*, representing "Alexandrine Gnosis," while the two Asiatic Letters are referred to "Pauline Gnosis." We can only point out the striking contrast in tone between the former pair of documents: the pseudo-Barnabas breathes a different atmosphere, he belongs to quite another world

from the writer of *Hebrews*. For *Ephesians* Pfeiderer is compelled to find an author distinct from that of the "revised" and interpolated *Colossians*, and of considerably later date. In fact, *Ephesians*, in his construction, holds much the same place as John's Gospel with the older Tübingen critics.

The *First Epistle of Peter* Pfeiderer does not discuss in his Lectures. His *Paulinism* ranks it along with the *Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, as a document of the transition period, antecedent to *Ephesians*: "The persecution of Trajan marks the situation of its readers." The absence of the "Judaistic bias" is strongly insisted on. It contains, on Pfeiderer's showing, "a popularized, and for that very reason a diluted, Paulinism, which ceases to retain any party colouring." The spuriousness of the epistle is for the Tübingen school a matter of life and death. Pfeiderer does not, however, impute to the author any specific "irenical tendency," as Baur is inclined to do on the strength of ch. v. 12. Its object is practical and hortatory. "But this fact gives the greater weight to the Epistle, as a testimony to the actual existence of a practical common consciousness of the Church" (vol. ii. p. 150). Precisely so; only we must take leave to complete the sentence by adding, "in the Apostolic age."

1 *Clement* is empanelled in Lecture VI. as a witness to "the transformation of Paulinism into Catholicism," already in an advanced stage of progress on its ecclesiastical side "at the end of the first century" (p. 248). But this document, if its evidence is to be accepted, testifies to very much more than this. It proves that the Catholic Church "at the end of the first century" was already a highly developed organism, with a settled constitution and a familiar history. And, what is more, it shows that the Roman and Corinthian Churches, situated in the very centre of Christendom, at this early date knew nothing of the great feud between Paul and the First Apostles. Had they forgotten it; or did it never exist, except in the Ebionite and Tübingen imagination?

The *Pastoral Epistles* and the *Ignatian Letters* (which Pfeiderer assumes to be spurious throughout) are products of the conflict of orthodox Paulinism with heretical Gnosticism.

1 *Timothy* is, in Pfeiderer's judgment, the latest of the

**Pastoral Epistles.** In it the attempt "to give the Church stability by means of organized ecclesiastical offices, especially the Episcopate," becomes very manifest. And "the Epistles published under the honoured name of the martyr Ignatius enable us to see with what increased energy and success within a few years that endeavour to strengthen ecclesiastical authority by means of the Episcopate was prosecuted amid the Church's struggle with domestic and foreign foes" (p. 260). In 1 *Timothy* "we observe only the growing desire to distinguish the bishop from the presbyters; the distinction is an accomplished fact in the *Ignatian Epistles*." Granting the Episcopalian "tendency" of 1 *Timothy* (and Dr. Pfeiderer knows how disputable is this assumption), it is still a long step in such matters from the "growing desire" to the "accomplished fact," and by all that distance the Pastoral Epistles are separated, on the Lecturer's own supposition, from the date of the *Epistles of Ignatius*. To suppose this radical change in the constitution of the Church hurried through in "a few years," is utterly unhistorical. In the pseudo-Ignatius "the principle of the genuine Catholic hierarchy has already reached a fully-developed form, ecclesiastical offices intervene between God and man; on the relation of the believer to the priest depends his relation to God, the purity of his conscience, the acceptability of his worship and his moral action, the determination of his salvation or condemnation!" (pp. 261, 262). And yet this pseudo-Ignatius, who "claims to be a good Paulinist," writes but "a few years" later than the author of the Pastoral Epistles, and in the same interest as the authors of the *Epistle to the Ephesians* and the Fourth Gospel! "The development of the Christian consciousness" can advance, sometimes at any rate, with amazing rapidity and by strangely disconnected steps.

However, we have reached at last the end of this wonderful evolution. Paulinism has been finally "reconciled" to the Judaic Christianity of Peter and the Primitive Church. The two repugnant elements have found their adjustment in the Catholicism of the second century, as it issued victorious from its struggle with Gnostic heresy. The legalism of

*Jerusalem*, which had resisted the influence of Jesus, had slowly yielded to the evangelic ardour and profound spirituality of Paul, and, above all, to the dazzling success of his Gentile mission. It had expanded under the influence of Gnosticism. But it stooped to conquer; it yielded only to reassert itself once more in the practical, cosmopolitan legalism of *Rome*.

We would gladly follow Dr. Pfeiderer through his sketch of the later fortunes of Paulinism. But the space at our command will only allow us to add some general considerations bearing on the Tübingen theory, without which our view of it would be altogether incomplete. The reader cannot but perceive how thoroughly *ideal* and *subjective* is the procedure of Baur and his school. "Like spiders, they spin all out of their own bowels," as Bacon says of the Rationalists. They protest indeed against the accusation. "My standpoint," says Baur (Preface to *Church History*), "is the purely historical one—namely, that the one thing to be aimed at is to place before ourselves the materials given in history as they are objectively, and not otherwise, as far as that is possible." Truly an admirable purpose, but how grievously has it miscarried. The external testimony for the canonical books is treated by Pfeiderer as though it had no existence, and the entire Tübingen school subordinate it in the freest manner to the criteria derived from their own interpretation of the internal evidence. Dr. Salmon, in his admirable *Introduction to the New Testament*, has shown more conclusively than ever how completely the Tendency theory is shattered on the immovable rock of historical fact, found in the witness of the pre-Nicene Church to the body of the New Testament Scriptures. Baur's History of the early Christian centuries is a Hegelian *history of ideas*, an *à priori* mental construction. From the abstract point of view, as an intellectual exercise, it is a marvellous *tour de force* of pure deductive logic. It shows how Christianity might conceivably have originated, and how its documents and institutions might theoretically be accounted for, given certain necessary assumptions. We begin, according to Hegel's formula, with Being and Not-Being (Paulinism and Legalism to wit), which by logical necessity find their synthesis in a Becoming (*i.e.*, in

Catholicism). The intervening history is simply the dialectic of this synthesis of antithetical ideas, into which the recorded facts must fit as well as they can; and if they will not fit—then so much the worse for the facts. Unfortunately, the reality of things has a perverse habit of setting at nought our theories. The rude and obstinate concrete will not run in the mould prepared for it beforehand by philosophical abstraction. Baur and Pfleiderer demonstrate how a Hegelian could have developed Christianity, if the work had been left to him, out of the four Epistles of Paul and the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. But, as it happens, the Church has grown up in quite another way. And we cannot even grant them their Paul and pseudo-Clement to begin with, unless they account for both in some more reasonable fashion. Notwithstanding, we believe that Baur has done a great service to Church History. Formerly it had been too much a mere chronicle of external events and unsifted traditions, or a battle-ground for Romish and Protestant polemics. Even Neander's treatment, while it put new life and meaning into the subject, was predominantly external, and failed to trace the inner genetic connection of things, and that "development of the Christian consciousness" on which Baur dwells with so much iteration. But Baur went beyond all bounds in the opposite direction. In his representation the personalities of the Apostolic age dissolve in a mist of floating "ideas." Peter, and James, and the rest, whom we thought we knew, become so many shadowy "tendencies." Paul himself dwindles into an abstraction, and is sacrificed to his own "Paulinism." From Paul's conversion down to Marcion's visit to Rome, it is difficult to find anywhere in the whole hundred years a chronological datum or a definite event. We wander in a shifting cloudland of historial speculation, which our new Gnostics invite us to take for "scientific Biblical theology" (*Paulinism* : Preface, p. vi.).

The elaborate character of the Tübingen hypothesis stamps it as *artificial*. At first sight it bears an appearance of simplicity, like the old assumption of the sun's rotation round the earth. But every step involves it in new complications. In reality it makes second-century Catholicism the focus of its movement, instead

of the historical Christ. Hence the Ptolemaic "eccentrics and epicycles"—to quote Lord Bacon again—which it is obliged to "feign," in order "to save the phenomena." Pfeiderer postulates at least four pseudo-Pauls, two pseudo-Peters, a pseudo-John, and a pseudo-James, besides the unknown authors of the Synoptic Gospels and the *Acts of the Apostles*—all persons of extraordinary literary gifts and capable of simulating their respective parts with the greatest skill, men of singular moral elevation and spiritual insight; yet, with one or two possible exceptions, belonging to the second century, contemporaries of Papias and pseudo-Clement. All these conspired in succession to pass off their pious frauds under Apostolic names, completely veiling their identity from the scrutiny of their own and succeeding ages, till at last the Tübingen critics unravelled this tissue of imposture! One such performance, achieving even a partial success, would be a wonder, even in an age of high literary art. But a *dozen* of them, and in the second century to boot! Can improbability, heaped upon improbability, reach a greater height? The Tendency school has unquestionably shed new light on Biblical criticism. It has shown that the New Testament has an internal history and organic growth; that there is a progress of thought and a combination of distinct historical elements in its construction that had been largely overlooked. But it has exaggerated and multiplied these elements beyond all reason. It has sought to rend the unity of the New Testament, and to distribute its scattered members amongst a series of nameless Church partisans invented for the purpose and stationed along the line of post-Apostolic times. It has done this in the name of *history*—and history must be its judge!

The *moral* aspect of the Tübingen theory is matter for serious reflection. These "pseudonymous" New Testament writings are, in plain terms, *forgeries*. It is in vain to appeal to ancient classical usage, to the practice of unknown or obscure writers, who clothed their own thoughts in the style of some master of their school, or recommended them by the patronage of an honoured name (Baur's *Paul*, vol. ii. pp. 109, 110). Such always questionable and sometimes fraudulent imitations, as a



rule, readily betray themselves and are soon forgotten. And the cases of *Job* and *Koheleth* in the Old Testament stand on a different footing. The Epistles bearing the names of Paul and Peter, if not composed by those Apostolic men, are unmitigated falsehoods, cunningly devised with intent to deceive from first to last. Little less can be said of the author of the Fourth Gospel, if he were not indeed St. John. The contrast between the nature of the contents of these writings and the spirit and aim of their authors, on the hypothesis in question, presents a moral and psychological paradox of the gravest character. Pfeiderer lightly tells us that the Gospel tradition was an "arsenal," supplying the Evangelists with "weapons" with which, as Pauline or anti-Pauline combatants, to assail the champions of the other side. And so the narratives of the miracles were "worked up," and the words of Jesus deliberately wrested this way and that, to serve as missiles of party warfare, or entrenchments under cover of which disparagement and innuendo might be more effectually showered, in turn on Paul and the First Apostles, and on their respective teaching. This, forsooth, is the way in which our Gospels were written! Who would have thought that these narratives, under their unstudied and ingenuous air, and dealing with a subject that beyond all others inspires reverence and sincerity, could have concealed such crafty "party tactics" and so many "pious frauds?" Criticism that judges thus is equally wanting in literary and in moral appreciation. There is a profound cynicism at the bottom of much of the current rationalistic unbelief. We happened to hear one of M. Renan's *Hibbert Lectures*, delivered on a kindred subject some years ago. Nothing that fell from the lips of the brilliant French scholar impressed us so much as the tone of droll and mocking laughter in which he amused himself at the *naïveté* of St. Luke in making believe that Paul and Peter were such good friends after all. "This is the way," he added, "in which ecclesiastical history is written!" No men are more surely deceived than those who have grown overwise, and are too knowing to recognize honesty even when they see it.

The supreme test of all Christian speculations lies in the old question, "What think ye of the Christ?" The Tübingen

answer it is difficult to gather. The Tendency school prefer to avoid the central figure of the New Testament; they find their congenial field in the more obscure region of post-Apostolic times. Baur said of Strauss that in his *Leben Jesu* he attempted to carry the fortress of orthodoxy by storm, while for himself he thought it wiser to reduce it by a regular siege. His hypothesis assumes *two* Christs to begin with—the Jewish Messiah of the Jerusalem Church, and the Christ of Paul's "ideal conception." On his supposition Christ *was* "divided." What form the real Christ behind this antithesis assumes to the minds of Baur and Pfleiderer, it is hard to see. Where we look for the historical Jesus, we find in Baur "the original Christian idea." This is discovered in the Sermon on the Mount, and consists in righteousness understood as an inward principle. In fact, "faith in the person of Jesus," as required in the Gospel of John, is, we are informed, "no part of the original Christian doctrine. The teaching of Jesus aimed simply at throwing men back on their own moral and religious consciousness" (*Church History*, vol. i. pp. 37-43). In what sense and for what purpose He claimed the Messiahship, we are not clearly told. His crucifixion showed that He was not to be the Messiah of Jewish national faith—a fact of which Paul was the first to grasp the full significance. With his death, Baur admits, Christianity must have died, had not "the miracle of the resurrection dispersed his disciples' doubts." But "history" knows nothing of miracles. It is enough that the disciples *believed* that Jesus had risen, and that in this faith Christianity "acquired a firm basis for its historical development" (p. 42). Whether this "firm basis" on which the historical structure of Christianity rests, was a delusion or a fact is, it appears, a matter of no moment to "a really scientific Biblical theology," to a criticism whose single aim it is to present things "as they are objectively!" The resurrection of Jesus was either a mere notion of the disciples, or a supernatural act of God. Historical criticism cannot evade the responsibility of giving judgment on this issue. On this depends the judgment we form of everything else in Christianity. "If Christ hath not been raised," says Paul, "our message is void, and we are false witnesses of God; your faith also is void and vain." Notwithstanding, Baur cannot elimi-

nate the miraculous in the transition from the Cross to the faith of the Primitive Church. "We may regard this resurrection," he says, "as an outward objective miracle, or as a subjective psychological miracle; since, though we assume that an inward spiritual process was possible by which the unbelief of the disciples at the time of the death of Jesus was changed into belief in his resurrection, still no psychological analysis can show what that process was." This is a confession of failure—failure at the crucial point. Pfeiderer repeats the vain attempt to solve the insoluble mystery which unbelief creates. In so doing he assumes that the overwhelmed and panic-stricken disciples were led by fond and sanguine expectation to believe and imagine that they had visions of the risen Jesus, and to maintain their delusions as facts, witnessing to their truth unto the death.

The Christ of modern Rationalism is a sublime teacher of righteousness, of inwardness, of universal charity. He accepted the Messiahship, but in a special and unhistorical sense. He died a sacrifice to bigotry, a martyr for the cause of righteousness and inwardness. Unaccountably, His disciples believed that He rose from the dead, and this belief became the corner-stone of Christianity. Their faith was new-born in the soul of Paul, who, in his lofty idealism, raised Jesus of Nazareth to the height of Godhead. Out of his singular experience Paul formulated "the Gospel of Christ," with which he conquered the Gentile world. All that the four Evangelists contain besides has grown up around this twofold primitive nucleus, and was gradually generated by the conflicting tendencies dividing the early Christian societies, in the process out of which the ante-Nicene Catholic Church was finally evolved. This is what the Tübingen theory requires us to think of Christ! The chasm dividing this Gnostic phantom from the living Christ, who stands before us in the pages of the New Testament, is one that no theory can ever bridge. Baur and his successors have laboured diligently, but in vain, to sap the outworks—they have not even approached the citadel—of the Church's faith in the Person of its Lord. The slow siege will prove as abortive as Strauss's violent assault. "But the end is not yet."

## ART. V.—THE LAND AND THE LABOURERS.

1. *The Land and the Labourers.* By the Rev. C. W. STUBBS, M.A., Vicar of Stokenham. London. 1885.
2. *Three Acres and a Cow.* By FREDERICK IMPEY, Hon. Sec. Allotments and Small Holdings Association. London. 1885.
3. *Our Land Laws as they are.* By H. GREENWOOD, M.A., LL.M. London. 1885.
4. *English Land and English Landlords.* By the Hon. GEORGE C. BRODBICK, Warden of Merton College. London. 1881.
5. *Prospectuses of the Landowners' Association for the Voluntary Extension of the Allotments System, and of the Small Farm and Labourers' Land Company.* London. 1885.

THE great want of the land is labourers, and the great want of the labourers is land. How these wants may be supplied without any breach of natural or moral law, and with endless advantages to all concerned—landlords, farmers, labourers, and the community at large—it will be our endeavour in this article to show. Incidentally, the salient points in the question, or rather in the series of groups of questions clustering round the ownership, the occupancy, and the cultivation of the land, will come up for consideration, and some of the projects and proposals for the reform of the English land laws will be passed under review, but only as they bear more or less directly on the pressing problem we have indicated.

Other things being equal, the productiveness of agricultural land depends upon the amount of labour expended upon it. Soils and seasons vary, prices rise and fall, crops and cattle improve and deteriorate in condition and value, landlords are free or fettered in the disposal and management of their estates, and their interest in them, and the capital they are able and disposed to put into them, vary indefinitely; farmers also, according to their freedom and security, differ quite as variously

in industry and enterprise. But where all these conditions of husbandry are the same, it is evident that the results of husbandry will be in exact proportion to the amount of labour employed.

That the soil of England is not so fruitful as it might be made is patent to all observers, and will not be denied even by those who take the territorial as distinguished from the commercial view of the possession of land. Lord Derby is said to have expressed the opinion that the produce of the land in this country might be doubled. Supposing it to be increased one-half, that would add about a hundred millions to the national income—a sum larger than the total value of all our exports to all our possessions, and large enough in seven years to pay off the national debt.

Why, then, is not the labour needed to produce this additional income expended? Not, assuredly, because of any lack of labourers; still less because of any rational fear of overproduction of *food*; and least of all, it is to be hoped, because of any wide-spread and deep-rooted conviction in the minds of our territorial aristocracy and landed gentry that the *raison d'être* of landowning is, not the profit of the community, but the pleasure of a class. The chief cause of this insufficiency of labour is to be found in the operation of our system of land tenure, which, though it has strong points of advantage, has many and serious defects.

On the surface, it might seem that the reason why the land is labour-starved is that landlords, farmers, labourers, alike, are suffering from lack of things essential to the development and progress of any trade or industry—capital and enterprise; and this no doubt is true, but it is not the whole truth. We must dig beneath the surface if we would find the root of the mischief. Lack of capital and lack of enterprise in this case spring from lack of liberty and of opportunity. Let us see how the system works. Starting from one of its most painful and disastrous effects, let us trace the evil to its source and cause.

“Our land laws,” it is sometimes said, “have much to do with ‘the bitter cry of outcast London.’” No doubt; but how? A report presented in February last by the Mansion

House Relief Committee states that "the ranks of the unemployed in London are daily augmented by migration from the rural districts." Too true; but why? In one sense this migration is quite natural, for every one desires to better his condition, and in some circumstances it might be desirable; but in the case before us the process will be found to be neither natural nor desirable. It is extremely artificial, and extremely injurious to the community. But the causes that lead to it are not merely those to which it is often assigned. For example, it is often said that agricultural labour is being displaced by machinery, and this is true to some extent. Many of the machines in use upon the land do the work of ten men. Then, again, we are pointed to the millions of acres of arable land that have been turned into permanent pasture in consequence of the pressure of foreign competition in corn. This process, it is said, is going on at the rate of 260,000 acres a year, the increase in grazing land in Great Britain in seventeen years amounting to 3,504,303 acres; and as four men to every 100 acres are required for arable land, and only one for pasture, this transformation will no doubt further account for the influx of the labourers into the towns.\* But this is only a partial explanation of the serious and continuous diminution of the rural population. What are the facts? Fifty years ago, one-fifth of the population of England was engaged in agriculture; now the proportion is less than one-tenth. At that time the number engaged on the land was one-half the labouring population; now it is less than a quarter. At the last census it was found that the agricultural

---

\* The same cause is beginning to operate in the United States. In Iowa and the middle Western States pauperism has doubled in amount in ten years. "The rural population in many parts of Iowa is growing steadily less and less, and the poor are crowding into the towns and cities. . . . Up to ten years ago grain-growing was the chief occupation; but it began to be found that it was more profitable to raise cattle. So the richer farmers and the banks and the money-lenders began to get possession of the smaller farms by purchase and by the foreclosure of mortgages, and to turn them into cattle-ranges. This policy is being steadily followed, and dispenses with fully two-thirds of the work needed in the old way of farming. As the small farmers sell out, they go west, but the labourers and renters crowd into the towns and bid against each other for the little employment that is to be had. It is inevitable that they cannot get a sufficient livelihood. In winter or in sickness they must have help or perish."—*New York Christian Advocate*, Jan. 21, 1886.

class in England and Wales had decreased by more than 31 per cent. in twenty years, while in the same period the general population had steadily increased. Thus this class has been decreasing at the rate of over 80,000 a year. But the decrease in arable land will only account for a decrease of 8,000 at the most; and the displacement of labour by machinery, especially in recent years, is comparatively inappreciable. How then shall we explain the larger portion of this portentous decrease? In these hard times, have the farmers, in order to reduce their labour bills, pursued the penny-wise policy of stinting the land of labour? It is to be feared that many of them have. Something too must be set down to the comparative dulness and monotony of country life, to the spread of education and of information, and to increased facilities for travelling. Due weight must be given to all these causes and considerations. But still the main cause is to seek.

To begin with the agricultural labourer, about whom we are especially concerned. Since this REVIEW began to plead his cause, now nearly thirty years ago, some improvement has taken place in the labourer's condition. As a rule, he is better housed and clothed and fed; but this is not saying much. His condition at that time was deplorable; it is still very far from enviable. In the Midlands and the South of England his wages ranged from 7s. to 9s. per week; they now range from 10s. to 15s. Taking the whole country, and making every allowance for extras, a liberal estimate would only give an average of 16s. or 17s. a week. Out of this he has to pay house rent and provide the necessaries of life for his usually numerous family, to say nothing of preparing against sickness, accident, loss of work, and old age. No wonder that he should be always on the verge of pauperism. No wonder that he should still be found in wretched hovels such as those which were described in the Report of the Royal Commission of 1867 as "deplorable," "detestable," "a disgrace to a Christian community," &c.—hovels in which comfort is a rarity, modesty a miracle, and health next to impossible.\* The standard of

---

\* This old report is far from obsolete. At the Church Congress of 1884 Mr. Stubbs described the cottages in his late parish of Granborough as typical of the

comfort is steadily rising, but unfortunately the general idea of a fitting house for a labourer has outstripped not only the provision of such houses, but the labourer's means of paying for them. Nor is this the worst of his position. Not only is he "cabined, cribbed, confined" in the matter of house accommodation by reason of his scanty wage; he has no means of augmenting his income. In many cases he cannot get a bit of land on which to labour in his leisure hours, and thus earn the necessary rent. Any little surplus capital he may have in the shape of strength to labour, he is unable to invest in the only way possible to him. There is no scope for any enterprise that may have been awakened in him. There is no "career" open to him. His lot at best is a hard and at worst a hopeless one. The very fact that he is so ready to change it is proof sufficient that his condition is intolerable. His love of rural life, his taste for rural labour, have not sensibly diminished; but he is fast becoming discontented, and unless something is done, and done speedily and effectually, to improve his position and his prospects, it is clear that the better class of labourer at all events will not remain upon the land.

Neither the farmer nor the landlord is in so hopeless a plight as the average labourer, but both of them are hampered in quite needless ways. In spite of all that has been done for him by recent legislation, the English farmer, even in better times, is beset with many difficulties and disabilities. With him lack of capital is a chronic evil, but of late this evil has been aggravated by a series of calamities, under which he is still staggering. As a class they never have possessed half the capital they might well have used, nor do they now possess

---

state of the labourers' dwellings in Bucks, Berks, and Oxon generally. "The village," he said, "had in it fifty cottages. Of these only four could in any sense be classed as satisfactory. Only three had more than two bedrooms; seventeen had only one; of these, eight, on sanitary grounds, were condemned as unfit for human habitation." Mr. Stubbs then gave statistics, obtained from 187 parishes by the Oxford Diocesan Conference, confirmatory of his own statements, and concluded by saying that "the present need for suitable cottages was urgent and desperate," and by expressing the opinion that "the nation could not afford to await the doubtful action of such slow eventualities as the law of supply and demand, or a possible rise in the class standard of comfort."



by many millions as much as they owned ten years ago. As for enterprise, indeed they cannot altogether be acquitted when accused of lack of that, so long as they allow the foreigner to send us year by year so many millions worth of produce that they might profitably grow.\* But let us be just to the farmer. He is not altogether to blame for want of enterprise or capital. He lacks liberty as much as either. The law of distress, *e.g.*, must greatly hamper him. So long as the landlord has a priority of claim for his rent over other creditors the farmer's credit with tradespeople and bankers must seriously be injured, and the capital he needs to increase his produce, or to vary it so as to compete with foreigners, or to enable him to tide over bad seasons and times of depression, and to meet the various accidents and emergencies of agriculture, must be withheld. We know what is usually said in favour of this law, but after mature consideration we are convinced that it is as injurious in practice as it is unjust in principle, and we hope it will soon be repealed. Another thing that ties the farmer's hands and "dulls the edge of husbandry" is want of complete security for the capital he invests in the land. Under the amended Holdings Act he is safe enough if he leaves his farm; but if he stays on, he is always liable to a rise of rent on his own improvements. How this evil is to be obviated it is not easy to see. The plan advocated by the Farmers' Alliance is obviously unfair, and would substitute still greater evils for those it seeks to cure. What the Alliance asks for is "continuity of tenure, with right of free sale of holding by the tenant." Such a demand will not be granted by any righteous and enlightened Government, least of all by one that is seeking to multiply freeholders and promote free trade in land. The two ideas—free trade and fixity of tenure—are mutually destructive. If a man, by dint of industry and self-denial, saves enough money to buy a piece of land, he ought surely to be free either to till it himself or to let it to whomsoever he will, and on what conditions he will. And yet the State is urged to say,

---

\* Value of such produce imported in 1884:—Butter, £12,543,455; cheese, £5,001,635; eggs, £2,910,493; beet sugar, £4,452,851. Fruit, vegetables, poultry, &c., no returns.

that if the man lets his land, his tenant shall become part-owner with himself, and that some trifling outlay on the part of the tenant—perhaps a twentieth of his own—shall give the tenant the right to sell his occupancy to some one else. The thing is preposterous. What prudent man would invest his money in land under such conditions? and what would be the effects upon present landowners if this proposal became law? What would be its effects on all concerned? We cannot stop to enumerate them all, nor have we space for the grounds of our judgment; but to our mind nothing would so surely check the outflow of capital from the pockets of the landowner, nothing would tend so certainly in the long run to cramp the energies of the farmer himself, and nothing would so speedily blight the hopes of the labourer as this one-sided and unchartered freedom. The landlord is as much entitled to security for his capital as the tenant. Equity demands that in exact proportion to their investment both shall share in the proceeds of the common undertaking. The land will never yield its utmost increase, and the labourer's condition be improved, until the relations between landlord and tenant are fairly adjusted, and until both of them in this way are encouraged and enabled to put into the soil the energy, intelligence, and capital it needs.

Many of the restrictions until recently existing upon landlords in the disposal of their interests in land have been removed. The law of primogeniture, by which in cases of intestacy landed property goes to the eldest son, though seldom operative, is still in force, and ought to be repealed. The large owners usually dispose of their property by settlements and the smaller ones by will; but as the balance of reason and justice and the overwhelming weight of opinion are alike against the law, it seldom finds an advocate, and admits of no defence. Not so the custom of settlement. This is strenuously defended, not merely by those who are directly interested in the maintenance of the territorial system, but by many who believe that the balance of evidence is in favour of the advantages, from every point of view—economical, social, and political—of arrangements which enable a man to gratify the instinctive and honourable desire to found a family and per-

petuate his name. Such a desire is both natural and Christian, and is often more powerful in its operation and far more beneficial to the community than the mere desire to accumulate wealth. No one objects to settlements of personal property. No one with a moderate income and with ordinary prudence and affection would allow his daughter to marry without some guarantee for her comfort and happiness in case of profligacy or misfortune on the part of the husband. No one, at least not many, would deny that it is right that a man should be allowed to provide prospectively for any living person, and, if he likes, for any unborn children of such person. To forbid such arrangements would be wantonly and needlessly to interfere with the family affairs of all the upper and middle classes in this country ; to weaken appreciably, if not to paralyze, some of the strongest motives to industry and self-denial ; to prevent the exercise of that precaution that is necessary to Englishmen ; and to go against those parental instincts which are amongst the most deep-seated and beneficent forces of Nature. The principle of settlements is sound enough ; but there are limits within which it may be wise to confine its operation. No one would wish to revive the law of perpetual entail—*e.g.*, by which a particular piece of land could be handed down to a man's heirs for ever. So long as estates could be so settled as to be inalienable all kinds of evils arose. Sometimes the owner was embarrassed, and could neither cultivate the land, nor improve it, nor sell it. It was therefore found necessary to limit the power of entailing by settlements of various kinds, and to surround these settlements by conditions and precautions calculated to secure the common weal. So far have these limitations been carried that, with the exception of a few properties purchased with public money and given as a reward for signal services, there is not an acre of land which cannot now be sold by some person or persons now living. Lord Cairns' Settled Land Act of 1882 falls short of the wishes of many land law reformers ; but it has effected a greater change both in practice and in law than most who speak and write upon the subject seem to be aware. It has effectually removed every legal obstacle to the free alienation of real estate. There is nothing whatever to prevent any life-owner, if he be anxious

to sell, from bringing his estate into the market. Limited owners are still hampered by provisions which have been deemed necessary for the protection of "incumbrancers" and "remaindermen;" "yet," to quote from Mr. Greenwood's valuable little book,

"it is only necessary to glance through the long list of reported cases, in which questions arising under the Act have already been decided by the Court, to satisfy the most sceptical that, even during the three years of commercial and agricultural depression which have elapsed since the Act came into operation, the beneficent powers of that Act have been very great."\*

A statement to the same effect was made by the President of the Incorporated Law Society at one of its meetings last year. What is needed further for the relief of landowners and for facilitating free trade in land is the clearance of the soil from past encumbrances, some means of cheap and easy transfer, and some method by which titles may be simplified. It is estimated that the landed gentry of England are indebted to the amount of £250,000,000; and it cannot be doubted that large numbers of them, if not actually bankrupt, are greatly embarrassed. As a natural consequence, many estates are sadly neglected, if not out of cultivation altogether; cottages are few and ruinous; the land is undrained and untilled; and the whole neighbourhood is kept in a state of stagnation and misery. Why should not creditors have power, with the sanction of some court, to force a sale of such property? And what is to hinder the establishment of a general registry of titles of land, such as is to be found in most civilized countries? Conveyance by the entry of the purchaser's name on the register, and at a reasonable cost, would do more to promote the sale of land than almost anything of which we can think.† What hinders and hampers both buyer and seller at present is chiefly the cost (about 3 per cent.), the difficulty and the risk of transfer; and what constitutes the difficulties and uncertainties attendant upon transfer is the

---

\* *Our Land Laws as they Are*, p. 104.

† Mr. Elphinstone, an experienced modern conveyancer, contributed a well-thought-out scheme for the registration of titles to the *Law Quarterly* for January 1886.

"tortuous and ungodly jumble" into which (to use the often-quoted phrase of Cromwell) the English law of real property has been brought by the ingenious devices of generations of lawyers. Before the transfer of land can be made simple, cheap, and easy, the technicalities of the law must by some means be removed. Perhaps the best means are those suggested by Sir J. F. Stephen in the *National Review* for February. We extract the gist of his proposals, but the whole article is well worth studying. He suggests a Bill of which the following would be the main indispensable outlines:—

"1. From the       day of       , all property whatever shall be, and shall be deemed, to be personal property. Estates in land shall cease to exist. All property shall descend on the death of its owner according to the law now relating to the distribution of personal property. . . . 2. All property may be effectually transferred, bequeathed, and otherwise dealt with by any instrument which is now effectual for the conveyance of personal property. . . . 3. All owners of property shall have the same power of settling and dealing with property, either by will or by deed, as they now have with respect to personal property, and no other."

Several cognate branches of the law, such as those which relate to prescription, mortgages, copyholds, &c., would need to be revised and adjusted, and provision would have to be made for adapting the old system to the new, so that in the transition no existing interest should be affected, and no reasonable expectation disappointed; and this of course would need the utmost skill and care. But it is surely within the competence of experts, and need not strain the virtue of fair-minded men.

By some such means as these free trade in land might be facilitated and secured with the least possible amount of friction and disturbance, and with countless advantages to the community. To make a sober if a somewhat sanguine forecast—as a direct result of these reforms, much land would come into the market. Large owners would sell considerable portions of their estates: the bad landlords in order to enjoy themselves and to rid themselves of irksome burthens, the good ones in order to obtain the means of improving their central and ancestral domains, and to provide more amply

and more equitably for their younger sons and for their daughters. By a beneficial process of natural selection the worst landlords will—for the change is sure to come—be weeded out; the soil, in lots of various sorts and sizes will pass from hand to hand, from embarrassed and incompetent to more affluent and capable owners; from those who have neither the ability nor the inclination to those who have both aptitude and eagerness to bring their estates into the highest and most profitable state of cultivation, and to enjoy the privileges and discharge the duties incident to property in land. The process of disintegration and diffusion may not be, probably will not be, a rapid one, but it will be none the worse on that account. In course of time a new and better rural *bourgeoisie* will spring up; new capital and industry will develop the resources of the soil; a farmer and a peasant proprietary will gradually be formed from the present holders of land, and from members of the trading and professional classes with spare capital and a taste for country life; hamlets will swell into villages, and villages into thriving little towns; our rural economy will be enlarged and liberalized; new life will be breathed into every trade and industry throughout the land; and, best of all—though this will be a cause as much as a consequence of this increased prosperity—a broad, bright path will be opened up along which the long-neglected agricultural labourer may advance to independence, comfort, and a larger share in the amenities of life.

Another forecast, made by Mr. Brodrick, may be mentioned here, and some of his opinions and suggestions quoted with approval, coinciding as they do with those that follow of our own:—

“Whatever form the rural economy of England may assume in future years, we cannot doubt that room will be found in it for a considerable extension of cottage farming. To justify such an extension, it is superfluous to invoke continental experience, and the arguments in its favour are too strong to require the aid of legislative intervention. For many years past the difficulty of retaining the best class of labourers in rural districts, and that of building cottages to pay a fair percentage on their cost price, have been among the standing complaints of landlords and farmers. Now, it is plain that both these difficulties may be mitigated,

if not overcome, by a return towards the ancient practice of attaching plots of land to labourers' dwellings."\*

For many years some of our largest landowners have adopted this plan, and last year two influential associations were formed for the voluntary extension of the allotment system and for the encouragement of small holdings and of peasant properties. The "*Small Farm and Labourers' Land Company*," which was formed at a meeting at Willis's Rooms last spring, and of which Lord Thurlow is chairman and Lord Wantage vice-chairman, aims at multiplying not only small occupiers but small owners. The latter nobleman gave the company an estate to start with at Lambourne in Berks, and the results of this wise and generous experiment will be watched with eager interest. In suitable localities and under favourable conditions small farms ought to prove a success, especially if they are devoted to the production of fruit and vegetables, milk and butter, eggs and poultry, and the hundred other minor edibles for which there might easily be created a practically unlimited demand. Evidence in abundance is furnished by both Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Impey of the superior productiveness of small holdings on which the spade is freely used—evidence from English sources amply justifying the Italian proverb, "Though the plough has a silver share, the spade has a golden edge." According to Sir James Caird, 390,000 of the 550,000 holdings in England are holdings of 50 acres and under. The impulse given to the subdivision of such holdings by the exigencies of agriculture will doubtless be further strengthened by that subdivision of ownership which we have already anticipated as one of the results of free trade in land. Under the additional stimulus of this new land company, therefore, there is every prospect that, without the intervention of those local authorities to which we shall presently refer, their number will be increased to the extent that it is reasonable to expect or to desire.

The other society of which we spoke is the association

---

\* *English Land*, &c., p. 427. The whole of this standard work is admirable. It covers the entire ground of the English land question, and easily holds the highest place, in point of style as well as of matter, amongst the numerous books we have consulted.

formed under the auspices of the Duke of Westminster and of the Earl of Onslow (who has accepted the post of honorary secretary) for the voluntary extension of the allotment system.\* That system has already been adopted by landowners possessing upwards of 1,500,000 acres in England and Wales, and it is stated in the prospectus that "a very large majority of these noblemen and gentlemen have expressed their willingness to devote a further portion of their estates to this purpose wherever tenants can be found." It is to be hoped that every large landowner in the country will be wise enough to follow this excellent example, and at once provide each labourer on their estates who wishes for them with a commodious cottage and a convenient allotment. That this can be done without loss, nay, with abundant profit of all kinds to all concerned, is proved by the experience of all who have adopted the practice, so far as we can learn. They have found how true is the Divine command with promise: "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, shall men give into your bosom." With a little land contiguous to his cottage, the labourer in his odds and ends of time may easily dig out of it gold enough to pay the rent for both of them, and have a surplus out of which to increase the comforts of his wife and children, and to make provision, if but scanty, for advancing and declining years. Mr. Stubbs' famous sample acre yielded an average profit during six years of depression and bad seasons of £9 16s. 6d. Some years the profit was more than £12; in no year was there a loss. The three acres devoted by Archdeacon Lea of Droitwich to fruit-growing, during fourteen years produced an average net profit of more than £100. And who has not heard of the successful allotments of pasture lands on Lord Tollemache's Cheshire estates? Every one of his labourers has offered to him, and now possesses (so his lordship has been good enough to inform us), three acres of pasture land near his cottage on which to keep a cow. Cow clubs are in operation, by means of which, at a small premium, the cattle are insured. As to where the cow comes from—that seems to be a mystery to

---

\* The temporary office is No. 7 Richmond Terrace, Whitehall, S.W.



Mr. Goschen and others ; for it is well known that on the Peckforton estates the labourers' wages do not average much above 12s. per week. But they forget La Fontaine's story about little Perette and her eggs. The eggs become chickens, the chickens are sold for a little pig, in time the pig gives place to a calf, and the calf grows into a cow. This process of transmigration is not unknown to thrifty and ingenious English labourers and their wives. By countless little shifts, by "the precious robberies of self-denial from every day's comfort," as Coleridge beautifully calls the savings of the poor, the little capital is scraped together, and a start is made. Lord Tollemache states that he has "never known an instance in this country of three acres being attached to a cottage without in a very short time a cow making its appearance." His lordship adds that both on his Cheshire and on his Suffolk estates (which are chiefly arable), the system of allotments and small holdings "works admirably."

We have not been able to ascertain even approximately the number of labourers' allotments in England. The number of labourers also is very difficult to ascertain. They are usually set down at 800,000 ; but whether this means the number in the United Kingdom or not we have failed to discover. Mr. Impey estimates that only half of them would need allotments. That would reduce the number to 400,000. How may the land be provided for them? First, there are the 250,000 acres or thereabouts in the hands of the Charity Commissioners already devoted to this purpose by the Act of 1882—an Act, by the way, which should be more stringently enforced. Then there are some of the Crown lands that might be utilized. The glebe land which so many of the clergy wish to let does not amount to much ; but it reminds us of an enormous quantity of land in many parts of the country that might easily be set free without violence or injustice to individuals present or to come. We refer to the land held in mortmain. Mr. Gladstone said at Dalkeith last November that there were "scores of millions of acres" of this kind of land in England ; but this must be a mistake, the total area of Great Britain being only about 76,000,000 acres. In another part of his speech he said "millions upon

millions." Suppose that there are only "millions" of acres suitably situated, these would furnish all the labourers need, and would probably bring the corporations that hold them an enormous increase on their present revenue. At all events, the suggestion is worthy of consideration. And last of all, there is the land that will be available through the operation of free trade, and through the voluntary agency of the landlords.

The only alternative proposal for the wider diffusion of landed property that we can notice is the one embodied in Mr. Jesse Collings' "Yeoman's Small Holdings and Allotments Bill." The principle of this Bill is, not free trade, but compulsory trade in land. It proposes to empower local councils to obtain land by forced sale, at market value, for the purpose of re-letting it, on certain conditions, to labourers and others in allotments of one to three acres, and in holdings up to 150 acres. This stupendous scheme is somewhat inchoate at present, but the idea at the bottom of it is that of making the proposed councils (among other things) into land societies with enormous powers of expropriation.

With some of the objects aimed at by the Bill we have the liveliest sympathy. We should like exceedingly to see a social ladder planted in the rural districts up which labourers by thrift and industry might climb from penury to plenty. But what if the lowest rungs were rotten, and what if most of the materials of which the ladder is constructed were stolen property?

Nothing, we believe, could be much further from the truth than to describe Mr. Collings' scheme as "the Budget of the Caucus for the purpose of bribing the rural electors." But every one must see the gravest danger in entrusting to rural councils the power of expropriating land. According to the constitution and the colour of the local authority for the time being, and especially after a heated election, obnoxious landlords would be in danger of having their estates expropriated, and that friendly voters would be favoured in the allocation hardly admits of reasonable doubt. In this way bitter seeds of greed and strife, of rancour and of enmity, would be sown in every nook and corner of the land. It is all very well to

say that the councils will be representative of all the rate-payers, and that Englishmen will see that justice is done ; but, when it is the electors themselves that are to be benefited, it seems to us a risk, and something more, to place in their hands this perilous power of patronage by means of confiscated land.

For, disguise it as we may, forced sale, in this case, is confiscation, even if a bonus be given by way of solace. Whenever land has been taken for railways, or for municipal improvements, or for any other public purpose, the owners have always been handsomely, some think excessively, compensated for the loss of that which has been tacitly recognized as their right of possession ; and this with equal justice and expediency. Compensation for disturbance has been well described as

“a fine paid by the State for an unexpected interference which it admits to be undesirable, and therefore wishes to make as exceptional as may be. And the reason why it pays the fine is, that it is of far more importance to the public that the sense of ownership should be strong and eager, and even peremptory, than that the State should be able to acquire property at easy rates. The one aim is at the root of all healthy social feeling, of all diligent acquisition, and of all salutary ambition. The other aim is quite a secondary one, often involving public convenience, but never involving the primary cement of society.”

When once the working classes get a little more property of their own, we shall hear less and less of “that blessed word compulsion.” To some of their leaders it may be a blessed word ; to us, as it one day will be to them, in any such connection, it is a hateful and an ominous word.

We are not careful to inquire into the history of the landed property of this country. Much of it probably would not come well out of the inquiry, especially if the inquest were pushed far enough back. Neither would much of the personal property. Imagine an inquest upon the wealth that has been acquired in trade and commerce and industry during the past century ! But for practical men all such inquiries are irrelevant. The titles of landowners in England to the use of their land, except by action of the State, are infeasible. No matter what may have been the origin of the

title to the soil, it is now held from the State. From one owner it has passed on to another through many generations and in many ways. Some of these ways have been very questionable no doubt, and some of them not questionable at all, but culpable in the highest degree. But purchase and prescription by the solemn sanctions of the law have concurred to ripen all these transfers and transactions into titles, which can only be upset by robbery or revolution.

With compensation and for an adequate public purpose enforced sale of land is no doubt legal, and has been not uncommon. Whether it is equitable is a different question, into which we will not enter. All we care to argue just now is, that to take land from individuals for the sake of letting it to a section of the community would be inexpedient and unjust, and that to take it without adequate compensation would be downright robbery. In explaining the provisions of the Bill we are considering, Mr. Impey, with natural and creditable inconsistency, says :

"If the public authority desires to take land again which has been let or sold, it would be able to do so, and would pay the owner or tenant for all unexhausted improvements, and *compensation besides for forced sale and disturbance of business and acts of husbandry.*" \*

That is all we contend for ; but as the same rule is not to be followed in dealing with present landowners, we must press the argument a little further.

What is the difference in principle between enforced sale of land without compensation and the depredations of the mob during the late riots in the West-end of London ? Will it be said that land is a monopoly ? So is all property. The terms are synonymous. The very idea of property is, that it belongs to me and not to any one else. If it be right to take my land without ample compensation, it is right to take my furniture, or my horse, or my house, or anything that is mine. Or will it be said that land is necessary to man ? So are many other things that no one proposes to expropriate—at least not yet. Bread, clothing, coffins, are even more necessary

---

\* *Three Acres, &c.*, p. 59.

to man than land. Would it therefore be right to take them from those who have, in order to give them or to sell them to those who have not? And if these local councils are going to supply land to all who ask for it, what will they say when asked for far more necessary things? The only difference we can see between the confiscation of land and the confiscation of mills or money, workshops or dwelling-houses, or anything else, is that the one is theft of real and the other of personal property; and we wonder that our neo-Radical capitalists and workmen do not see that if the principle is acted on in one case it will soon be acted on in all. In the interests of all classes, but especially in the interests of the labouring classes, many of whom have some "belongings" and all of whom are vitally concerned in keeping sacred and inviolate the idea and the reality of property, we protest against the doctrine fundamental to this ill-considered and portentous Bill. Is it too late to ask our agrarian friends to "ponder the path of their feet?" Is it too much to beg of them to proceed upon that path at least with cautious and with calculated steps? Is there not real danger of their unwittingly "goading ignorance into riot and fanaticism into rebellion?" Is it worth while, for the sake of increasing the comfort of a class, even if that could be accomplished by such means, to upset the very idea of property, and thus destroy that public credit which is the vital air of national industry and national prosperity?

Many other objections might be urged against the scheme, but they will find a better place perhaps in a wider and more thorough discussion, which we contemplate, of the legitimate functions of Government. Meanwhile, let us part in peace from those whose views we cannot share, whose views indeed we hold to be erroneous and pernicious to the last degree. We have striven to form a sober estimate of rival methods of attaining a common and to our mind a pre-eminently desirable end—namely, the fixing of the labourers on the land, in order, through its better cultivation, to secure the welfare of the labourers and of the community at large. Most heartily we recognize the good intentions, and the honesty, and the

often noble aims of those to whom we are opposed ; but then, in Mr. Goschen's weighty and far-reaching words, " we shall ill serve the common cause of increasing the sum of human happiness by ignoring dangers which surround the execution of even lofty purposes. Nor for the sake of quick and palpable reform is it always right to compromise the future. The flattering aspect of an immediate improvement must not blind us to sowing the seeds of future danger. We might sap the self-reliance of a class in order to remove some present abuse which other methods might even more effectually remedy."

---

#### ART. VI.—IRELAND UNDER THE TUDORS.

*Ireland under the Tudors, from 1509 to 1578 ; with a Brief Sketch of the Earlier History.* By RICHARD BAGWELL, M.A., of Clonmel. In two vols. London : Longmans. 1885.

**I**N reading Irish history, we are always being reminded of the old Greek myth which tells how the stone pushed to the top of the hill invariably came rolling down to the bottom. Everybody who takes the dismal subject in hand is condemned more or less to the fate of Sisyphus ; no sooner has he established his conclusion than it is all upset, and some one else tries to establish something similar, but in a different way. From Hallam's day, at any rate, the tale has been repeated with wearisome iteration that Ireland is as it is because England never did her work there thoroughly. Confiscating whole provinces, planting colonies under the strictest conditions (on paper) as to personal residence of the grantees and improvement of their grants, she has always shown the same foolish faith in human nature, and the same neglect to enforce provisions which were in every case evaded. That is, without romance, the plain story of the connection between the two islands. England interfered to prevent internal development ; to stop that growth from the tribal to the national state which was allowed to go on in Scotland because Scottish soil and climate were less tempting to an invader. But, while making

native law and order hopeless, England never set herself to enforce the alternative of law and order such as they were understood in Norfolk or Wiltshire. Scottish history is, as the history of every nation struggling out of the tribal state must be, written in blood; our own history during the long contest between the tribes of the so-called Heptarchy is no less bloody; Merovingian history is even worse. But in all these cases there was a successful striving towards unity. One tribe, one family, so far dominated all the rest as to furnish something wherewith other nations could treat or make war, feeling that in dealing with it they were dealing with a power which had a right to represent the whole. Irish history is not more bloody; but the difference is that, before the stage had been reached at which England arrived under Egbert and Scotland under Malcolm Ceanmore, an external force was thrust in, which threw the tribes back into anarchy, and, indeed, deliberately maintained itself by playing off one of them against the other. Here we are on firm ground; and, if writers on Irish history had taken their stand on this undoubted fact, real progress might have been made, and the Irish riddle, as far as it is connected with the past, might have been solved. England intervened at a time when nothing but complete conquest could have insured order and tranquillity; and, instead of attempting anything like complete conquest, she sat down as a disturbing power, trusting to the uncertain processes of absorption and assimilation. We have seen something of the same kind more than once in South Africa; and it is to be feared that our last experiment in Zululand is not likely to be more successful than were those in Ireland under the Plantagenets and Tudors. But, instead of recognizing this, every writer on Ireland has preferred to choose—in some instances to make—for himself ground which has always proved untrustworthy. Now it is, as with Mr. Froude, something in the Irish character which “makes Ireland the spendthrift sister of the Aryan family,” and which is so malignant, and at the same time so enticing, that it corrupted alike the Norman “civilizers” of Strongbow and the matter-of-fact colonists of Elizabeth. Now, on the other hand, it is something in the nature of the “English oppressor,” as if,

forsooth, the hand of any other invader would not have been just as heavy ; as if France, for instance, treated Brittany with more kindness and consideration than England displayed to Ireland. The difference was that France, annexing Brittany long after that dukedom had acquired a settled government, never attempted to confiscate whole districts or to upset existing interests ; while for England Ireland was for centuries what her Plantations in America afterwards became, a field for colonization, "the natives" being not heathen red men who dwindled away before the incoming whites, but a race as persistent as the English themselves, linked, moreover, to the invaders by a faith which those invaders were grudgingly forced to confess was the same as their own. Religion, indeed, was in early times the only thing which kept "the Celt" within the commonwealth of nations. The "mere Irishman," to kill whom was no felony, to intermarry with whom was a crime denounced by successive statutes, was still a fellow-Christian. A campaign against him could not by any ingenuity be represented as a crusade, though Pope Adrian IV. did his best to raise it to that level. The Irish were Christians, but with a difference ; and, as a necessary corollary to the tentative and inefficient mode of invasion, the distinction between the two peoples—the English garrison and the tribes which lay outside it—was accentuated by growing religious differences. The old Scotie Church, call it Patrician or Columban or what not, was monastic, was moulded to the needs of a people in the tribal state, not formally under the authority of Rome, though its greatest men always spoke and wrote with deep respect of the Roman patriarchate. Rome, in fact, had not fully formulated her supremacy when Ireland, owing to the Danish invasions, became almost cut off from the rest of Europe. She had tardily accepted the Roman ruling as to that old dispute, the keeping of Easter. She gave up, at Rome's bidding, the tonsure (from the forehead to the middle of the skull, leaving the back hair long) traditionally connected with St. John, though scoffers called it the tonsure of Simon Magus. These and other changes were adopted by the South of the island at the Council of Leighlin (A.D. 736) ; and at last the North, and even Iona itself, yielded to the argument that it



was not likely the whole civilized world would be in the wrong and a few outlying Scots in the right. When the English came over, therefore, the Irish Church was in full communion with Rome, though tribal wars made it very difficult to collect the unwonted impost of Peter's pence. But after the formation of an English "Pale," with a hierarchy wholly of English blood, the tendency to separation became greater and greater. Glendalough and Dublin furnish a typical case—close to each other, yet the former a native See based on the monastic system; the latter in foreign hands, and for some time dependent, not on Armagh, but on Canterbury. Hence, too, the native Church naturally declined. It was the Church of warring tribes, whose old feuds were nourished by the arts of the invaders and whose culture (in early times relatively very considerable) steadily decayed as war and rapine became more and more their normal state. At the Reformation this native Church had well-nigh lost its power as a humanizing agent to check licentiousness and cruelty. Unhappily, when England accepted a change of religion, she took, as usual, no heed whatsoever of the Irish outside her Pale. Their religious endowments, indeed, were seized, and their Church dignitaries were ordered to conform or to resign; but the new liturgy was to be read in English or Latin, not in the native tongue, and hence was lost an opportunity, which never recurred, of bringing in a people who certainly just then had no special affection for Rome and no close connection with her. Between the decay of their own Church and the neglect shown to them by the English Reformers, the native Irish were almost in danger of lapsing into heathenism. They could not accept Protestantism as it was presented (or, rather, not presented) to them; and at the same time political reasons kept most of the English of the Pale to the old faith, it being a standing rule with the English colony to oppose anything that came from the mother country. Thus the Reformation was checked in both directions, till the struggle had begun between England and the great Catholic Powers; and then Ireland, heretofore slighted by the Popes, had become important, because it could so easily be made a thorn in England's side. The first thing, therefore, was to keep it to the old faith; and this was secured

by the invasion of friars, of whom Mr. Bagwell says, speaking of Henry VIII.'s time :

"Religion was at an extremely low ebb, and only the friars preserved the memory of better days. Henry may have imagined that he could lead the people through the bishops and other dignitaries ; if so, he was entirely mistaken. The friars defied his power, and the hearts of the poor were with them. In Ireland, at least, it was Rome that undertook the work of popular reformation. The Franciscans and Jesuits endured cold and hunger, bonds and death, while courtly prelates neglected their duties, or were distinguished from lay magnates only by the more systematic nature of their oppressions. And thus, as the hatred of England daily deepened, the attachment of the Irish to Rome became daily closer " (vol. i. p. vii.).

Never was the way in which a movement originally political became intensely religious more clearly set forth than in these few words. Every effort of Henry to conciliate the Irish was frustrated by the very men who alone kept them Christian ; and when Elizabeth came to the throne she found herself confronted with a nation of zealots ready to rise in rebellion at the first hint of Spanish assistance. How the Church as by law established had fared in the interim is seen from the *Sydney Papers* (quoted vol. ii. p. 319). It had become a mere field for Englishmen seeking promotion.

"Out of 224 churches in the diocese of Meath, the richest and best-peopled in Ireland, 105 had passed into the hands of lay impropiators. In not one of these was there a resident parson or vicar ; and of the 'simple and sorry curates' appointed to do duty only eighteen could speak English, the rest being 'Irish priests, or, rather, Irish rogues, having very little Latin, less learning or civility.' They lived by the offertory. In no case was there a dwelling-house. Many of the churches were down, the great majority roofless. Out of the whole 224, only thirteen parishes were in such a state as the bishop (Brady) could approve. 'Your Majesty may believe [says Sydney] that upon the face of the earth where Christ is professed there is not a Church in so miserable a case.' Even the very sacrament of baptism seemed to have fallen into disuse."

That is the state to which bishops like Browne of Dublin and Bale of Ossory had reduced the English Pale. As early as 1550 Sir A. St. Leger, complaining of the decay of piety and the growth of immorality, said : "I never saw the land so

far out of good order ;" and things certainly did not improve in this respect under Elizabeth. Well may Mr. Bagwell remark : " Even if England had remained in communion with Rome, bishops who were Government officials first and chief pastors afterwards could scarcely have ministered successfully to O'Neils and O'Donnells." Her parsimony (which made poor Leicester's ragged soldiery, his "paddy persons," as he called them, a laughing-stock in the Netherlands) prevented her from being even as active as her father in the work of unifying Ireland ; and she certainly had a more difficult task, for along with the religious reaction had grown up a bitter hatred to England. So different had been the state of feeling under Henry VIII., that Mr. Bagwell says :

" had he continued to Defend the Faith in the original sense, he might have ended by attaching the native Irish to the Crown. By respecting for a time their tribal laws, by making one chief an earl and another a knight, by mediating in their quarrels, and by attending to their physical and spiritual wants, a Catholic Tudor might possibly have succeeded where Angevin and Plantagenet had failed."

Here, for a wonder, Mr. Bagwell is deserting safe ground, and he comes to a speedy fall in consequence. What might have happened had Henry remained Catholic no one can tell ; but that, although " he allowed Irish chiefs who visited his Court to bask in the sunshine of royal favour," he would ever have seriously acted as what Mr. Bagwell calls " a patriot king " will be doubted by those who have read the *State Papers relating to Ireland*, in the first volume of which (1515) it is said that, " if the King were as wise as Solomon the sage, he shall never subdue the wild Irish to his obedience without dread of the sword ; nay, so long as they may resist and save their lives, they will never obey the King." In this is struck the first note of that dirge which rings out in a State Paper of a few years later : " Take from them their corn ; burn and destroy the same ; and then have their cattle and beasts. For in these two things the very living of the Irishry doth clearly consist." Henry was, in fact, as Machiavellian in disposition as his daughter, but he lacked opportunity. In fact, no writer can fitly deal with the Tudor reigns who does not recognize the profound dissimulation which seems a moral

epidemic of the time, so thoroughly does it characterize high and low, from princes down to their humblest agents.

But it is not often that Mr. Bagwell errs by placing himself on an imaginary standing-ground. The peculiarity of his work is, that it is throughout less a history than a chronicle. "The historian's office," he says, "is that of the judge, whose duty it is to marshal all the material facts with just so much of comment as may enable his hearers to give them their due weight. The reading public is the jury." And his own aim being "not to please any party or school," his comments are of the briefest. Indeed, to carry on the figure with which we began, there is in his case no fear of his stones rolling to the bottom at the touch of adverse criticism; for he never pushes them up hill at all. Fact after fact he leaves lying on the level surface instead of forcing them to crown some unstable mound of theory. Herein he is just the opposite of Mr. Froude; and thus his mere narrative will be a relief to those who are weary of having all the thinking done for them, and who resent Mr. Froude's habit of insisting on conclusions which, if the reader does manage to pause and think, he feels are untenable. Of course such a method is fatal to that picturesqueness, which in this sensational age everybody looks for in a historian. An annalist is not called on to be picturesque; a judge leaves flights of rhetoric to the counsel on either side. Such a method also presupposes in the reader a power of reading between the lines, and of grouping and arranging facts, which very few possess. But for those whom some previous knowledge of the subject has prepared to profit by Mr. Bagwell's careful statements, the result can hardly fail to be what he says "it must be, if Irish history is really studied for the truth's sake—viz., to make men more tolerant." There is so much to be said on both sides; so seldom has any one—native chief or invader; so-called rebel or royal emissary—a wholly stainless record, or one, on the other hand, in which there is no redeeming brightness. Perhaps, as a whole, the followers of Strongbow have less to be said in their favour than any who went over after them. Prompted only by their own greed, they forced their way among the native tribes, making national progress impossible,

and themselves degenerating as rapidly as they degraded those among whom they settled. Mr. Froude, in his *English in Ireland*, tells us the Normans came as "civilizers," and failed because the contagion of Irish manners was too strong for them. Whether these Normans would under similar circumstances have had a very civilizing influence in England or not, may be judged from their behaviour in Stephen's reign, when the strong curb of the able and masterful kings who had previously held them in check was removed. In Ireland the controlling power was so weakened by distance that from 1170 to 1509 it was one long Stephen's reign; and the sole legacy of Norman "civilization" was the feud between the Yorkist Geraldines and the Lancastrian Butlers, protracted till the close of Elizabeth's reign, and with her help carried out to the bitter end with circumstances of frightful cruelty. For Elizabeth and her agents there is much more to be said than for the Normans. They could no more leave Ireland to itself than we at the present time can allow a separation. England was fighting for her existence as an independent Power; and the wonder is that Philip II., instead of wavering between Fitzgibbon and Stukeley, between the Irish and the English refugee, should not have made a serious attempt on Ireland, rather than use her, as Mr. Bagwell says, merely "as a pawn in his game." The Armada at Cork or Galway would have met with little resistance; and the permanent establishment of the Spaniards would have changed the face of history even more thoroughly than if de Tourville had been victorious at Beachy Head, or Louis XIV. had made up his mind to keep James II. in Ireland. Elizabeth was forced to do all she could to hold the island; and, having small means, she worked by statecraft, setting chief against chief, clan against clan, and not disdaining still baser measures, as when Sussex attempted to poison Shane O'Neil (1563), and Essex at a great merry-making seized, and carried to Dublin for execution, Brian O'Neil and his wife, murdering at the same time the chief's people, with whom he had been peaceably feasting (1574). Moreover, Elizabeth's Deputies had some excuse in the temper of the men with whom they had to deal. Thanks to the disintegrating effect of the Anglo-Norman invasion, the Irish had got into such a

state of universal feud that not even the hope of shaking off the English yoke could hold them together. It was mainly with Irish troops that Desmond in the South and O'Neil in the North were fought down. Maguire and O'Hanlon were "Queen's Irish." O'Donnell was generally on the English side against the chief of the eastern half of Clan Connel—the O'Neil. Even when for a moment a grand confederacy seemed formed to support the promised Spanish invasion, there were almost as many Irish on the English side as there were against them. This disposition on the part of the natives of course increased the English engeriness to play off one clan against another and, for the sake of present security, to make stable order and social progress impossible. Nations have even less conscience than corporate bodies. No honest man, however desperate his struggle to keep himself from sinking, thinks for a moment of maintaining his own position by degrading friend or neighbour. But a nation, in the struggle for existence, has no such scruples. England undoubtedly held her ground in Ireland at the cost of degradation to large numbers of the Irish. It is easy to say the Irish should have resisted instead of inviting degradation. Unhappily, a people in the tribal state are never able to hold nobly together; they inevitably yield a large crop of traitors and unpatriotic hirelings; and the worst of it is that this evil seed lasts long after the circumstances in which it was first gendered have passed away. The Irish character of to-day still bears the stamp of evil impressed on it in the miserable struggle which, thanks to Elizabeth's pitiful policy, dragged on all through her reign, and was even bequeathed to her successor. What she did was this: she so thoroughly weakened the whole of the native race—taking it in detail, and waging war with desolating cruelty—that James had a very easy task. The strength for resistance was gone; and therefore his Plantation succeeded, while former attempts, like that of Sir Thomas Smith in 1572, had completely failed. Mr. Bagwell does not enlarge on the cruelties of Elizabeth's wars; he is almost as terse as the Irish annalists of whose jejuneness he complains. But what he says suffices to show the method adopted, which was certainly thorough enough to satisfy Mr. Froude. "Everything that would burn

was burned " (it is of Maltby's raid into Burkes' country that he speaks), "and every person met with was killed. . . . Maltby's soldiers were chiefly Irishmen, and but lately open enemies, who under strict military discipline became all that a general could desire"—showing their soldierly qualities by killing in cold blood the garrison of a strong castle whom their leader "put to their misericordia." And Maltby is a very favourable specimen of the sort of captain whom Elizabeth employed. His remarks on the Irish character are well worth quoting (to Walsingham, 1577):—

"To do good among this rude nation, travail, industry, and plain dealing must be applied well; and plausible dealing doth prevail much in some of them; and in others rigour doth no hurt, so as every one of them must be used in their conditions. They be a people that do now seek much unto the administration of justice, and do greatly seem to covet it, which, God willing, they shall not want, with the best advice that I am able to give them."

Clearly Maltby could not, so long as he adhered to these principles, act as Sussex and Essex did to the O'Neils, or as Coshy, seneschal of Queen's County, did to the O'Mores at Mullaghmast. Of this latter massacre Mr. Bagwell fully indorses the verdict of the Lough Cé annalist: "no uglier deed was ever committed in Erin."\* Had Mr. Bagwell continued his history to the end of Elizabeth's reign, he would have found far greater cruelties to describe; indeed, he would not have been able to tell his tale without describing them. But he breaks off abruptly at the close of Sidney's administration, showing that his title is a misnomer, for "Ireland under the Tudors" certainly cannot be understood without the closing years of Elizabeth. If herein he fails to be as good as his word, in another direction he is better, for he devotes 123 pages to a succinct history of pre-Tudor times, in which he takes care to show how (as we said) the natives lost, under pressure of the original invasion and of subsequent inroads, nearly all remnants

---

\* Dowling, Chancellor of Leighlin, an almost contemporary authority, writes: "Rory O'More, sub umbra servitii accersitus collusorie, et super quadam protectione, interfectus fuit apud Mullaghmaslyn cum suis."

of that culture which the Danes had begun to destroy in the ninth century of our era.\*

In this sketch he points out that

"the existence of the Irish pentarchy, Ulster, Leinster, Connaught, Munster, and Meath (the Middle, the hereditary appanage of the over-king), was as real as that of any similar confederacy among nations in the tribal state, and the means of enforcing the over-king's orders were not very different from or less effective than in many federal States, ancient, mediæval, and modern. . . . The Irish central power was not always strong enough to enforce rights; but neither were the German Emperors always able to enforce their decrees against the princes and nobles of the Empire; and in numerous instances the decisions of the imperial chancery might be regarded in precisely the same light as those of the Brehons—as mere arbitrations."

This is a sufficient answer to those who assert that "the Irish have always shown themselves incapable of self-government;" their government was quite as efficient as that of any people under similar conditions—indeed, as that of some who had advanced far beyond them in material progress. While to slight the Brehon Code, and say that in native Ireland there was no law properly so called, "is wholly irreconcilable with actual facts, and especially with the existence of a rich and elaborate nomenclature of native terms not borrowed from Roman law. *This nomenclature implies an equally elaborate machinery.*" Over these tribes Mr. Bagwell is disposed to think the influence of Christianity was less powerful than we generally imagine. Quoting Dr. Sullivan, of Cork, he says:

"The Irish Church organization, being, unlike the diocesan and centralized system of the Latin Church, acephalous, was ill calculated to influence the social habits and political life of the people. Hence a high spiritual life and intellectual cultivation within the numerous cenobiums was quite compatible with practical paganism and disorder outside."

He might have added that even where the Latin system was most thoroughly developed there was often such a large amount of practical paganism as to drive people of tender consciences

---

\* This early Irish culture was one of those "egg-shell civilizations" which have been unable to stand against rude shocks.



to adopt the monastic life. In glancing at the old land system, he remarks that

"English statesmen in the sixteenth century (Sir John Davies and others) probably made as many mistakes about tenures in Ireland as their representatives in the eighteenth and part of the nineteenth made about tenures in India. Good faith may be generally granted in both cases, but the blunders made were no less disastrous."

Primogeniture was certainly no Celtic usage; it is no part of the law of Nature, though the Tudor lawyers treated it almost as a necessary element in the eternal fitness of things. Another proof that neither feudal ideas nor the canon law were prevalent in Celtic Ireland is the persistence of that blood-fine or composition for murder which was originally common to all the Aryan race. And at this point Mr. Bagwell, who had previously rather lamented the fact that "Ireland never knew the Roman Peace, Agricola never having carried out his intention of conquering it," makes some remarks on the way in which the English invasion was conducted, so as to bring, not peace, but a never-sheathed sword, which are worthy of careful study.\*

"Irish history cannot be understood," he says, "unless the fact is clearly grasped that the development of the tribal system was violently interrupted by a feudal half-conquest. The Angevin and Plantagenet kings were strong enough to shake and discredit the native polity, but they had neither power nor inclination to feudalize a people which had never gone through the preliminary stages. When the Tudors brought a more steadfast purpose and better machinery to the task, they found how hard it was to evolve order out of the shattered remnants of two systems which had the same origin, but which had been so brought together as to make complete fusion impossible. . . . The Tudor lawyers and statesmen could hardly even attempt to look at jarring systems from the outside. They could not do in the sixteenth century what only the most enlightened Anglo-Indians can do in the nineteenth. They were more civilized than the Irish, but not educated enough to recognize the common ancestor. That there was a common ancestor, and that neither party could recognize him, is the key to Anglo-Irish history both before and after Tudor times."

---

\* See also, in Lecky's *Eighteenth Century*, the same point insisted on in reference to the different way in which Scotland and Ireland have fared under the English connection.

The Danish incursions, which fell with peculiar fury on Ireland, spreading their influence over two-thirds of the island, instead of confining them (as in England) to a Danelaw, were a great help to the incoming English. In the Danes they found a kindred people who, when they accepted Christianity, went to Canterbury, and not to Armagh, for their bishops, and who had built the sea-coast towns which enabled Strongbow's followers to keep a firm grip upon the island. Towards the end of the tenth century the Dal-Cais, or West Munster tribes, inhabiting the present county of Clare, made head against the Danes, and, burning Limerick, succeeded in driving them out of the whole neighbourhood. They were under two brothers, Mahon and Brian. The former was murdered by some Irish who took sides with the Danes, and then Brian conceived the idea of combining the parts of Egbert of Wessex and Alfred. He reduced the Danes of Waterford, and soon felt himself strong enough to join the over-king Malachi in storming Dublin. The conquest was complete. "There was not [says the annalist] a winnowing-sheet from Howth to the furthest point of Kerry that had not a foreigner in bondage on it, nor was there a quern [handmill] without a foreign woman." Sitric son of Olaf was reinstated as subject-king of Dublin, and Malachi subsided into the kingdom of Meath, giving up the over-kingship to Brian. Sitric, however, urged on by his mother, Olaf's widow, whom Brian had married and (as her former husband did) had repudiated, formed a great Norse confederacy, including Sigurd Earl of Orkney, Brodir the Viking, &c., and, throwing off his allegiance, was defeated at Clontarf (1014), at the close of which battle Brian fell. His monarchy fell with him, and Mr. Bagwell sees no signs, during the 150 years which elapsed between Clontarf and Strongbow's landing, of any process of consolidation. "A feudal system which had lost none of its vigour was [he says] confronted with a tribal system which had lost none of its inherent weakness." Sir H. S. Maine, on the other hand (*Origin of Institutions*), thinks that one tribe had very nearly established its supremacy, and would soon have done so completely but for the armed intervention of England. At any rate, the Dal-Cais had ceased to be the premier tribe; in Henry II.'s reign

the contest for the over-kingship was between the O'Conors and the O'Neils, and the latter seem to have been the stronger of the two. Five years after Strongbow's landing, a treaty was made between Henry II. and Roderic O'Connor which throws a good deal of light on the English king's intentions. He was to hold Dublin and Waterford "with their appurtenances," Meath, Wexford, and "those lands which were in the hands of his barons." In return, he was to confirm O'Connor in the over-kingship, and to help him if he should be unable to maintain his authority. Clearly he had no idea of a full conquest; he knew this was beyond the power of a feudal army. His policy was to balance the adventurers and the native princes against each other. Still, he did not interfere to stop Anglo-Norman aggression, nor does any Irish chief seem to have thought of appealing to him for protection. The annexation went on so rapidly that at the date of Henry's death the coast from Larne to Cork was strongly held by the invaders. They were also firmly established on the south side of the Shannon estuary, and they held the central plain almost as far west as the Shannon, while De Courcy had pushed on far into Ulster. John divided the barons' land into twelve shires, and left the island in such good order that, but for the feuds among the colonists and the neglect consequent on the French wars (which even drained the land of Anglo-Irish and "King's Irish" and provisions), things might have progressed along the line of permanent assimilation. As it was, the colony grew weaker; the contending barons sought Irish aid in their quarrels, and began to adopt Irish customs, naturally choosing the evil and leaving out the good. In this way De Burgos, Berminghams, &c., took native names, and became "more Irish than the Irish." With the view of counterbalancing the growing influence of the natives, Edward III. added to the earldom of Kildare (to which his father had raised the Geraldine Fitz-Thomas) the earldoms of Desmond (also Geraldine) and Ormonde (conferred on the Fitz-Walters, the founder of which family Henry II. had made hereditary butler). The result wholly failed to justify the King's sagacity, and till the destruction of Desmond in Elizabeth's reign Irish history is largely made up of the quarrels between the Geraldines and

the Butlers, with one or other of whom the Viceroy (when he was not one of themselves) almost invariably took sides. The colony steadily declined, and the Statutes of Kilkenny, passed at a Parliament held by Lionel Duke of Clarence in 1367, by sharply distinguishing between the two races, laid the foundation of all the subsequent misery and ill-feeling. So far was Edward III. from dreaming of carrying out Henry II.'s promise of equal justice to native chiefs and English colonists, that the natives are styled "the Irish enemy;" marriage, and even concubinage, with natives is declared high treason; so is supplying them with horses or armour; English and Irish living inside "the Pale" are to speak English only, to bear English names, and to ride and dress in English style on pain of forfeiture. War with the Irish is inculcated as a solemn duty, the end aimed at being that "the Irish enemy" should be finally destroyed. Such are the chief civil enactments of a Statute which was as mischievous in its way as the subsequent Penal Laws. In religion also it drew the line between Irish and English in a manner quite opposed to Henry II.'s practice. He made O'Sealbhaigh, an Irishman, bishop of the Danish See of Waterford, and sent him to the Archbishop of Cashel to be consecrated, thus showing that he wished natives and foreigners to be as one in regard to the Church. The Kilkenny Statutes, on the contrary, provided that any one who presented an Irishman to any preferment among the English of the Pale was *ipso facto* excommunicated, and the presentation was to lapse to the Crown. On the same principle, religious houses in the Pale were strictly forbidden to receive Irish monks or nuns. The only edict that one can look upon with satisfaction is that which punished private war among the English as high treason, and which forbade the keeping of idle kernes at other people's expense. The effect of these Statutes, during the century ending in 1485, Mr. Bagwell sums up thus:—"The English, in trying to become perfectly English, had shrunk almost to nothing; the Irish, by being held always at arm's length, had become more Irish and less civilized than ever." There had been no lack of "government" in the interval. Richard II. was twice in Ireland. Each time he brought nearly 30,000 men; and on the second visit he had a sacred

flask of oil which had been sent down from heaven to Becket when he was praying at the shrine of St. Columba. Yet a single chieftain, Art MacMurrough, checked his advance for eleven days; indeed, "this chief may be said to have crowned the House of Lancaster," for Richard stayed so long in the hope of chastising him that when he landed at Milford he found his cause ruined. For a moment, Talbot, in the beginning of Henry V.'s reign, gave promise of better things; but his salary fell into arrear, and his unpaid soldiers became a worse scourge to the colony than the Irish had been. All this time absenteeism had been growing among the great landowners; and then came the War of the Roses, during which Richard Duke of York, made Deputy in 1449, created a strong Yorkist party. This party at once recognized Simnel, whom even the native annalists speak of as an undoubted prince; and one of the most amusing scenes in Mr. Bagwell's book is the description of a dinner at which Henry VII. entertained the Anglo-Irish nobles whom he had summoned to London. "My masters of Ireland," said the King, "you will crown apes next;" and, to give point to the remark, he ordered Simnel to hand wine to those who had so lately assisted at his "coronation." "None would take the cup out of his hand, but bade the great devil of hell take him before that ever they saw him. 'Bring me the wine if it be good,' said the lord of Howth, being a merry gentleman, 'and I shall drink it off for the wine's sake and for mine own sake also; and for thee, as thou art, so I leave thee a poor innocent.'" Just before Henry's accession the entire standing army consisted of 200 men raised by the thirteen members of the Brotherhood of St. George, who were chosen out of the chief landowners of "the four obedient shires," Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare. The Butlers were excluded, and left to form a small Pale of their own around Kilkenny. To such scanty dimensions had the English civil power shrunk when to the task of bringing Ireland within the comity of nations, and assimilating it as an English possession, the Tudors brought their statecraft, not untinctured with the Spanish ideas derived from experience in the New World. Spain had soon elaborated what we may call "a short way of dealing with aborigines," and several Tudor

statesmen did their best to apply this "way" to Ireland. It failed, chiefly because the country had no attraction, such as America had in her precious metals, for any large number of colonists. Those who came were not numerous enough to hold their own without the help of a standing army, and such an army was costly, and all the Tudors were anxious to make Ireland pay its own expenses. Henry VII.'s reign is memorable for Poynings' Acts, the importance of which was not suspected when they were passed, and for a peace between Kildare and Ormonde. But nothing was attempted in the way of drawing the two races together in friendship; indeed, Lord Gormanston's words, after a great battle against the Connaughtmen are in the spirit of the Kilkenny Statutes: "We have done one good work, and if we do the other we shall do well. We have for the most part killed our enemies; and, if we do the like with all the Irishmen that we have with us, it were a good deed." Under Henry VIII. the power of Kildare, who had long been virtual ruler of the Pale, began to wane, and in 1520 Lord Surrey was made Deputy, and found that £740 was paid in blackmail to various clans; that the King's army was as oppressive to the commons as the Irish enemy; and that, as for the Church, "there is no archbishop nor bishop, abbot nor prior, parson nor vicar, nor any other person of the Church, high or low, great or small, that useth to preach the word of God, saving the poor friars beggars." Things could not be expected to mend under Edward VI., though Bellingham, who came over in 1548, made a large killing of O'Conors: "none escaping but by mistake, such was the great goodness of God to deliver them into our hands."\* Nevertheless, he did nothing permanent: "the figure of the Puritan soldier has its charms, but the sword of the Lord and of Gideon is not a good instrument of civil government." Any good he might have done by his personal popularity was undone by creatures like Captain Andrew Brereton, "a man singularly unfit to deal with a high-spirited race like the O'Neils." From first to last there have been too many Breretons in Irish

---

\* "The Old Testament in English," Mr. Bagwell remarks, in his usual quiet style, "was beginning to make its mark on language and on habits of thought."

history. About St. Leger the one good point was the toleration for which the fanatic Archbishop Browne attacked him so fiercely, and which doubtless led to his re-appointment in Mary's reign; though, if the story of Dean Cole and the Commission for which his hostess substituted a pack of cards with the knave of clubs uppermost, is true (Mr. Bagwell accepts it on Archbishop Ussher's authority), Queen Mary intended the same one-sided toleration for Ireland which she practised in England.

With Elizabeth began those troubles in the North which only ended in the Plantation of Ulster, and early in her reign broke out the final quarrel between Desmond and Ormonde, resulting in the complete destruction of the former family. Mr. Bagwell does not follow either of these events to its close. What he does give is the saddening picture of cruelties like those of Humphrey Gilbert in Munster (as "thorough" as anything that is reported of Cromwell) and of Essex in Tyrone: "a mode of making war," is our author's characteristic remark, "which was certainly not calculated to advance the civilization of Ulster." Indeed, we scarcely wonder that he should have flung aside his pen before his appointed task was over. He must have felt that what he has written down with such abundance of detail is more than enough to give point to his appeals for moderation; and he must have realized, far more than his readers do, how sickening is this continuous chaotic struggle, the scenes of which keep shifting like the changes in a bad dream. Desmond "out again," or Desmond quiet; Sir Brian MacPhelim attacking Essex on the plea that, while Fitzwilliam the Deputy stays in Dublin, he believes Essex to be only "making private war" after the fashion of a native chief; Sir Brian by-and-by seized at a feast and put to death; and, all the while, the farmers of the Pale streaming across into O'Neil's country because there they are free from the exactions of the Queen's soldiery, money being sent in such dribbles that nobody ever gets properly paid, and that at one time there are only 3 cwt. of powder in Dublin. To this add

"bridges falling down; churches roofless; no new charities to replace the old monastic ones; no good schools, for no teacher could be sure of being paid; in the law everything jobbed by certain families, the bench filled with unlearned men; little apparent difference between a seneschal

and a native chief, disorders being as great among English soldiers as among Irish kernes and gallowglasses; all Englishmen making parties among the Irish, and everything daily going from bad to worse" (vol. ii. p. 184).

So wrote Sidney's secretary in 1571; and to this gloomy picture Archbishop Loftus and others add even darker touches. Universal self-seeking, in fact, was the lesson which the incomers had taught the natives, and which the latter had learned only too aptly. "It cannot be affirmed," remarks Mr. Bagwell (ii. 305), "that the system of private conquest was any improvement on native usages." He had already noted (i. 125) that, "though the method of paying a Viceroy by letters of marque cost the Crown nothing, the greatest ingenuity could hardly have devised a plan more fatal to an unfortunate dependency," inasmuch as, the Viceroy getting a grant in tail of whatever land he could recover from any "rebel," it was his interest always to have some one or other in rebellion. Add to this a vastly overrated Queen, who changed her mind in the most reckless manner (see ii. 293), and who seems in regard to Ireland to have been always at the mercy of the latest informant, and we cease to wonder that the "civilizing" begun in 1170 had, more than four hundred years later, resulted in plunging the natives into extreme barbarism and in rousing and stirring up enduring hatred between them and the English. If anything more is needed to condemn Queen Elizabeth's Irish policy, we may mention the way in which she behaved to the best of her Deputies, Sidney (Sir Philip's father), "her ill-temper towards whom was due to this faithful servant having treated her somewhat too like an equal." With Sydney's recall Mr. Bagwell ends his narrative, concluding with one of his lucid and valuable chapters on the Irish Church. As we said, he does not deal in declamation; he feels (with the wise man, Eccclus. xlii. 24) that "all things are double one against another," in Irish affairs even more than in anything else. Take such a case as that of the friars—they were most undesirable teachers; it is they who stereotyped in the Irish mind a very impracticable form of Romanism; yet but for them the mass of the people must have ceased to be Christian at all. So with Deputies and generals; much of what they did was most blameable, but



often we do not see how they could have done otherwise. Chiefs, too, and tribes were foolish to "rebel" (as it was wrongly called in the case of those who owed no allegiance); and worse than foolish is the way in which they quarrelled among themselves. But their "rebellion" was often inevitable, for it was, as a rule, the interest of some powerful "undertaker" that they should rebel. Irish history, in fact, is a series of dilemmas; and the study of it, in the calm, impartial spirit in which Mr. Bagwell has taken it in hand must (as he says) *make men moderate*. We wish he could complete his work, and show how much evil there was on both sides in the later years of Elizabeth's reign; doing for Robert Devereux what he has in his second volume done for his mean-minded father.\* But we are thankful for what he has given us, and for the spirit in which he has written. The conclusion forced on all who read him thoughtfully will be that when, with the coming of the Tudors, the opportunity came to make Ireland an integral part of the kingdom, it was frittered away by men wholly unequal to the task, men divided between abject cringing to Elizabeth and unscrupulous self-seeking. There was not among all whom she sent over any one with true statesman-like instincts, or with a firm grasp of the position. Her Deputies and generals were tossed to and fro between those who advocated the speedy extermination of the natives and those who advised trusting to the slow sap and mine of individual enterprise. And so the opportunity went by, and never came again; and we are paying the penalty. The difficulty between Ulster and the rest of Ireland is only one of the difficulties which the miserable inadequacy of Tudor policy has bequeathed to us. Almost every page of Mr. Bagwell's book speaks eloquently in condemnation of that policy, all the more eloquently because he makes no comment, but leaves the facts to speak for themselves. Such a way of writing history is new; and, in impartial hands like his, the result is certainly satisfactory. The

---

\* He will now have the valuable help of the just published *Calendar of State Papers*, 1588-1592, which Mr. Hans Claude Hamilton has added to his former instalments.

moral is that we must not hope to set everything right at once in a country which was so long in a state of misrule, and that we must, above all things, not try to govern in the interest of a faction. Through doing that, ignoring the mass of the people, and looking only to the Colony, the Tudors failed as the Plantagenets had failed before them.

## ART. VII.—AMERICAN SCHOOLS.

1. *The Report of the Commissioner of Education.* For the years 1868–1883. 6 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office.
2. *The American Journal of Education.* Published Quarterly. Edited by HENRY BARNARD, LL.D. 1856–1872. 21 vols. Hartford, Connecticut.
3. *Circulars of Information from the Bureau of Education, Washington—*
  - No. 5. 1880. English Rural Schools.
  - „ 4. 1884. Illiteracy in 1870 and 1880.
  - „ 6. 1884. Rural Schools in the United States.
  - „ 1. 1885. City School Systems. By JOHN D. PHILBRICK, LL.D.
4. *State and City Reports.* Between 1869 and 1883.

THE question of American schools is one as to which very conflicting opinions are uttered, and one at the same time which necessarily forms an important element in the discussion that is now being carried on, in a more or less desultory way, as to national education generally. We purpose, accordingly, to furnish, from undeniable authorities, a sufficient view of this subject to guide those who are engaged in the study of the question.

The current notions as to the common schools of the United States are saturated with fallacies. It is generally supposed that they are organized on a system; whereas the total

[No. CXXXI.]—NEW SERIES, VOL. VI. NO. I. K

absence of anything like a common system, of common rules or methods, of common control, is the most characteristic fact in relation to American schools. It is taken for granted by most persons that American teachers are usually trained for their profession, and have superior professional qualifications; whereas training is the rare exception and not the rule, the majority of American teachers being persons, sometimes men but more often women, casually employed under a licence from a local official, and destitute of any sort of training. It is supposed that American teachers are highly paid; whereas, in comparison with English elementary school teachers, the teachers of the "common" schools of America, although they are in their broad character middle-class schools, are paid extremely low salaries, the most skilful and experienced being paid much less, grade for grade, than in England, while the average payments for teachers generally are very much lower indeed. It is taken for granted that the range of instruction in the "common schools" of the States is considerably higher than in the English public elementary schools; whereas it is, on the average, very much lower, and even in the "Grammar schools" of the most advanced cities is not superior to that of a high-class elementary school in this country; while in the "High schools," so-called, for youths and girls of from fourteen to eighteen, it is not superior to that provided in such upper-grade elementary schools as have been established by the School Boards of some of our manufacturing towns, and which are attended by scholars much younger, as well as generally of a considerably lower social position, than those in the American "High schools." It has been affirmed by public men of some eminence, from time to time, and has been extensively believed, that educational compulsion has long been established in the United States; whereas in the Continental or English sense educational compulsion has never been known in America. The strongest proposals for compulsion have never contemplated compelling attendance for more than a fraction of the year, and these proposals, only made in a few States, have been carried out in still fewer, and even in these have been executed in such a way as out of America would not be regarded as amounting to anything like effective or real compulsion. It

is frequently supposed that the very general employment of female teachers in the American schools as teachers of boys is a point of high and refined modern theory, part of the advanced educational ideal of the States; whereas it is the direct result of social and economical causes—of “social pressure,” in fact—and is now admitted by the educational experts of the States to be, at least in the extent to which it is carried, a serious educational disadvantage. It has been stated with great confidence, that under their free school rule attendance at American schools is much more regular than in English schools; whereas the facts of the case are directly contrary. And finally, it has been imagined that the undeniable smartness and intelligence of the American people has been mainly owing to their superior education; whereas it has been much more largely owing to social incentives and opportunities, and to the unparalleled advantages afforded by the virgin wealth and resources of their boundless country, than to any other cause; and the very circumstances which have promoted general intelligence and secured success in life have frequently tended to interfere with and prematurely to arrest school education.

It is an interesting and instructive study to inquire how it has come to pass that misconceptions so complete as to the educational conditions of the United States could have taken so strong a hold of English opinion. The elements of an answer to this question may be briefly indicated. In the first place, it must be remembered that the American Colonies, which afterwards became the United States, were colonies of more or less educated and, generally speaking, self-respecting people, and that a tradition of useful and not illiberal middle-class education has thus been the inheritance of the leading States. Speaking generally also, the emigrant population of later ages has consisted of persons above the illiterate and pauperized classes, and containing a considerable proportion of men and women of character and intelligence. It was a natural prepossession, accordingly, to take for granted that education would flourish in such a population. Nor was the expectation unwarranted by fact, if the ideal be not pitched too high. A certain amount of plain education was in very general demand, and every township had at least its schoolhouse.

If the education given was generally, as from Barnard's *Journal of Education* we know it to have been, of an inferior type—inferior even, as a rule, to that which at the same period commonly prevailed in England; if in western States it was such as has been so graphically described by Edward Eggleston in his *Hoosier Schoolmaster*; it was nevertheless sufficient to open the way to an independent and well-to-do life, and it was shared alike by the people generally. In New England it was often a liberal education, as may be learnt from Mrs. Stowe's *Oldtown Folks* and *Poganuc People*. There was no class of the white population so dependent and poor as to be below school education. It is true that there were straggling illiterate families here and there, backwoods people utterly remote and isolated, for whom the schools did not avail. But in the general idea of American national education this class was left out of sight. To Americans generally it has been a surprise to learn during the last twenty years that such illiterates, and in no inconsiderable numbers, were to be found in their country.

Furthermore, New England, and in particular Boston, have been regarded, and have regarded themselves, as truly representative of America. The institutions of New England have been described as the institutions of America—New England being the most famous and one of the oldest of the colonial territories. Indeed, it may be said that not only the institutions of New England, but the ideas and projects of Boston educational theorists, have been accepted as if they were the facts of universal American law and life; whereas for the most part they have never yet become realities even in New England, and have found no place whatever in the States generally. Boston, with Harvard University in one of its suburbs, is the Edinburgh of the United States, if on some accounts it might not even be compared to Oxford. Its literary coterie has always been highly cultivated, and in touch more or less with the most refined European culture. But it is quite as little representative of American education and attainments generally as Edinburgh would be of English education or Oxford of Scottish culture and ideas.

Doubtless also another reason of English misconception

as to the question of American schools has been the prepossessions of republican theorists in this country. Their panacea for all national evils and defects has been education in the sense of schools and school systems. America has been their pattern republic—a republic distinguished by its common schools and its universal prosperity. For an English republican theorist it was the most natural, it was almost an inevitable, inference, that the intelligence and prosperity of the States were the direct results of the common schools and the universally-diffused education. If it had really been known what the schools were, it would have been known how very imperfect a school education served for the most part the demands of the prosperous American people.

A further element in the case, of considerable importance, is that English travellers, already prepossessed, from such causes as we have indicated, with high expectations as to American schools, and knowing, for the most part, very little of good English schools for the people, have made it their business in the States to visit one or two of the "common schools," probably at Boston, where the schools are at the best, or at New York, where the schools rival those of Boston; and having thus had a cursory view of the best-appointed sample schools, have easily accepted the conclusion that American schools generally were of like character and equal merit, than which there could hardly be a more complete mistake.

The root of most of the fallacies and misconceptions of which we have spoken is ignorance of the broadly and deeply contrasted conditions and characteristics of society and of life in America and in England. Nor will it be possible to furnish a clear and comprehensive view of American education without in the first instance exhibiting, at least in outline, the points of this contrast.

America has possessed the inestimable boon of a boundless territory of virgin land, wealthier in every description of natural riches than any national territory in the world. Of this territory—this new world—its people have gradually taken possession, subduing it to their uses, and replenishing it by degrees. In the old countries of the world, and in

England in particular, the calculation has been as to the average number of families for each acre of land; in the States the calculation has been as to the average number of virgin acres for each family, if not—as indeed was at first and for long the case—for each person. There has been patriarchal plenty and not a little of patriarchal homeliness and independence. The great stratum of population which forms the universal foundation of society in all old and highly developed European countries, the hereditary class of peasants and day-labourers, whose ancestors were serfs or villains, and who in England have for the most part unhappily remained, till lately, in a semi-serf and more or less pauperized condition, has been entirely wanting in the States. Thus the American Republic has enjoyed an immunity from the greatest social difficulty and the greatest educational difficulty to be found in the national life of England. In America some remote and isolated families have fallen into illiteracy. In England illiteracy may be said to have been in a sense the natural condition of the great mass of the people, a condition from which it could only be redeemed by strenuous and long-continued legislative effort, and by a stringent national organization. Speaking generally, the American people needed only to be left to themselves, and, township after township, or city by city, or school district by school district, they would not fail to provide, so far at least as to meet all pressing need, an education for their families. A central system for so vast a country, with such immense vacant interspaces gradually occupied and sparsely settled, was out of the question—not only impracticable, but almost out of the region of speculative thought. Indeed, the State rights and separate legislative organization of the different States would alone have made any such thing impossible. The loose, free, decentralized educational condition of the United States is the only condition suitable for so vast an aggregate of sovereign republics, federated for far other than educational purposes. It is a part of the greatness of the country that it has no national system of education, and that education throughout its territory is found in so many varieties of form and method, and at such various stages of development. Only, it should be evident that such a country can never serve

as an educational model for England or any European country of ancient civilization. What are inevitable incidents in the growth and filling up of America would often be serious faults in an English system of education. Not only are the social conditions of the two countries in contrast with each other, but the educational problems to be solved are essentially different.

One of the great distinctions between the two cases is, that whereas in Europe the lower classes are to be saved from pauperism, to be made independent of "parish" or of patronage, and to be elevated in the social scale by means, to begin with and as an initial necessity, of a suitable, a penetrating, a thorough school education, a finished or exact school education is not necessary in order to secure independence and material well-doing for the American boy. Even in England seventy years ago a very plain and limited education was often sufficient to start a boy well in life. It is so still in the United States, to an extent that was never known at any period in England. A "plain business education" is sufficient to put the young American into the road to wealth, or, if his ambition inclines in that less reputable direction, to distinction as a "politician." The American nation, as a whole, has obtained only a small and very elementary fraction of its total education during a short attendance at the common school. The intelligence of the American citizen has been stimulated and developed to the very utmost by circumstances. He is born into an open world of unlimited territory, and infinitely numerous and varied opportunities for industry, for ability, for enterprise; a world of eager, restless, incessant activity, and of universally diffused individual responsibility in every sphere of life; a world in which there are no social barriers, and which, at least till very lately, was capable of speedily absorbing all unemployed working power. The cheap newspaper has for generations been in every man's hand; the best literature of England is the cheapest book-reading to buy and the easiest to get. Every man has both a stake and a voice in the government of the nation, of his State, of his city or township. The population of such a country, though they may have had but little school teaching, cannot but receive an effective education for all that relates to material prosperity



and the ordinary duties of citizenship. They are accordingly an intelligent and well-informed people, although this is by no means the result, speaking generally, of a thorough or in any sense high-class school education.

It must be borne in mind, in connection with what we have now been saying, and as a very material point in regard to American education as compared with that of England, that, being mainly and characteristically a farming and middle-class nation, and the common schools being intended for the body of the people, infant schools do not enter at all into the school schemes of America. Children are not supposed to go to school before six; in many cities, indeed, it is against the law for them to attend a common school before that age. Often they do not go till later. The infant-schools of England stand in direct relation with the needs of the labouring classes and the claims of the labour market for boys and girls and for working men and women. But as the corresponding class does not exist in the States, there is no corresponding provision. It is true that there are many thousands of emigrant operatives at work in the mines, forges, and factories of America. But these hard-working "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the American nation become themselves after some years owners of house and land, be it more or less, and their children grow up American citizens superior to the condition of the organized operative classes.

There are, it is very material here to add, two conditions of American life in particular which everywhere, except in the great cities, have operated adversely against school-education. Of these, one is the long and hard American winter, with which must be taken, as necessarily linked to it, the brief and very busily occupied summer. The other adverse condition—itsself a direct consequence of the material prosperity of the people, if it be not rather an element of that prosperity—is, that there is no class in the States, except the coloured people and the Chinese—and these are to be had only in the cities—that takes naturally or congenially to service. Certain classes of Irish of recent importation act as servants in eastern cities, but in the second generation this is at an end. Hence it results that the whole family, outside of the cities, from a very

early age, have to work on the farm. The labour of the lads on the land, of the girls in the house—often, indeed, also on the land, or in the garden or farmyard—is too precious during the greater part of the year to be spared. As regards vast territories this is the case of the whole population. As regards the whole country, it is the case with much the largest part of the people. Under such circumstances school attendance is scarcely possible for most of the elder children, certainly not for the elder boys, except when farm-work is suspended; that is to say, they can only go to school in winter. The school term is often not more than four months of the year; only in some of the eastern States, where a very long and hard winter combines with hereditary care for education to prolong the school period, does it, outside of the principal cities, reach six months. Or, if there are two terms, the summer term is for the younger children, under a summer mistress, and the winter term is for the elder children, under a female teacher of superior gifts or pretensions, or under a master; the two schools being quite distinct. Of course, under such circumstances a trained or professional teacher will seldom be employed. The teacher throughout the States, except in some of the large cities, is paid by the month and engaged for the term. A female teacher is paid on an average thirty dollars a month; a male teacher about forty-five dollars. Such payments could never remunerate trained and professional teachers in a country where profits are so large, opportunities for employment so tempting, wages so high, and living very often so dear, as in the United States. Trained teachers accordingly are scarcely to be met with outside of the large cities, and even there are not the rule, but the exception. The country teacher is, commonly enough, a farmer's daughter of the neighbourhood, who may or may not be a smart scholar, but who is desirous to "run" the school for a term or two. If the teacher is a man, not seldom he is still, as in the young days of Daniel Webster, who was himself such a school teacher, a college student, who supports himself at college for two or three terms by what he saves from his teacher's stipend during several winters; or he may be a minister who has not yet found a charge. In some parts of the Union the custom is

not even yet obsolete for the school teacher to board, month by month about, with the farmers of the neighbourhood.

What has now been said furnishes in part the explanation why there are so few men among the teachers of American "common schools." But there is another and more powerful reason for this fact. It must be remembered that not only in country schools, but even more in city schools, female teachers are the rule, and male teachers the rare exception. The reason of this unique characteristic of American school arrangements is, as we have intimated, to be found in a severe form of "social pressure" which affects American women, especially in the eastern States. While in the States in the Far West, especially in the gold and mining regions, women are very "few and far between," in the eastward States so large a proportion of the manliest men have for some generations past been continually drawn away to the boundless and inviting west that the women have found themselves everywhere constituting a surplus quantity, which it was a pressing necessity to provide for in some way of honest employment. Even fifty years ago this fact had produced one very striking result. Those were the early days of manufacturing in New England. As yet the Irish had not flooded the labour market, nor had men and women of American blood and breeding acquired that antipathy to organized manual labour, except as done for them by others, which is now their characteristic. Accordingly, at that time the reputable and energetic daughters of the small freehold farmers of New England, finding even then the need of independent employment and maintenance, came in from the surrounding country to the factories at Lowell, and became factory-workers, living together in boarding establishments, suitably organized by themselves. All that, however, has long passed away. As female education in New England improved and developed, the young women prepared themselves to become teachers—a more congenial, and in the cities a more steady and certain, employment than factory work; they began also to find other ways of independent employment. At the same time, the influx of Irish labour to the manufacturing centres

supplanted the New England girls and lowered the whole tone and style of the factory community.

The movement of the spinster population, however, having begun, could not but continue and increase, as the best manhood of the east poured in a continually larger volume into the opening territories of the far and still farther west, especially after the El Dorado of the Pacific slope came within view of young adventure in the older States. The movement advanced with the power of an invasion. Wherever young women could supply vacant posts which otherwise might have been filled by men, they offered themselves for the work. In the stores they not only lined the counters, but occupied the cashier's desk; they pressed into merchants' clerkships, telegraph offices, Government offices, whether at the State capitals or at Washington. The bureaux at Washington, besides a very few chief *employés*, are filled by women, who are busy reading, writing, preparing documents, answering letters, making *précis* or abstracts, under the direction of the chief officials.

The passion for literary distinction and the demand for medical education, both of which are so characteristic of American women, and both of which originated in New England, are traceable to the same cause. Literary distinction had become a means of livelihood to the sex, because the teaching profession was almost wholly in their hands; and the universal necessity for remunerative female employment led women to press into the medical profession. Hence, again, the special passion for abstract and somewhat masculine studies which took hold first of New England girls, and then of American women generally. Many of these girls were to be teachers, not only of girls, but of boys. They had need, accordingly, to master specially masculine studies, including in particular mathematics and exact science. All this, indeed, has often been carried much too far, as American writers have said and shown with the greatest emphasis and earnestness. The effect has been bad both physically and morally. It has, there can be no doubt, been one cause—although not the only or the most serious cause—of that imperfect physical development of the women which is now one

of the troubles of New England, and full of sinister omen for the future of the country. Such, however, has been the condition of things which has at the same time flooded the market for teachers with women seeking employment, and correspondently given law to the aims and methods that have prevailed in the education of girls throughout the older States generally, but especially in New England. It would doubtless be better on every account if American girls in the older States were in much larger proportion destined for marriage and family life, and if public school teaching were far more largely in the hands of trained and able masters. But if this should come to be the case, the tastes and habits of both men and women will have to be simpler and more frugal than they now are, and much larger salaries will have to be paid to male teachers than are paid at present.

Such is an outline of the social, climatic, and general conditions in the midst of which the work of popular education in the United States has to be carried on, and which determine the manner in which the work must be done. To a certain extent, indeed, the city school systems are less stringently determined by these conditions than the methods of the country schools. But even the city schools are largely governed by them. It should always be remembered, too—though English speakers and writers about American schools scarcely seem to be aware of the fact—that much the greater part of the American people receive all the school education they ever get in country schools. It is therefore very material to observe that the organization and condition of country schools differ more widely from those of city schools than could well be imagined. We will here give an extract from an authoritative document which will illustrate both this and some other points in the preceding general description of the social conditions which affect American education. Though there is no national system of schools in America, nor any national central authority for the direction of public education, there has existed since 1868 a central bureau at Washington for the purpose of collecting and diffusing information on the subject of education. It is from one of the circulars published

by this bureau that we are about to quote. The circular is not yet two years old ; it was issued last year, and it is dated November 1884. The general subject of the circular is the " rural schools " of the United States, and under the heading " Present Condition of Ungraded Schools " occurs the following passage :—

" When we consider that the rural schools of our country provide elementary instruction for more than one-half of our school population, and all the formal education that the majority of this half ever receive, and further the great diversity of conditions represented in this population, it seems strange that a people so fertile in expedients as our own should have adhered so closely as they have done to one type of rural school. The type is familiar to us all. A school consisting of scholars of both sexes, ranging in study anywhere from the primer to Euclid, housed in a schoolroom of but one room, and provided with one teacher, upon whom devolves all the instruction and discipline. Possibly the teacher changes every term ; probably no systematic record of studies, classes, or progress is kept ; and each teacher takes up the work as if nothing had gone before, and ends it as if nothing were to follow. The teacher may be a person of excellent education, wise, conscientious, firm, loving, and versatile—many such there are, and ' their works do praise them ' ; but a school may be favoured in this respect one term, and the next pass into the charge of a callow youth, a crude girl, or a man or a woman of inferior mind, and harsh, unsympathetic nature, who, ' for a consideration, ' makes confusion worse confounded in juvenile intellects. Of supervision there is little, of inspection less, and of standards of scholarship and tests of work none but those the teacher has wit enough to supply. Such is the rural school as it exists among us to-day."

It must be remembered that these are the words of an American official, and that the document containing this description is sent far and wide from the Washington Bureau of Education as a " circular of information " for the benefit of American educationists and publicists. It affords an illustration of the fearless fidelity with which the educational authorities at Washington do their work. It is certain, however, that if any English educationist, as the result of his own observations and inquiries, had made any such statement, it would have been received with incredulity by most Englishmen, and would have been contradicted by some self-constituted spokesmen for American schools. The statement is indeed very startling, and the whole paper from which it is taken is

in striking contrast with an authentic and carefully prepared "Circular of Information (No. 5, 1880)" on "English Rural Schools," issued four years before from the same Bureau, in which it is shown that "English rural schools" are, on an average, probably as efficient as the schools in towns are under similar inspection, and are equally taught by trained and certificated teachers.

The circular from which we have quoted shows that in the rural parts of the Union—that is to say, over the great breadth of its territory—the condition of things is not greatly improved from what it was in Vermont in 1869. Vermont, it must be remembered, is one of the most purely American of the States. The late Bishop of Manchester, writing of it at nearly the same date, in his Report on American schools, refers to it as being styled the "Arcadia of the States." At that time its proportion of illiteracy was returned (in 1870) at 5·9 per cent. It is now (1880) returned as 4·9 per cent., a difference of no great account. It may be assumed, accordingly, that in 1869 this anciently settled and model State, although it may not have been quite equal in its educational condition to its standard of the present time, must have afforded a not unfavourable example of the effects of the "common school" education of the older States of the Union, and that its educational condition then must have been at least equal on the whole to that of rural America in general to-day. We feel at liberty, accordingly, to connect the passage we are about to quote from a Vermont official document of 1869 with that which we have quoted from the Washington circular of 1884. Each statement illustrates and confirms the other. The general Report of the Vermont Board of Education for 1869 contains the following passage :—

"We claim, as a people, to take great interest in popular education, and in some sort we do. We boast much of our common schools, and with some reason. But if a part of the time spent in self-laudation were spent in efforts to improve their condition, we should be entitled to more credit, and our schools would be more efficient. A man, by dint of rare native gifts and great industry and perseverance, with only the advantages of a common school education, rises to a leading position among men. We shout at once, 'See what the common school can do!' But

this is no fair test of the efficiency of the common school. These men learned little more than to read poorly and to write worse at the common schools. The true test is, what are our schools doing for the masses? Who does not know that a good reader among those who have attended our common schools is a rare exception? Who does not know that a great number of the children of Vermont have left its schools without the capacity to write a letter legibly and intelligibly? We speak of the rural districts, where the great mass of the children attend school, and where twenty-eight out of every thirty children in the United States are to be found. We need not rely upon the academies, seminaries, colleges, and universities, for the education of the people. Only one man in 150 is educated otherwise than at common schools, and there is scarcely one in 1,000 that is educated at a college. It is the daily public school, after all, which must fix the character and control the destiny of this Republic."

This was in 1869, at a time when the country districts of England contained thousands of inspected day-schools of which the standard was essentially the same as at the present time, and which were scarcely, if at all, less efficient than the rural schools of to-day, although there were not so many of them, and compulsion was not yet applied. The majority of the American people of to-day were educated in the rural schools of America, as they were in 1869 and in earlier years. The Vermont Report by no means represents ancient history. To judge from the circular we have quoted, matters are not materially improved in the country generally, in comparison with the earlier date. The two accounts closely tally.

One of the points illustrated by the passage we have quoted from the circular on Rural Schools is the casual nature of the supply of teachers for such schools, and the fact that, unlike the rural schools of England, trained or professional teachers are not to be looked for in them. For this fact we have already assigned the reason in our introductory observations. An extract from the Ohio State School Report for 1872 will furnish further illustration on this subject:—

"Nearly one-third of our teachers leave each year for other employments. Of the many thousands required for the schools, only a few hundreds intend to be teachers. . . . The class of professional teachers will long be comparatively small. Teaching in the near future, as in the past, will in most cases be a temporary calling, engaged in by young



men while 'getting under way,' and by young ladies unable to find some other more attractive or more remunerative employment."

The following remarks, from the pen of Dr. Philbrick, are contained in his Report on "City School Systems of the United States," published last year by the Bureau as a "circular," and show that even in city schools the like evil exists to a very large extent. Besides the causes of this, which have been explained, and which, though powerful in rural schools, might have been expected to have little force in city schools, the characteristically American law of annual election, which brings all paid offices within the range at least of city, if not of national, politics, operates most injuriously on the teaching profession. The principles of civil service reform have not yet begun to receive practical application in the States. When they do, not only will the tenure of office for civil servants be made permanent, and their entrance into the public service become dependent solely on good character and proper tests of examination, but the office of the school teacher will cease to be the subject of a necessary and often contested annual election. After remarking that the eminent Horace Mann, secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, had to submit to the process of annual election during his whole tenure of office, and that his successors have had, down to the present time, to submit to the same ordeal, Dr. Philbrick proceeds as follows:—

"If such is the tenure of office of the chief educational official of such a commonwealth, it is not strange that the public school teachers generally should be no better off. Accordingly, we find that the teachers in our city schools are almost universally subject to the ordeal of an annual election. The teachers are considered as having no property or interest whatever in their position. They are not only liable to removal at the end of each year by a failure to be re-elected, but they are liable to summary dismissal at any time by the action of the local boards, without notice, without the right of a hearing, and without the right of appeal to a superior authority; and such dismissal is final and absolute. The cities affording an exception to this precarious tenure are few. Among these exceptions there are two very important ones—namely, New York and Brooklyn. This precariousness of tenure is a peculiarly American feature of public instruction. It exists in no other civilized

country. . . . The plan is coeval with the modern organization and development of our common school system. It has been tried on a large scale for a long period of time. During this period we have made comparatively little progress in securing a permanent teaching corps. . . . Our system has failed to create a stable, permanent profession of teaching, while such a profession has been created by the systems of all enlightened countries except our own. My inference is, that the failure of our system in this vital particular is owing to the short and precarious tenure of office of the teacher."

Dr. Philbrick speaks of the annual election as "our barbarous school guillotine." "Capable men," he says, "hasten to quit a situation which exposes them to such humiliation."

In connection with this subject, however, he makes a statement which an English educational expert cannot read without surprise. The American system, he says, "instead of taking permanency of tenure" as its basis in trying to build up a teaching profession, "has relied primarily and mainly upon compensation in money as the mainspring in the scheme." We are surprised at this statement, because teachers' salaries in America, according to any English standard of payment, are exceedingly low. In Massachusetts, indeed, the average payment is tolerably high, as would be expected in a State which, while it is determined to lead America in school education, still maintains in operation the "barbarous school guillotine." But even in Massachusetts the Report for last year gives for a male teacher only an average of 108 dollars, or £22, per month; the average length of the winter school being from five to six months in the year. The average monthly wage for women in the same foremost State is \$44.18, or £9. In the Barnstable County the male teachers receive \$64.7, and the female teachers \$37.79 per month.

The monthly average salary for both sexes varies in the several States from \$21.27 in North Carolina to \$89.45 in Nevada; the general average being \$36.39. The school year, it must be observed, including both the winter and the summer schools, outside the great cities, ranges in the various States from 62 days in North Carolina to 199 days in Maryland, with an average of between six and seven months. The average amount paid per teacher in the school year is estimated at \$236.37—about £47. By far the highest

salaries are paid, as might be expected, in the costly and splendid city of New York. In the immense organized school system of the city and county of New York, \$1,000 per annum is considered high pay for a public school teacher, being in purchasing power less than £150 English. Three thousand dollars is the highest salary paid to any male principal of a grammar school; \$300 is the lowest for any male teacher. The salaries for female principals of schools vary from \$750 to \$1,250. To estimate the effective value of these amounts it must be remembered that house-rent in New York is on an average twice as high as even in London; that a suit of good black broadcloth costs not less than £20; that a hat of the best quality costs £3; a pair of black kid gloves ten or twelve shillings; a silk umbrella from £2; and other things in proportion. Even in New York, accordingly, salaries are greatly lower in proportion than are the salaries of our masters and mistresses of inspected schools in any part of England. In the State of New York (excluding the city) the average salary falls at once to the low level of \$42.24, or £9 a month. Throughout the country, it must always be remembered, these schools are not for the organized operative classes, especially not for wage-earning work-people's children, but for the people of America, the children of city store-keepers, of ministers and professional men whose salaries are not up to the highest mark, for farmers and settlers universally. But the pay of the teachers is far lower than of the public elementary masters and mistresses of our own country.

Such being the state of the case, we need not wonder that so few American teachers have been professionally trained. Dr. Philbrick, in the Report from which we have already quoted, insists upon the necessity of

"a thorough professional training of teachers in normal schools, as the primary guarantee against the appointment of teachers without the requisite qualifications." He adds that "only a small fraction of the teachers now engaged in the service are graduates of normal schools, there being no one State that has not recoiled before the task of securing to the whole body of teachers a professional education; and this because of the very great number of teachers which teaching as a temporary employment necessitates."

This statement from so eminent an authority will astonish some English educationists or educational amateurs. It is, however, the only account of the matter which has ever been given by American writers of any authority. A dozen years ago it was officially estimated that three per cent. of the common school teachers had received some training in normal colleges. Since that time the proportion may be supposed to have increased. It must be understood, however, that the period of training is very short and irregular. A fair instance will best illustrate this assertion. Notwithstanding what has been quoted from the Vermont State School Report, old Vermont has always been one of the most creditable States in the Union. Its educational enlightenment is shown by the fact that it has four normal colleges, with 400 students passing through them in a year, being more in proportion to its population than almost any other State. So long ago as 1869 the State had two normal colleges, and from the State Report of that year, already quoted, we are enabled to give capital illustrations of the irregularity of training of which we have spoken. In one of the colleges there were, in the autumn term of 1868, 70 students; in the winter term, 58; in the spring, 104; in the summer, 19; while of the whole only 14 (12 females and 2 males) "graduated"—that is to say, passed the proper leaving examinations. In the other college the proportions for the four successive terms were 90, 47, 95, and 23.

In 1870 a normal college was for the first time established in New York. But in that city and in Philadelphia the normal colleges are in fact city high schools of the most ambitious character for girls. They are very fine institutions, and magnificently appointed in every way. One department of the college is the normal or training department for teachers. Dr. Rigg visited the New York Normal College in 1873, on the great occasion of its entering for the first time into possession of its splendid new buildings. He was deeply impressed by what he saw, but the large number of students (1,000) was at first a mystery. He tells us, however (in a recent lecture on American schools, delivered before the College of Preceptors), that on his inquiring how many

teachers were sent out into schools every year, he was informed about eighty, the total number under normal training being about 120.\* Not a great while ago an English lady visited this Normal College and that at Philadelphia, its rival, and wrote a letter to an advanced English journal of education, in which she held up these two institutions to admiration as unequaled colleges for the training of teachers, assuming that all the students were intended for the teaching profession. In this way serious errors are propagated.

Teachers who go to normal colleges for training, it must accordingly be understood, go for periods of time varying from three months to a year—i.e., one to four terms—and only a fraction of them “graduate.” According to the latest Report of the Bureau of Education there were 51,132 scholars in the normal schools of the Union, but those actually and “normally” trained as teachers for some period, more or less, during the year, were only 17,984. There were 225,917 schools, of which the teachers for the most part remain only a very short time in the profession, often not more than one or two years; so that there is an enormous demand for teachers. Eighteen thousand trained students will therefore go a very little way towards supplying the demands of this vast multitude of schools. We have in this country 3,200 students in our normal colleges to supply the wants of 28,000 school departments; but besides these there are under training in the schools 25,000 pupil teachers, of whom there are none in the American schools.

The teachers no doubt, although few of them are trained, are all of them certificated. But in what sense? They have been passed by the local commissioner, superintendent, or secretary: that is all. As to this point, Dr. Philbrick, writing, it must be noted, in regard to city schools, which are incomparably superior in their organization to rural schools, says:

“In these examinations there is no such thing as uniformity either with respect to standard or method. While the certificate of qualification granted by one School Board may be well-nigh worthless as evidence of fitness and capacity, the certificate given by another Board in the same State and neighbourhood may be safely taken as evidence of the holder's competence.”

---

\* *Educational Times*, Jan. 1, 1886.

He insists that what is wanted is "a system of examining and certificating teachers by experts wholly under the control of the central authority; the local certificate, the only one, with few exceptions, now issued, does little," he says, "for the establishment of the standing and reputation of the holder." These local certificates of course have no force beyond the school district in which they are given, and they are given only for the term. How this system works for rural schools may be conceived from the description of such schools already quoted from the Circular of the Bureau. It is still in many places, we may be sure, much as it was in the decent town of Woodford, Vermont, in 1869, as to which Mr. C. M. Bliss, the superintendent of public schools for the town, thus states his experience:—

"I have lived in this town over fourteen years, and during that time I have seen no improvement in the schools. We employ teachers of a low grade. I have given certificates to girls who did not know so much of arithmetic as a boy ten years old ought to, and who had about as much knowledge of the geography of their country as an Esquimaux-Indian. As to grammar, they hardly knew what the word meant. But the question was—these or none."—*Vermont State Report*, 1869, Appendix, p. 8.

We have referred at some length to the large preponderance of female teachers in the States, and to the reasons of this preponderance. How far this peculiarity of American school arrangement has been carried may be understood from the statement made by Dr. Philbrick, that even in cities it is the exception rather than the rule for any male teachers to be employed at all in the elementary schools, except as principals or as specialists, such as teachers of German or music. "In the elementary schools of Chicago there are no male teachers properly so called." Classes of boys of every age are everywhere entrusted to female teachers. At length, however, this condition of things has found its limit. New England, where the fashion found its most influential early examples and advocates, pronounces that it is time to take some steps in the way of retreat. In Massachusetts, in fact, the tide seems to have begun to turn from 1873. In that year it was reported that the decrease of male teachers for the State was

25, while the increase of females was 233. But since that year there has been for that State no farther increase in the number of female teachers. And now Dr. Philbrick, who represents educational experience and authority in Massachusetts, reports that "there is, without doubt, a growing conviction among our prominent educators that a very considerable increase in the proportion of male teachers is a needed reform," and this, not only for the sake of securing experience and professional stability for the work and office, but "also because the instruction and training of boys above ten or eleven years of age requires the handling of a master rather than a mistress." Thus, after long wandering from English ideas, New England returns to them. Social pressure had made female teaching an immense convenience and relief, and therefore it became at once a custom and a "fashion." With natural practicalness, a "virtue was made of necessity," and female teaching for boys of all ages and in all subjects was by many American theorists commended to Europe as an admirable arrangement. At length, however, America recants on this point. We warn Dr. Philbrick, however, that only by offering men adequate salaries as teachers, both as principals and assistants, can the needed reform be brought about.

Nothing can be simpler than the principle out of which the whole school growth of the United States has developed. In America, as everywhere else, religious principle was the primary force which inspired and created national education. In the colony of Massachusetts, in 1647, certain resolutions were adopted as to the education of children. The colonial ordinance begins thus :

"It being one chief project of the old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures, as in former times, by keeping them in an unknown tongue, so in these latter times, by persuading them from the use of tongues, that learning may not be buried in the grave of our fathers in the Church and Commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavours: It is therefore ordered that every township in this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint," &c.

At a later date school districts were defined, and throughout New England these self-governing districts were solely responsible for education within their limits. Even in Boston till a very few years ago, the city was cut up into many districts, each being absolutely independent. That, however, is now altered in Boston, and the municipality itself is an educational unit. Still, however, in the New England and north-eastern States generally the old rule and usage prevails, although in Massachusetts a great effort is being made to introduce more consolidation and unity of administration. It can easily be understood how natural and convenient were these small and independent subdivisions in the infancy of colonial life. But for many years past they have worked injuriously. A lively picture of the manner in which this subdivision has operated in these primitive and in some respects pattern Anglo-American States, is given in the Vermont Report for 1869, from which we have already quoted :

"Here (in Vermont State) are over 2,000 little educational republics, practically independent of each other and all the world, a large number of them being remote from intellectual centres, and wedded to practices which were necessitated by sparseness and poverty in early times. They (the school districts) have been able to say to all projected improvements, 'Keep off! we manage our schools in our own way, and if it is a poor way, it is a cheap one, and we mean to perpetuate it.'"

The year 1869, as it was the year following the organization of the Washington Bureau, under the direction, as its first commissioner, of Professor Henry Barnard, the veteran New England educationist, seems to have been a period of out-pouring on the part of New England educational officials, in which vent was freely given to long-hoarded complaints. In the Maine Report on Education for the same year we find the following description of the condition of things in that famous temperance State given by one of the county supervisors or inspectors :—

"I saw that the task of elevating our schools to any very high degree of excellence was one of herculean proportions. A radically defective school system, leading naturally to defective work in all directions, had resulted in a very general want of zealous, enthusiastic, and skilled



labour on the part of teachers; in a—to a very large extent—practically indifferent, or at least ineffective, system of supervision on the part of town superintendents; and in a general want of interest among parents; and of these causes had been begotten a numerous and constantly increasing progeny of evils. School buildings, disgracefully mean and ill-furnished; schools, short, ill-attended, badly classified, frequently broken up by unruly pupils, with parental approval in many cases; school agents, almost universally remiss in duty, and superintendents the same, in a large portion of the towns, and these often working the one against the other; agents striving for poor schools by the employment of cheap and unskilled workers, and superintendents, who really were conscientious in the discharge of duty, rightly refusing to certify such teachers.”

To such accounts as these, from famous and old-settled States like Vermont and Maine, might be added parallel accounts from Connecticut, New Hampshire, and the rural parts of Massachusetts. In Massachusetts itself there has been, under the able and energetic lead of Dr. Philbrick, a marked improvement in recent years. But elsewhere the general condition of the New England States does not seem to have improved during the last census period, nor has the school district organization as yet been done away. In Maine and New Hampshire indeed, not only the actual amount but the percentage of illiteracy had increased during the decennial period from 1870 to 1880. What is further to be noted in regard to the facts which have now come under view is, that they relate precisely to that section of the United States with which English people have been apt to associate ideas of very superior education and enlightenment.

Outside of the New England or north-eastern section of the States the school district does not seem anywhere to have been separately defined, but either the city or the county has been the district—i.e., the unit of educational organization. New York is both city and county. Everywhere the State law requires the school district, whatever it may be, to provide necessary schools for the population. This universal requirement has served as a rough-and-ready expedient for securing a universal education, at least for the white population, and, except it should come to be done by the several States independently, a closer and more authoritative oversight of what is needed and what is provided is not to be expected in such

a country as the United States. America may well be content to be America, with the defects in detail entailed by its freedom and its immensity. The spread of an enlightened public opinion is the one means by which national improvement and progress in educational theory and practice will be secured.

In this article we have only dealt with half of our subject. We have been considering, almost wholly and only, the conditions under which education is carried on in the States: the specific results have been left almost untouched. In another article we hope to deal with the most important of the subjects not as yet reviewed, and in particular, with the organization and teaching results in city schools, with school attendance, and school age, especially in cities, the amount of illiteracy in the Union, the question of compulsion, the cost of the schools, the incidence of the charges, and the varying opinions of Americans themselves as to the general influence and tendency of American schools.

What we have written thus far has, however, we hope, been sufficient to show that if America could not adopt or assimilate our English system of graded education, from the infant school upwards, with its centralized national "Bureau," its one binding and universal Code, and its army of inspectors all alike required and trained to administer that one Code in all parts of the country; on the other hand, the educational needs of England would not at all be met, even if its social conditions did not render it impossible even to attempt so to meet them, by any imitation of the decentralized, unequal, and irregular methods of school-provision and school-teaching—often, indeed, highly organized and effective, but still more often altogether unskilled and inefficient—which are characteristic of American national education.

## SHORT REVIEWS AND BRIEF NOTICES.

---

### THEOLOGY.

*Jacob Boehme, his Life and Teaching; or, Studies in Theosophy.* By the late Dr. H. L. MARTENSEN. Translated from the Danish by T. RHYS EVANS. London : Hodder & Stoughton.

**B**OEHME is the greatest of Protestant theosophists or mystics. His life falls between 1575 and 1624. Whatever his merits or demerits, they were due to pure genius; he owed nothing to education, and perhaps the utter want of education explains much of the obscurity of his style. He was full of ideas, for which he could find no expression. His gentle, patient disposition found abundant scope for exercise under the persecution of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of his day. The recognition and influence which, in spite of persecution, he attained during his life, has grown immensely since William Law was his disciple, and translated his works into English. Baader, Oetinger, and others, have looked up to him as their master. Bishop Martensen was an admiring student of the Silesian shoemaker, and became his expositor in a study, which is now translated for the benefit of the English reader. It is this fact of so many eminent minds having found light and food in Boehme's writings, which convinces us that they must be worthy of attention. Proceeding simply on the results of our own reading, we should condemn both the object and the method of Boehme. The subjects with which he deals seem to us to be quite beyond human faculties at present, and the method pursued, the intuitive, can never yield certainty. Even Martensen fails to make Boehme's teaching always connected and clear. We catch glimpses of light now and then, but that is all. And the expositor does not fail to criticize and correct the master on many points.

What, for example, are we to make of an "eternal Nature" in God? Dr. M. says, "Nature in God! Many who have been accustomed to the idea of the pure spirituality of God will be appalled, and will fear that we wish to introduce materialistic views, especially as at the same time they hear mention of salt, mercury, sulphur, the sour, the bitter, &c. But we would call attention to the fact that these definitions are figurative and symbolical, and that when Nature is affirmed in God, it is, in comparison with what we call Nature, something infinitely more subtle and super-

material, is not matter at all, but rather a source for matter, a plenitude of living forces and energies." If this is all, what need of strange and misleading phraseology? So again we fail to follow Boehme's doctrine of some process of development within the very essence and life of Deity. We are told of some impersonal, undifferentiated state of existence out of which God emerges. How does such a doctrine differ from the Hindu doctrine, from the Gnostic "Abyss," and from the modern "Philosophy of the Unconscious?" Boehme undertakes to explain the "genesis" (P) of God. We are not much helped by the statement that this takes place, not in a temporal manner, in succession, but in an eternal manner, in simultaneity. The account given of the "Abyss" would exactly fit Hindu teaching: "Here as yet there is no ground, cause, or basis, no centre, no principle, nothing defining or defined, because ground, cause or basis can only appear when the different, the definite appears. Here there is neither light nor darkness, light nor fire, neither good nor evil; here there is neither height nor depth, great nor small, thick nor thin. Here is everything and nothing. For all is stillness, in which actuality stirs. In this stillness lies the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Spirit, who have not yet come forth." Dr. Martensen notes the affinity of such teaching to that of the Gnostics, who "conceive of God from the outset as *in potentia*, an obscure possibility out of which he evolves himself into actuality."

Still, undoubtedly, there is much in the volume that will interest religious minds of a speculative turn. Boehme is Protestant in doctrine, and on some questions is more orthodox than his expositor. If he does not add much to our knowledge, he stimulates thought and provokes contradiction. "For Boehme, Jesus Christ has not simply an ethical, but a cosmical significance. Christ is not only the Head of the human race, but of the whole creation. This leads necessarily to the theory that, even if sin had not occurred, Christ would yet have come, not indeed as the Saviour who was crucified, but as the Consummator of man and of the whole creation."

The translation is well done. On p. 186 we find "undesirable" misprinted for "undeniable."

*The Life of Jesus Christ the Saviour, retold from the Evangelists.*

With Maps and Illustrations. By Mrs. S. WATSON.

*The Life of Jesus; or, the Story of Jesus of Nazareth in its Earliest Form.* By the Rev. W. S. LEWIS, M.A. London:

The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

In her *Life of Jesus Christ the Saviour*, Mrs. Watson has endeavoured to present the narrative of the Gospels in a compact and consecutive form, with so much illustrative detail and occasional comment as

may make the earthly life of the Saviour a deeper reality to the reader. She has succeeded admirably. Without the slightest parade of learning she carefully avails herself of the best results of modern study. The narrative flows naturally along, and leaves on the mind a definite picture of our Lord's ministry and the succession of events which few ordinary readers of the Gospels ever gain. The style is chaste, the notes suggestive, the chronological summary at the end of the volume exhaustive. This book will be of great value to old and young. Sunday-school and Bible-class teachers have been especially kept in view. We must add a word about the illustrations, of which there are more than fifty. The copies of Mr. Tinworth's terra-cotta panels are remarkably fine. The admirable full-page views of Jerusalem, Samaria, and other Gospel scenes add great interest to the narrative.

Mr. Lewis's *Life of Lives* pursues quite a different method. Its aim is evidential rather than narrative. St. Matthew's Gospel is taken as "the first known Life of Christ." What sort of ideal of Jesus of Nazareth, Mr. Lewis asks, does it present to our thoughts? This inquiry he pursues under four branches: the appearance, the ministry, the Passion, and the re-appearance of Christ. These topics are handled with freshness and vigour. The style is crisp, the results are clearly put. The admirable "summing up" points out the unity, perfection, fulness, power, and utter simplicity of the narrative. "We have not found a suspicion of 'art' in it, or a symptom of effort, from the first page to the last. With all the essentials, in fact, it has none of the pretensions of the highest productions of 'art,' consequently it has treble the worth." Mr. Lewis asks whether a simpler or better solution of the wonderful history can be found than the Christian explanation. Matthew "had a Divine Original from which to copy. He had Divine Help in so doing. Hence the perfection—the double perfection—of the result." Such a study as this will show those who are troubled with doubt, or anxiously seeking for convincing evidence of the truth of Christianity, that Jesus Christ Himself is the greatest miracle and the most convincing argument.

*The First Century of Christianity.* By HOMERSHAM COX, M.A.  
Longmans. 1886.

Mr. Homersham Cox is a County Court judge, and author of some works on ancient English institutions and principles of government. In this considerable volume his aim is to "present in a popular and concise form an account of the Church in the first century." The volume is dedicated to Mr. Gladstone, and there is no mistaking the prepossessions of the writer, which are those of a High Churchman, who is not quite a ritualist. It is, however, a carefully prepared and serviceable volume. Those who cannot study such works as that of De Pressensé on the Chris-

tianity of the first ages will find a useful compendium in the present volume. The range of topics is very comprehensive, and the matter is very condensed.

*Immortality: a Clerical Symposium on the Foundations of the Belief in the Immortality of Man.* By Preb. C. A. ROW, Rabbi H. ADLER, &c. London: Nisbet & Co.

The contributions to the discussion carried on in the present volume are of unequal value. Not much would have been lost by the omission of the papers by Canon Knox Little, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Page Hopps and Professor Stokes. Some of the other papers broach curious opinions. Preb. Row takes an extreme position in affirming the almost complete silence of the Old Testament on the subject of immortality, for which he is justly taken to task by subsequent writers. "Nothing," he says, "affords a stronger proof of the inability of reason alone to place the belief in a future state on a sure foundation than the position which it occupies in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. I am far from wishing to affirm that many of the psalmists and prophets did not, in their higher moments, entertain a hope that they should survive the stroke of death; but inasmuch as these Scriptures make it clear that the revelations which they record contain no direct affirmations of the existence of a future state, such hopes must have been the result of inferences of a more or less doubtful character." Is then the Old Testament the product of "reason?" Mr. Hopps may well say that such teaching is "very confusing to those who have been used to believe that the Old Testament is a part of 'the Word of God,'" and asks, "What becomes of the 'revelation' of the New Testament, when only a monument of 'the inability of reason' is found in the Old?" As the Jews lived so long in Egypt, where the doctrine of immortality was held, it is, of course, simply impossible that they should have been ignorant of it. Upon this Mr. Row goes so far as to say that Moses "must have deliberately rejected" the belief of Egypt on this subject, and "thought it better to trust to temporal sanctions." Dr. Adler's paper is a full and conclusive refutation of Mr. Row's extraordinary position. The spectacle of a Jewish Rabbi correcting a Christian minister on such a question is a curious one. We believe that Mr. Row is nearly as far astray in his account of heathen ideas respecting a future state. Inability to give speculative reasons for a belief is not an infallible criterion of the strength of a belief. If some of Plato's reasons seem feeble, it does not follow that his faith was dim and uncertain. Bishop Weathers replies to Mr. Row on this point. The truth is that immortality is one of the presuppositions of all religion, whether in the Old Testament or elsewhere. We can no more conceive religion without it than without the

idea of God. For this very reason there is no need to assert either one or the other. Mr. Horder keeps most closely to his text, and his paper is one of the best reasoned and best written in the volume. The contributions of Bishop Weathers (barring his metaphysical argument) and Mr. J. R. Gregory are also excellent. Principal Cairns makes a vigorous attack on the theory of Conditional Immortality, which is by no means successfully repelled in Mr. E. White's discursive and dogmatic paper. Mr. White tries to establish a distinction between future existence and immortality with small success. As usual, he reminds us of the number of distinguished men who favour his theory. All that the quotation from Dr. Dorner's letter says is, that annihilationism is preferable to universalism—a poor compliment. In his *Dogmatics* Dr. Dorner rejects both theories. How then can Mr. White take refuge "under the ægis of Dr. Dorner's name?"

*The Rule of Faith and the Doctrine of Inspiration: the Carey Lectures for 1884.* By ROBERT WATTS, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

The first three lectures, dealing with the Rule of Faith, are unexceptionable. After briefly characterizing the position of Rationalism and Mysticism on the subject, the lecturer enters into a more lengthened comparison of the Protestant and Romish doctrines. The position taken is the right one, and it is supported by strong, cogent reasoning. The Romish doctrine is fairly stated and well refuted. The other seven lectures are devoted to a defence of the theory of the Verbal Inspiration of Scripture. Here, while we admire the lecturer's candour as well as the directness and vigour of his style, we cannot think that he is equally successful. Verbal Inspiration to some extent all must admit who believe in an inspired Bible at all. But the theory maintained by our author is too rigid and uniform. It applies in the same sense to the whole of Scripture; whereas, on any rational doctrine, it must have varied with the subject-matter. Again, Dr. Watts strenuously repudiates the notion that verbal inspiration is identical with dictation. But if it does not mean this in the symbols and theologians of the Reformation, we do not understand their meaning. The lecturer, however, does not point out how his definition of verbal inspiration differs from theirs. Or, rather, where he does define his theory, it becomes something very different. Thus, in distinguishing it from mechanical dictation, he says (p. 230), "All that is essential to it is that the agency of the Spirit extended to the form of the utterance, or of the record, and determined the language employed in both cases. This is the true verbal theory, and it is all its advocates undertake to defend, as it is the position their opponents have to assail." This is always the ground taken by advocates of the verbal

theory when they have to deal with any of its *crucies*, such as the variations in the inscription over the cross. Dr. Watts says, "To take the ground that the Holy Spirit, in placing this fact on record, was bound to keep by the literal wording of the title, is worse than trifling with this august subject." But we cannot see that the theory, thus defined, makes inspiration apply to more than the substance of the record. For such a theory "verbal" is a wrong name. The phrase naturally suggests a very different meaning, and had a very different meaning in older writers. If "all that is essential" to the theory is what Dr. Watts describes, it is held by all who believe in inspiration, and by many who would not use the phrase "verbal inspiration." It may not, indeed, be held by Mr. Row, with whom Dr. Watts argues at great and unnecessary length. But then we cannot see that Mr. Row, either in his lecture on the subject in his Bampton Lectures, or in his paper on the Symposium just reviewed, holds supernatural inspiration at all. In the Bampton Lecture he argues just as strongly against more moderate theories. In short, we believe that most of the differences between different theories of inspiration would be removed by a definition of terms. When Dr. Watts comes to state what is included in "verbal" inspiration, it is seen to be the same that others call "dynamic" or "plenary." Of course, the latter refers to form as well as matter, the two being inseparable. But the use of the former term to denote something different from the meaning belonging to it by etymology and usage is misleading.

*The Last Judgment. Being an Abridgment of the late Rev. E. B. Elliott's "Horæ Apocalypticae."* By H. E. E. Third Edition. London: Nisbet & Co.

To those who cannot afford the time necessary for going through Mr. Elliot's bulky work and yet desire to become acquainted with his scheme of interpretation, this very adequate abridgment will be very useful. Mr. Elliott sees the history of the Church, and of the world, so far as the history of the world bears on that of the Church, written beforehand by the seer of Patmos. With confident step he leads us from century to century. Whether we agree with him or not, his scheme has to be reckoned with. The sincere and devout tone of the work is of course admirable.

*The Father Revealed and Christ Glorified.* By H. H. BOURN. London: S. W. Partridge & Co.

An exposition of our Lord's great prayer in the seventeenth of St. John, the product of intelligent study and deep spiritual experience. Written in great physical weakness, it directs to the abiding, unfailing sources of



Christian comfort. References to the best writers and expositors are aptly introduced. For purposes of edification the work is one to be unreservedly commended.

*The New Testament in the Original Greek; the Text Revised by*  
Drs. WESTCOTT and HORT. London: Macmillan & Co.

A very cheap and handy reprint of the text adopted by the editors in their great work of 1881. A brief statement is appended explanatory of the principles of criticism followed. It is almost needless to say that the work is an indispensable one to the student, who will be thankful to editors and publishers for so portable an edition.

*The Anglican Pulpit of To-day.* Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.

Here are forty select sermons of distinguished preachers, and prefixed to them as many short biographies of the preachers. Two great preachers are absent—Canon Liddon and Dean Vaughan. But the forty include the archbishops, many of the bishops, and a large number of able preachers among the deans and canons of the Church, of all theological complexions. Bishop Reichel also is here, of the Irish Church; Dr. Salmon, of Trinity College, Dublin; and Dr. Phillips Brooks, of Boston. Besides bishops, deans, and canons, there are some dozen less highly placed clergy; among them Drs. Hatch and Sanday, Principal Wall, two headmasters of great schools, and two regius professors. Altogether the volume furnishes the most comprehensive selection of representative preachers of the Church of England ever presented in small compass. The biographies, though short, add much to the value and interest of the book. Assuredly the Church of England is in full revival as a preaching force just now, although we look for a yet greater development in this direction.

*Daily Strength for Daily Living.* Twenty Sermons on Old Testament Themes. With an Appendix on "Abraham's Mistake in the Offering of Isaac." By JOHN CLIFFORD, M.A., LL.B., B.Sc., F.G.S., D.D. London: Marlborough & Co. 1885.

The sermon to which most readers of this volume will at once turn is entitled "Abraham's Mistake in the Offering of Isaac." Dr. Clifford gives a strange description of the patriarch: "a man dazed by life's illusions, a dreamer of strange dreams, and a seer of impossible visions, he has yet a firm hold of solid fact." This prepares the way for a new version of the story of Isaac. He tries to show that Abraham altogether

misunderstood the Divine command. He regards it as a simple direction to suffer Isaac's life to be directed and shaped, as his own had been, by the counsel of God alone. "Give him full freedom, permit him to be a living independent Will, unfettered by the restraints of an unwise, though loving, parental dictation, dedicated wholly and for ever to God and to God's work in the world." If that "was the entire meaning of the revelation," as Dr. Clifford asserts, we may also venture to assert that nothing would have been more acceptable to Abraham; there could have been no trial for the friend of God in thus leaving his son in the hands of the Almighty. Dr. Clifford says that Abraham fell into the sin of importing the current falsehoods of the heathen world into the Divine revelation. "Goaded by the agony of the hour, he leapt forth with to follow the *first* impression that seized him." Is it not much more natural to suppose that the meaning was burnt into his soul before he stirred himself to obey? Such a command was an entire departure from all God's methods. Abraham had offered many sacrifices before, but he had never been called to make such an offering as this. We may therefore rest assured that a man of Abraham's mould knew what God meant before he set out for Moriah. Dr. Clifford says that the meaning of the Hebrew word must be fixed by its context and other considerations. He then asserts that the context is decisive for his view, because God corrects any such meaning in the after command, "Lay not thine hand upon the lad." That is to say, Dr. Clifford understands the command better than Abraham. The words are natural enough as the sign that the trial and triumph of faith were complete. If Dr. Clifford's version be correct, that Abraham was to receive directions at the place God would show him as to the way in which the surrendered life was to be blessed in the service of the kingdom of God on earth, what of the words spoken to Abraham there? "Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me." What colour is there here for such a theory? God is certainly His own interpreter, and few readers will doubt that Abraham had rightly understood the command. Are we to allow no weight to the New Testament? If Abraham made a mistake, what can we think of the famous verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews? We are not able to describe this theory as anything but a vagary of criticism. God never intended to countenance human sacrifice. The trial of Abraham's faith is the crucial point of the story. As we read it we are filled with a dread that the interposition may come too late; but is not that because we do not keep in view the fact that God could not err? If the terrible drama had been controlled by human wisdom the fatal stroke might have fallen, but in the hands of God there could be no such catastrophe. The sermon on "Present Day Inspiration" is not free from the charge of confusing the power which rested on the "holy men of old" with the influence of God's Spirit on all hearts. With these exceptions we can commend this volume to all who wish for "Daily Strength for

*Daily Living.* It is full of happy quotations and illustrations. Since writing the above notice we have received an able pamphlet by Dr. Dawson Burns, "Abraham not Mistaken," in which he argues the whole matter carefully, and shows the many weaknesses of Dr. Clifford's theory. It is published by Partridge & Co.

*Christ and the Age.* Sermons preached in Highbury Quadrant Church, London. By LLEWELYN D. BEVAN, LL.B., D.D. London : W. Isbister. 1885.

This is a volume of masterly sermons, full of high thinking and simple gospel truth. The discourse, which gives a title to the book, was preached on the opening of Dr. Bevan's church, and is a noble exposition of the relations of Christ and His Church to our own restless age, with its vast power over material conditions, and its wide-spread individualism. Dr. Bevan's forcible reasoning is expressed in picturesque language, full of Christian spirit and life.

*Truth in Tale. Addresses chiefly to Children.* By W. BORD CARPENTER, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ripon. London : Macmillan & Co. 1885.

These sixteen delightful addresses are dedicated to the children of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, to whom they were first delivered. They are remarkable for their freshness, and for the way in which their interest is sustained to the end without apparent effort. The moral is short, but clear and impressive. Few books will more acceptable to young readers.

*In the Footsteps of Heroes, and other Sermons.* By the late ENOCH MELLOR, D.D. London : Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

This is a beautiful memorial of an honoured and much-prized ministry. The volume takes its name from the last sermon on the words : "That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." That sermon was not fully written out, but is given because it was preached immediately before Dr. Mellor's last journey. He who drew the beautiful picture of "the whole family in heaven" was soon to join the company. We can give the volume no higher praise with a large circle of readers than to say that it deserves a place with Dr. Raleigh's sermons in every home library. The style is singularly chaste ; the thoughts are refreshing and suggestive. The sermon on "The Elder Son" shows how much better it is never to be a prodigal. Dr.

Mallor treats this subject in a singularly judicious manner. "Christ's Progressive Teaching" is one of the finest sermons. The "Recognition of Friends in Heaven" will comfort many a mourner. We must not forget to pay a tribute to the discourse on "Love fulfils Law:" it is in the best style of pulpit simplicity.

*Sermons in Brief.* From the MS. Notes of a London Clergyman. Two Series. London: R. D. Dickinson.

These outlines have been edited from MSS. left in an incomplete state. They are very numerous, they range over a wide variety of topics, and are well classified. We do not think the editor exaggerates when he says that they are "rich in strength of suggestion and beauty of illustration. They are uniformly pervaded with a glow of evangelical doctrine and a persuasiveness to practical godliness; albeit they speak to the mental conflicts and difficulties of the present day." They do not wear the appearance of having been made for publication.

*Hints and Outlines for Children's Services.* By Rev. C. A. GOODHART, M.A., Vicar of St. Barnabas, Sheffield. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1885.

Mr. Goodhart's *Hints and Outlines* will help many Church of England workers who have little time and few books. There are fifty-eight outlines arranged according to the course of the Christian year, with many useful hints on the best way to conduct children's services. The first outline on "Preparing the Way" omits all reference to Eastern roads, and is certainly not happy in the phrase "the smallest child may be a navvy in that band which prepares the road for Christ."

*The Children's Service Handbook for the use of Sunday Schools, Christian Bands, Catechumen Classes, &c.* By THOMAS DAVIES, M.A., Ph.D. In Tonic Sol-Fa and Staff Notation. London: Elliot Stock.

This little book supplies a liturgy for six children's services, with music for a hymn, a chant and an anthem in each, also forms of prayer, and a table of Scripture Lessons. In addition to all this there are outlines of twenty-four addresses with appropriate texts on the subject, and some apposite pieces of poetry. Even this does not exhaust the contents of this sixpenny book. There is "A Short Synopsis of Gospel Truths," arranged under nine divisions, with proof-texts for almost every statement. The book deserves a wide circulation.

*Bible Readings.* Selected from the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. By Rev. J. A. CROSS. London : Macmillan & Co. 1885.

This little volume simply gives selections from the first six books of the Bible in the words of Scripture, without note or comment of any kind. Suggestive headings are prefixed, and the extracts are well made and well arranged. The printing and general get-up are very neat. Mr. Cross says, in his preface, that the division into paragraphs will present some episodes as independent traditions, and save the reader from any ill-advised attempts at harmonizing such passages as the account of the Creation and the Garden of Eden. Such a statement needs a caveat. It comes near to a perilous surrender, though it may have some limited measure of truth.

*The Pentateuch : its Origin and Structure.* An Examination of Recent Theories. By EDWIN CONE BISSELL, D.D. London : Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

Dr. Bissell is an American clergyman, professor of the Hebrew language and literature in the well-known Theological Seminary at Hartford, Connecticut. In him orthodox New England Congregationalism possesses a sound and learned divine, who has made modern theories of speculative and heterodox Old Testament criticism his special study. The Pentateuch lies at the foundation of the Hebrew revelation, and is as essential to the whole system of Old Testament truth in its highest and most authoritative character as the Gospels are to the New Testament; and as the New Testament rests on the Old, it follows that the Pentateuch is one of the foundations of Christianity itself, regarded as a divine revelation. Nothing can be more important, accordingly, than the subject of this volume. The questions raised by the reckless criticism and destructive theories of German infidel critics are so perplexed, so numerous, and so remote from plain methods of inquiry, that no examination of them can be other than difficult and complicated. That Dr. Bissell's language is not always lucid is not therefore a matter of surprise, nor that his treatment is more or less intricate and involved. It is, however, very thorough and very able. We think the volume would be much the better for being wholly rewritten. Nevertheless we recommend it to every real student of theology as necessary and invaluable.

*A Critical and Expository Commentary on the Book of Judges.* By Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, M.A. London : Nisbet & Co.

Mr. Fausset is a tried expositor, and the present work exhibits the same qualities of care and thoroughness which distinguish his former

works in the same field. The marks of haste apparent in some modern expositions are little consistent with the reverence due to God's word. Nothing of this kind is seen in Mr. Fausset's expository work. The minutest detail has evidently been the object of loving study. His aim, as stated by himself, is threefold—"First, to examine critically the original Hebrew, and to give to the English reader the results of reverent modern scholarship, so that he may know accurately the meaning of the sacred text; secondly, to give the fruits of research in relation to the topographical, historical, and chronological references in the book; thirdly, to endeavour, in dependence on the Holy Spirit, to draw forth from the narrative and the inspired Word the spiritual lessons designed by the Divine Author." The whole work is faithful to the letter and spirit of this statement. The exposition constantly refers to the original text, the historical and local allusions are carefully dealt with, the moral lessons and applications are drawn out with marked ability. We call especial attention to the last feature. Many will be surprised to find the Book of Judges so "profitable for instruction." Yet the histories of Jephthah, Samson and Gideon alone ought to redeem the book from the charge of lack of interest. And the other portions of its contents are as replete with instruction both for individuals and nations. Mr. Fausset uses the works of former expositors, ancient and modern, without leaning on them. Above all, the reverent spirit, subdued but strong, breathing on every page, is altogether admirable. No one can read the work without feeling that to the writer the Bible is inspired and divine.

*Horæ Psalmicæ.* Studies in the CL. Psalms. Their Undesigned Coincidences with the Independent Scripture Histories Confirming and Illustrating both. By Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, M.A. Second Edition. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1885.

We are not surprised that this book has reached a second edition. All who are familiar with Brown and Fausset's *Commentary* will find here the same thorough and suggestive treatment of Scripture. This volume is intended to trace the undesigned coincidences between the Temple Songs and the historic books in much the same style as Paley treated St. Paul's Epistles. The light thrown on the history of the Psalms is, perhaps, the most remarkable merit of the book. Students may not always be convinced that Mr. Fausset has found the historic occasion on which a psalm was written, but they will always find him suggestive. His patient investigation furnishes many a clue to the setting of these Hebrew hymns, which will be highly prized by all who know how hard it is to restore the local colouring which has been lost in

the case of most of the Psalms. The way in which Psalms xlvii. xlviii. lxxvii. and lxxviii. are associated with the history in II. Chronicles xx. is most suggestive. Interesting discussions about Hebrew poetry are woven into these thirty-three lectures. Every Bible student will thank Mr. Fausset for such a book.

*Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.* The Acts of the Apostles, with Introduction, Maps and Notes. Vol. II. Chapters xiii.—xxviii. By THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D. Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 1885.

Dr. Lindsay's first volume on the Acts contained the usual introductory matter about the authorship and purpose of the history, so that his space is now free for a careful discussion of that memorable struggle for Gentile liberty which fills such an important place in St. Paul's life. Twenty-three pages are devoted to this subject, then follows a careful analysis, a chronological summary, and an excellent genealogical table of the Herod family. The notes are intended for private students and Bible-class teachers. They are well-adapted for such readers. Clear, concise and full, they are interesting, scholarly and thorough. No difficulty seems to have been overlooked.

*Zechariah : his Visions and Warnings.* By the late Rev. W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E. London : J. Nisbet & Co.

Without entering upon critical questions, Dr. Alexander gives an exposition of Zechariah worthy of his fame. There is the reality of learning without parade, ample use of previous expositions without slavish dependence, fulness of matter along with a flowing, pleasant style. Purposes of edification also are not forgotten. Altogether the work will prove far more useful to ordinary students than many formal commentaries.

*The Prophets of the Old Testament.* A Book of Bible Teaching for our Elder Children. By M. D. H. London : J. Nisbet & Co.

This is an excellent book for the young. After a brief account of some minor prophets, each of the prophetic books is taken in order and an epitome of its contents given, the chronological order being followed: Isaiah, Micah, Nahum, Joel, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi are thus dealt with. We can imagine no more instructive or profitable employment of Sunday

than for a mother to read to her children first the portions of Scripture concerned and then these brief expositions of the contents. The language is surprisingly simple and idiomatic, without being childish.

*The Parables of our Lord.* Second Series. (The Parables recorded by St. Luke.) By MARCUS DODS, D.D. London : Hodder & Stoughton.

A welcome addition to the beautiful *Household Library of Exposition*. Dr. Dods' former volume dealt with the parables in St. Matthew. This one discusses those contained in St. Luke with equal ability. The volume is the more welcome as the parables of Luke are among the greatest, and also present special difficulties. Leaving verbal exposition and explanation of details on one side, Dr. Dods, with unerring tact, seizes on the central teaching of each parable and enforces it with great vigour and often with homely illustrations. In considering the parable of the Unjust Judge he presents the whole question of prayer, all that is said against it and all that need be said for it, with wonderful precision and strength. The chapter is a striking example of condensed thought and expression. Like all Dr. Dods' works, the present volume is also a fine specimen of finished work. Within the limits prescribed by the author's purpose, it could hardly be improved.

*The Pulpit Commentary.* Edited by the Revs. Canon SPENCE and J. S. EXELL. *II. Corinthians*: Exposition by the Ven. Archdeacon FARRAR. *Galatians*: Exposition by the Rev. Prebendary E. HUXTABLE, Vice-Principal of Wells Theological College. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

Archdeacon Farrar's exposition is lighted up by many illustrations characteristically felicitous. Previous work has abundantly prepared him for his task, so that students of the *Pulpit Commentary* will reap the fruit of his long research and thorough grasp of the subject. The comments are concise but clear. Every one knows that Dr. Farrar does not lose an opportunity of setting forth his own views. The unhappy expression, "the terror of the Lord," in chapter v. verse 2, gives him a good opportunity.

"Multitudes of texts have been torn from their context and grossly abused and misinterpreted, but few more so than this. It is the text usually chosen by those who wish to excuse a setting forth of God under the attributes of Moloch. With any such views it has not the remotest connection. It simply means, 'Knowing therefore the



fear of the Lord, we persuade men ' either 'to keep in view the same fear of the Lord as ourselves,' or (reverting to the last assertion of his own sincerity and integrity in verse 9), that 'our sole ambition is to please God.' The rendering 'the terror of the Lord,' for the every-day expression, 'the fear of the Lord,' was wantonly intruded into modern versions by Beza, and has not a single word to be said in its favour. The phrase means (as always) not the dread which God inspires, but the holy fear which mingles with our love of him. To teach men to regard God with *terror* is to undo the best teaching of all Scripture, which indeed has too often been the main end of human systems of theology."

The exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians is scholarly and suggestive. Even where we find ourselves dissenting from Mr. Huxtable's conclusions, we are instructed by his discussions. He translates the difficult passage in the fourth chapter: "But good it is to be admired in what is good at all times, and not only when I am present with you." Here, and in the sixth chapter, we prefer to follow Bishop Lightfoot. Mr. Huxtable considers that the phrase *πᾶσι τοῖς ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα* refers to the whole letter: he thinks that *γράμμα* means a section of the argument, not a letter of the alphabet. He would therefore regard this letter, like the shorter Epistle to Philemon, as one which the Apostle wrote with his own hand. The view is suggestive, if not convincing. The Introduction and dissertations are excellent. Homiletics by Dr. Thomas, the editor of the *Homilist*, and Professor Croakery, with Homilies by eight different hands, follow each section, so that any preacher who prizes such suggestions for the pulpit will find them in abundance. The style in which this large volume is printed and got up is thoroughly substantial and very neat.

*Thirty Thousand Thoughts.* Being Extracts covering a Comprehensive Circle of Religious and Allied Topics gathered from the Best Available Sources of all Ages and all Schools of Thought, with Suggestive and Seminal Headings, and Homiletical and Illuminative Framework. Edited by the Revs. Canon SPENCE, J. S. EXELL, and CHARLES NEIL. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

This volume of *Thirty Thousand Thoughts* is devoted to "Jehovistic names and titles of God, the Attributes of God, Sins and Christian Dogmatics." The section on the Jehovistic names is short, but suggestive. We are surprised that the compilers could not furnish a richer store; but they explain this in their preface. Under the Divine Attributes there is a beautiful series of illustrations of "Invisibility," culled from Dr. Raleigh's sermons. The whole of this section is rich in good matter. "Christian Dogmatics"—a part of this vast enterprise which has been specially and constantly inquired after by many readers in England and

in America—fills more than half the volume. It is one main feature of the whole work, and matter has crowded in so fast that considerable delay has arisen in its publication. The subject is arranged in three divisions: The normal relations between God and man; their breach; their restoration. There is an introduction of fifty-seven pages. The subject of the Trinity and the Creation are thoroughly treated. "Christian Dogmatics" will be concluded in the next volume. This section will then form a theological system in itself.

*Time Flies: A Reading Diary.* By CHRISTINA G. ROSETTI.  
London: S.P.C.K.

A dainty little book for devotional reading. The daily readings in prose and verse are all original, in Miss Rosetti's well-known manner. Many of them remind us of the quaint conceits of the old writers. "Like apples of gold in baskets of silver" is the simile which best describes the book.

*The Biblical Scheme of Nature and Man.* By ALEXANDER MACKENNAL, B.A. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

We have here four thoughtful lectures delivered by the author in the Bowdon Downs Congregational Church. The general aim is to indicate the harmony between the great doctrines of the Bible and the facts and experiences of human life. The treatment is able, and many noble thoughts enrich the discussion. Some positions of the author are, in our opinion, more than doubtful, but discriminating readers will find these brief broad reviews of cardinal questions instructive and strengthening.

*Revision Reasons. A Manual for General Readers and Students of the Revised Version of the Old Testament, accounting for Every Change.* By the Rev. C. G. K. GILLESPIE, A.K.C., A.C.P., &c.—I. *The Pentateuch.* Manchester: John Heywood. 1885.

This is a learned work. Mr. Gillespie has been busy upon it almost as long as the revisers of the Old Testament. Its publication has been delayed for some time by the moderation of the Old Testament Company. They did not adopt many changes which Mr. Gillespie had expected so that he had to withdraw a large number of the notes he had prepared in expectation of more extensive change. He seems, however, to be pleased that this labour was wasted. The introduction gives a long enumeration of learned authorities with brief descriptions of each. Then follows the main part of the work. It begins with the first verse of Genesis, and

proceeds, verse by verse, through the Pentateuch. The notes are more suited for general readers than Hebrew scholars. They are clear, brief, simple. We notice that Mr. Gillespie says nothing about Joseph's tunic. Perhaps he does not profess to touch marginal readings. The omission in such a case as this is unfortunate. We may perhaps suggest that the chapter and book should be put at the head of each page. There are no landmarks, and the search is bewildering. The plates at the end, with readings from the Septuagint and other information, are special features of the work.

---

## PHILOSOPHY.

MCCOSH'S "PHILOSOPHIC SERIES."—No. V. *Locke's Theory of Knowledge, with a Notice of Berkeley.* No. VI. *Agnosticism of Hume and Huxley, with a Notice of the Scottish School.* No. VII. *A Criticism of the Critical Philosophy.* No. VIII. *Herbert Spencer's Philosophy.* Edinburgh: Clark.

THESE four pamphlets form the historical section of a series in which Dr. McCosh proposes to discuss the contents and bearings of the chief philosophies of our day. The didactic section, also consisting of four numbers, discusses the chief philosophic problems abstractly. The author's name guarantees accurate and full knowledge, while at the same time it indicates the position taken. Dr. McCosh is a Realist in the true sense. Instead of making the mind the only immediate object of knowledge, and then trying to build a bridge from mind to matter, he posits both factors as given in immediate perception. By this canon he tests the different systems reviewed. In a pamphlet of sixty or seventy pages, Dr. McCosh presents, not, indeed, the whole system of the thinker under notice, but its salient points. The true elements are emphasized as well as the false. The development from Locke through Berkeley to Hume's blank scepticism, is carefully traced. We are then shown how Kant tried to rebuild the ruined edifice on a new foundation, but only succeeded in laying the foundation for Spencer's nescience. The author knows how to put his points clearly and succinctly. Thus, in criticising Kant, he says:—"I object to his critical method, to his phenomenal theory of primitive knowledge, to his ideal doctrine of the mind imposing forms on things appearing." The wording needs revision here and there. "His defective views on this subject perplexes his whole philosophy" (V. p. 57) is scarcely a correct sentence. On pages 10 and 39 of No. VIII. there are some needless repetitions.

*Organic Philosophy ; or, Man's True Place in Nature.* Five Vols.  
Epocosmology, Ontology, Biology, Sociology, Method. By  
HUGH DOHERTY, M.D. London : Trübner & Co.

It would have been wise in the author, in launching a new theory of life and the world, to indicate wherein he differs from his predecessors. By not doing so, he throws a serious burden on his readers, and runs the risk of defeating his own object. Perhaps it is our own fault; but we confess that we have been unable to find such an amount of originality in these five volumes as to justify their publication. The able author could surely have made known his special views in a volume of moderate size. The nearest approach to a special theory, which pretty careful search has enabled us to find, is the idea that in man as a microcosm the laws of all existence may be discovered in miniature. But this, of course, is not a novel idea, and it is not drawn out very explicitly in the present work. The clearest expression of it is contained in the first volume, in such passages as this: "The human body is the highest type of physical life and organization on our globe; the human mind, the highest type of mental forces and phenomena; and by the laws of order found in these we shall attempt to gauge all other laws of equilibrium in Nature." It is obvious that such a theory can only be put forward, in the first instance, in a tentative way. "Man's true place in Nature," according to the author's view, is by no means made clear. The subject, if not lost, is at least obscured in the details. A reader wants to see at a glance how any new theory advanced is related to Theism, Agnosticism, Comtism, Pantheism. This work does not enable him to do so.

The work is the fruit of enormous labour, and indicates no mean ability. That the author contends for the universality of law and order, the supremacy of mind, the soundness of the teleological principle, the insufficiency of evolution as an explanation of everything, is clear. The author's power of invention in the matter of terminology is wonderful. The new terms used, however numerous and forbidding at first sight, are often happy; for example Epocosmology, to include all the sciences dealing with objects on the surface of the earth. This again is subdivided into the Atmospheric Realm, Pluvial, Oceanic, Reliquial, Geospheric and Elemental Realms.

*Hobbes.* By GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON. Edinburgh and  
London : Blackwood & Sons. 1886.

Prof. Croom Robertson's delineation of Hobbes as a man and a thinker, which forms the latest volume of the series of *Philosophical Classics for English Readers*, is a model of what work of the kind should be, exact and learned, yet never dull; sympathetic, yet perfectly dispassionate

—in a word, a thoroughly appreciative survey of the life and work of one of the most fertile and comprehensive of English thinkers. If we were to measure philosophers by the quantity of truth which they discovered, Hobbes could not be ranked high; there is usually more of error than of truth in his theories, but he applied a stimulus to English, and, indeed, European, thought, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of signal potency, at least in the ethical domain, and though one result was his own refutation, the historian of philosophy is bound to recognize that the world is the gainer in the long run by an honest and clear-sighted exposition even of false doctrine in the larger view and firmer grasp of the truth which its refutation brings with it. In this regard Prof. Croom Robertson's last chapter is especially valuable.

*Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy.* By Dr. EDWARD ZELLER. Translated, with the Author's sanction, by SARAH FRANCES ALLEYNE and EVELYN ABBOTT. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1886.

Dr. Zeller's *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy* is admirably suited to give those who are beginning the study of philosophy a comprehensive view of the course of Greek speculation from its earliest origins to its final absorption in the arid wastes of Alexandrian mysticism. The translation before us covers only 356 small 8vo pages, yet the amount of information contained within this short compass is really wonderful. There is no vagueness or sketchiness anywhere observable. Whatever is said is said with precision, and no space is wasted in the vain attempt to popularize a subject which will always be "caviare to the general." We have little fault to find with the translation, but we wish Mr. Abbott would have found some apter rendering of *δέφα* than "presentation," which is both awkward and inaccurate. The work is well indexed.

*Utilitarianism an Illogical and Irreligious Theory of Morals.*  
By the Rev. J. RADFORD THOMSON, M.A. London: Religious Tract Society.

This is a judicious, well-reasoned, and beautifully written pamphlet—the fortieth of the series of *Present Day Tracts* which have done such good service among intelligent readers. Mr. Thomson shows with great force the weakness of Utilitarianism and upholds the claims of conscience and the moral law.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

*The University of Cambridge.* I. From the Earliest Times to the Royal Injunctions of 1535. II. From the Royal Injunctions of 1535 to the Accession of Charles I. By JAMES BASS MULLINGER, Lecturer on History, and Librarian of St. John's College. Two vols. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1873-84.

MR. MULLINGER must be heartily congratulated on having compressed the laborious research of many years into these two most interesting volumes. The subject is one which no Englishman can handle without emotion. Our Universities belong so thoroughly to the nation, that the history of their growth is part of the record of national life; and, like other institutions which we accept as matter of course, and which have helped to fix our position in the world, their origin and early growth are obscure. There is plenty of fable; King Alfred founding, or perhaps only reviving, University College, Oxford; the Crowland monks sending to Cambridge a band of zealous workers, who, in a humble barn, taught the meagre curriculum of monastic learning—this, and much more of the same kind, has been relegated by modern criticism to the limbo of amiable fiction. No doubt there were at St. Frideswide's, Oxford, and at Ely near Cambridge (if not in the place itself), schools, such as were early attached to almost every monastery. But the connection between these and the Universities can only be conjecturally established; and it is from Paris, and not from local effort, that the inspiration came which made the Cam and Isis the centres of our educational life. About Cambridge especially, early information is sadly wanting, for Cambridge, even more than her sister, has suffered from "gown and town rows" and consequent destruction of records. Happily, what is wanting here is abundant in Paris. Of that University, of which ours may almost be called off-shoots, the records go back considerably beyond the thirteenth century, though not till 1215 was the title *Universitas* (which German lawyers use for a corporate town), applied to her group of schools. No one can be named as its founder in the sense in which Irnerius (Werner) was the founder of Bologna. William of Champeaux, whose logic school was opened in 1109, was the teacher of Abelard, whose pupil was that Peter Lombard whose "sentences" were long the great theological textbook. The teachers and their pupils gathered round the Church of St. Génévieve, in what is still called the Latin Quarter. They were divided into four sections—French (including Italians, Greeks and Spaniards), Picards—i.e., all from the North-East and the

Netherlands, Normans, English (or, as they were called after 1430, Germans). From the first the French kings welcomed the young institution, seeing in it a set-off against the power of the Popes. The students had the same conflicts with the citizens which were afterwards so frequent at Oxford and Cambridge. As the Oxford University migrated to Stamford, and that of Cambridge to Northampton, because the "town," in each case, persisted in ignoring University privileges, so that of Paris broke up in 1228, some going to Rheims, Angers and Orleans, but so many to England that this emigration had the greatest influence on the early growth of our Universities. Very early, colleges began to be founded in Paris. Crevier, the great authority on the subject, refers that of St. Thomas du Louvre to the twelfth century. The Sorbonne was founded in 1250 by St. Louis's domestic chaplain, poverty being from the first the condition of admission. Then in 1305 the wealthy college of Navarre was founded by Jeanne of that kingdom, wife of Philip the Fair. How far Merton, founded at Oxford in 1264, was based on a Parisian model, and how far it was a revival of Harold's foundation at Waltham for seculars as opposed to regulars, is thoroughly discussed by Mr. Mullinger. Peterhouse, at Cambridge, was founded some twenty years later, on the model of Merton; and next came Michaelhouse, afterwards incorporated into Trinity. The history of the early foundations is followed by a full and very interesting account of student life in the Middle Ages; and then comes the part taken by Cambridge in the great classical revival, in which Erasmus is such a prominent figure. His disappointment at the backwardness of Cambridge students to join his Greek class was great, and frequent and humorous are his complaints that those who did join could not afford the rich presents which he had expected when he came over. "I can't make money out of men with empty pockets," he writes to Dean Colet; "I was born with Mercury unpropitious." Yet the residence of such a man was of value; and Mr. Mullinger shows how he influenced, not Fisher only, but Bullock, Faune, Bryan, Whitford, and many more who carried forward the new learning. Then begins the Reformation period, and the part taken by the University in the question of the king's divorce; and the Royal Injunctions of 1535—that the Scriptures are to be read, the Pope's rights renounced, the canon law given up and no degrees conferred in it—fitly close the first volume. In his next volume, Mr. Mullinger deals with what, prior to the present, is far the most important century in Cambridge University history. Then the new code was introduced which overthrew the old academic constitution and by which the University was governed for nearly three hundred years. Cromwell as Visitor, Alane and the *Institution of a Christian Man*, Cheke and Ascham and Ridley of Pembroke, Matthew Parker of Corpus, the founding of Trinity, bring us to Edward VI.'s reign, that period of wretched misrule which a generation ago used to be spoken of as a bright spot amid surrounding darkness. Mr. Mullinger brings into fitting relief the rapacity of the

courtiers, "one of whom," said Lever, afterwards Master of St. John's, in his sermon at St. Paul's Cross, "was worse than fifty tun-bellied monks." Not only did these courtiers seize all they could out of the estates secured to the colleges, but they sought to pull down the grammar schools, of which some were old monastic foundations, others (like Sedbergh, which narrowly escaped "impropriation") were attached to the different colleges. Several of these were only rescued by being refounded under the title of King Edward's Schools, with a fraction of the revenue which had hitherto supported them. A sad sign of the times—of the social demoralization caused by the sudden and irregular acquirement of wealth by one class—was the disappearance from the University of the studious class, especially of the poor students. Dr. Cains, refounder of Gonville College, was disgusted at the change which had come over the University since he was an undergraduate. Harrison (*Description of England*) says of the students: "being for the most part rich men's sennes, they oft bring the Universities into much slander. . . . And for excuse, when they be charged with breach of all good order, they stand upon their reputacion and libertie, thinking it sufficient to saie that they be gentlemen, which *grieveth manie not a litle*." What study there was took the form of polemics, under Peter Martyr at Oxford and Bucer at Cambridge. Edward had grand designs—meditated another college with Melancthon in Bucer's place; but the result was that some of the existing endowments were so seriously threatened, that one of them, Clare, sold its plate and books, and divided the proceeds among the fellows. Of the state of Cambridge under the Marian reaction it is hard to form a judgment: Ascham's account is evidently a "gross, palpable exaggeration." Of Cambridge, under Elizabeth, there is plenty to tell, and Mr. Mullinger tells it in admirable style. He does not confine himself to his own University, but devotes several pages to the foundation of Trinity, Dublin, and of the four Scotch Universities. His "comparison of English Universities with those abroad," brings out the advantages of the collegiate system, which saved Oxford and Cambridge from becoming abyssees of recklessness like Jena and other Universities abroad; but the chapters which, perhaps, will most interest the general reader, are those describing James I.'s two visits, and how the royal pedant sat through the play of *Ignoramus*, which lasted more than five hours, and this after a very full Sunday, including, besides sermon, a *clero* of an hour and a half. It is amusing to find the rivalry of town and gown unchecked by the royal presence; the sheriff insisted on asserting himself, whereupon the Vice-Chancellor appealed to the Lord Chamberlain and had him well snubbed. The whole two volumes are monuments of research, and are, nevertheless, full of matter which everybody will like to read. We hope Mr. Mullinger will follow them up with another, in which the Puritan and Calvinist character of Queen's and Emmanuel will be brought into clearer prominence.



*Histoire du Méthodisme dans les Iles de la Manche.* 1784-1884. Par MATHIEU LELIÈVRE, D.D. Theophilus Woolmer. 1885.

Dr. Lelièvre is known to our readers as a French Methodist minister, the writer of an admirable biography of John Wesley in French, a volume by means of which the character and life-work of Wesley, and the early history of Methodism, have been made known to the French world of letters, as well as to French Protestants generally, and, let us not doubt, to some devout and intelligent French Roman Catholics. He is now, and has been for two or three years, stationed in Jersey, and has thus been led to write the present work, as a centenary volume for the Methodism of the Norman Isles, Methodism having, in 1784, been introduced into those islands, where it has since taken root so deep, and borne fruit so abundant. The volume is gracefully dedicated to the Churches among whom the author is at present labouring: "To the Methodist Churches of the Channel Islands—in Guernsey, which gave me a pious and brave mother; in Alderney, from whence the missionary went forth who led my excellent father to the gospel-faith; in Jersey, where I found the loved companion of my life; I dedicate this work, composed in the midst of them and for them, as a feeble testimony of gratitude and devotion."

An article from Dr. Lelièvre's pen, on the subject of the Huguenot Reformation in the Norman Isles, has lately appeared in this Journal. It was in connection with the preparations he was making for the publication of the volume before us that the writer was led to make the very interesting investigations, of which the results are found in that article, the substance of which article, in the writer's beautiful French, reappears in the book before us. "The interest which belongs"—we are translating Dr. Lelièvre's words—"to these little known beginnings of the insular Protestantism would not be sufficient to justify the place we have given them in this work, if there did not exist between the Huguenot movement of the sixteenth century and the Methodist movement of the eighteenth a sort of moral filiation. The Methodists have been in the islands the true successors of the Huguenots, and they have owed, without doubt, a part of the results of their own work to the work of their predecessors. Here we have the true apostolical succession, a succession of far more value than that which the French Reformed are reproached with having interrupted when they established in the islands the Presbyterian discipline."

There are few episodes in the history of early Methodism more interesting than the history of its introduction into the lovely islands of the Norman archipelago—an archipelago closely embosomed within a hollow of the French bay of La Manche, but yet so very far apart from France in its religious and social condition, and in its civil and political ideas. The labours in this field, between 1785 and 1790, of Adam Clarke, of

"Squire Brackenbury," of the fervid and faithful Jean de Quetteville, the father of a tribe of godly and devoted men and women, and of John Wesley himself, have a singular freshness of interest, especially as they are related by Dr. Lelièvre. Nor has the after-history of Methodism in the islands been unworthy of its commencement. The relations of the work and the labourers in the Channel Islands with the evangelistic work in France is a subject of no secondary importance, which is well set forth in this volume. The work was begun mainly by means of French preaching, and still by far the largest number of Church ministers and hearers chiefly use the French language, and are ministered to in French. There are, however, very large and important English congregations. The English ministers are about one-third in number of the French ministers. Methodism extends through all the parishes in the islands and, if it were not for the parochial schools, which are nearly all in the hands of the parish clergy of the Anglican pale, the English Church would hardly be able to maintain an equal position by the side of Methodism. In the Channel Islands, however, as in England, the position of the Established Church is very powerfully entrenched behind the bulwark of the parish day-schools. We strongly recommend this volume, alike for the intrinsic interest of its contents, and for its admirable style. Dr. Lelièvre stands high in his own country as a *litterateur*, and this volume will maintain his reputation.

*John Gordon, of Pitburg and Parkhill; or, Memories of a Standard-Bearer.* By HIS WIDOW. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1885.

This volume is the record of a devoted Christian life. John Gordon was a Scottish landowner of the same stock as the hero of Khartoum. Born at Aberdeen in 1827, he studied under a private tutor, spent two years at Eton, and in 1845 entered Trinity College, Cambridge. Two remarkable incidents of early life may be taken as a fair index to his character. Being in Paris in 1848, he went out with a friend to see the fun. They soon found themselves entangled in a mob of revolutionists, who were excited with drink. Suddenly a voice at Gordon's side ordered him to drink to the toast "Liberté, Egalité, et Fraternité." An ill-looking man, with bottle and glass in hand, summoned him thus to prove his devotion to the Republic. Without a thought Gordon shouted in stentorian voice "Vive le Roi!" A burst of execration followed. The young Scotchman's friend fled in one direction, whilst he burst through the group and sprang off in another. He was six feet four, and soon distanced his pursuers. An attempt to send him to Coventry, because he preferred to subscribe to other amusements rather than to the "boats" at Cambridge, was a signal failure. Gordon's imperturbable good nature brought him off completely victorious. His cousin, Mr. Gordon Forlong

was the means of leading him to Christ. He at once renounced all amusements or occupations that seemed inconsistent with his new life, and gradually threw himself into all kinds of evangelistic work. His tract distribution had a touch of eccentricity which made it singularly impressive. He started a tandem, which he knew would attract attention, and had his dog-cart well stored with tracts, so that when people turned to look at the tandem they received one of his silent messengers. He never lost an opportunity of doing good. Once, in travelling in Scotland, he found himself with a companion whom he recognized at once as a man of mark. The stranger conversed with him on religious subjects, but let him know that he was "a Catholic." Mr. Gordon kept clear of controversy, but took care to give the full Gospel-message in Scripture texts, with which he seemed fed, as he said, one after another. He afterwards found that he had been talking to the late Mr. Hope-Scott, the great lawyer. Next year, when Mr. Gordon entered a railway carriage in England, he found his former fellow-traveller and a lady there. Mr. Hope-Scott at once recognized him, and said, "It is very singular that we should meet again just here, for the last time I travelled on this part of the line a fellow-passenger spoke to me exactly as you did last year." Mrs. Hope-Scott, the grand-daughter of Sir Walter Scott, listened with almost breathless attention as Mr. Gordon spoke of Christ and His full salvation. She died not long after. Such incidents may show the character of this interesting volume. Mrs. Gordon is the daughter of Sir David Brewster. Her husband's life was full of zeal, and unwearied in all evangelical work. Such a record will introduce him to many who never heard of him while living, and will encourage all Christian workers. There are not a few features of Mr. Gordon's character which remind us of the Gordon whom all England mourns.

*Memorials of R. Harold A. Schofield, M.A., M.B. (Oxon.), late of the China Inland Mission; First Medical Missionary to Shan-Si, China.* Chiefly compiled from his Letters and Diaries by his brother, A. T. SCHOFIELD, M.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

This is an inspiring life. Dr. Schofield had a brilliant career at Owens College, Lincoln College, Oxford, and St. Bartholomew's Hospital, his scholarships amounted to nearly £1,500, but he gave up all prospects of success at home to labour in the China Inland Mission. During his fatal illness he said that the three years spent in China had "been by far the happiest in his life." His brother allows Dr. Schofield to tell his own story by extracts from his correspondence and his journals, but the volume is prepared with skill. It is full of

various interest, and must prove a blessing to those who thus catch a glimpse of this devoted *alumnus* of John Wealey's College.

*The Successful Merchant. Sketches of the Life of Mr. Samuel Budgett.* By WILLIAM ARTHUR. Author's Uniform Edition. London : Bemrose & Sons. 1885.

Eight years ago this book had reached a forty-third edition, and had been translated into Welsh, Dutch, French and German. It has had great influence on many a busy man, and has charmed many a leisure hour. This beautiful edition is just the present one would like to put into the hands of young men who are rising into positions of usefulness and honour. The attractions of the book itself—the most popular work that even Mr. Arthur ever wrote—need no commendation. We are glad that the young men of to-day are not to be without their own edition.

*Faithful Service: Sketches of Christian Women.* By MARY PRYOR HACK. London : Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

This is the fourth of Miss Hack's portraits of Christian Women. Her earlier books have won a high place in this biographical style of literature. All their excellencies are here reproduced. The volume is devoted to Lady Maxwell, Sophia Zeller, Sarah B. Judson, and five other ladies less known, but not less worthy. The fresh and fragrant sketch of Priscilla Johnston, the eldest daughter of Fowell Burton, is one of the best in the volume.

*The Good Fight ; or, More than Conquerors : Stories of Christian Martyrs and Heroes.* By Rev. JOHN HUNT, D.D., and others. With Illustrations by Frank Dodd, E. F. Brewtnall, F. Barnard, F. A. Fraser, &c. London : Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

Terrible though the pictures of suffering presented in this beautiful volume are, they will be studied with profound interest. The sad stories are told with great skill. This is in fact a book of martyrs which conveys an adequate impression of the heroic endurance of the noble army of martyrs without lingering upon the hideous details of their agony. Fine illustrations are profusely scattered through the volume. It is strange to find such a sentence as the following in the sketch of Stephen. "Saul of Tarsus, bending over the clothes which had been cast at his feet to conceal the emotion which his face betrayed, had become a believer." Is the writer ignorant of the fact that Paul went to

Damascus after the martyrdom of Stephen breathing out threatenings and slaughter?

*Domestic Annals of Scotland. From the Reformation to the Rebellion of 1745.* By ROBERT CHAMBERS, LL.D., &c. &c. Abridged Edition. W. and R. Chambers. 1885.

This is an abridgment of a work well-known and highly-valued by all cultivated Scotchmen and by all students of Scottish history. It shows us the domestic interior and the highway and byway life of Scotland for the two important and interesting centuries covered by its range. We need say no more in commendation of it, except that the abridgment is carefully done by a competent hand, and that the book, besides being cheap, is strongly and well got up. It is a neat, solid, interesting volume.

*Letters by the late Frances Ridley Havergal.* Edited by her Sister, M. V. G. H. Third thousand. London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1885.

The preface to this collection of letters is dated last August; the volume before us belongs to the "third thousand." There is no need to recommend, it is sufficient to announce, a volume of letters from the hand of the late gifted and pious poetess, whose strains are popular throughout the world, and whose prose is, like that of so many poets, very pure and charming. Here is much of the inmost experience of an intense and glowing Christian—a Christian, too, who was chastened and disciplined in character, self-denying and practical in life, no less than devotional in spirit. Sometimes ecstasy and humble practicalness of Christian obedience and service do not go together. They did in the case of Miss Havergal. There were, no doubt, some peculiarities in her evangelical views, such as might not be accepted by a syndicate of profound theologians. But there is nothing either heterodox or dangerous; while the full soul of devotional feeling, the earnestness and strength of evangelical conviction and principle, the happy infection of Christian lovingness which characterize her letters, are such as to render this volume very profitable and inspiring to the Christian reader.

*The History of Israel and Judah from the Reign of Ahab to the Decline of the two Kingdoms.* By Dr. EDERSHEIM. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

The name of Dr. Edersheim is sufficient guarantee for the accuracy and the masterly ability of his volume, which deals with a very important and difficult period of Israelitish history.

## BELLES LETTRES.

*Faust. A Dramatic Poem.* By GOETHE. Part II. Translated by Sir THEODORE MARTIN, K.C.B. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh & London. 1886.

A TRANSLATION of the Second Part of *Faust* is a hazardous undertaking. The work will never be popular, even with Germans. The second and third acts, which comprise the classical Walpurgisnacht and the allegorical myth of the marriage of Faust and Helena, are marked by a high if somewhat severe quality of imagination, and throughout the play the technique is admirable, while the lyrical portions are often exquisitely beautiful; but in the first and fourth acts the interest flags, and the poem as a whole is wanting in the depth and spirituality which we look for in a soul's tragedy. Hence no comparison is more inapt than that which has sometimes been instituted between *Faust* and the *Divina Commedia*, for while Dante is always intensely earnest and sometimes, particularly in the "Paradise," really profound, Goethe seldom rises above the level of the consummate literary artist, who looks upon culture as the be-all and end-all of life. Sir Theodore Martin's translation is a scholarly performance; it is hardly necessary to say that it preserves the metres of the original, as a translation of *Faust* which did not do so would be an anachronism. Unfortunately, however, the poetry and melody of the original seem, as is not unfrequently the case with translations, to have been left behind. The work, however, is certainly an improvement upon some other versions of the poem which we have seen, including Bayard Taylor's.

*Wilfred and Marion.* A Drama in Five Acts. By EVAN ALEXANDER. London: Tinsley Bros. 1885.

The preface to this volume is a startling production. The man who set himself to analyze some of its sentences would find that he had an impossible task. "History unfolds many strange adventures, events, and *much* other tragical scenes, wherein the meditative reader can comprehend lovable and detestable characters, which *retain* the world in continual trepidation and embarrassment." Such a sentence may be matched by expressions in the poetry: "who *lits* mine anger up." "She claims respect, but I *discard* it her." The preface might be given bodily in any book of composition to teach "how not to do it." All the young people of the drama are paragons of virtue. Two of the fathers are bad with a badness that beggars description. Take, for instance, part of

the address made by one of them to his father's likeness, at which he *stares scornfully*—a word for which the poet has a strange *penchant*.

“ Here is the devil in a human form,  
With every churlish look distinctly seen,  
With his malicious and offensive grin.”

Lady Grace needs to tell her father—the other villain of the play :

“ So long as I am not by you ill-used  
With any instrument inflicting pain,  
I will remain your true and faithful child,  
And strive to be obedient, meek, and mild.”

The second of these lines is singularly wanting in anything like poetry. Wilfred is the best poet of the play. His touch about Shakespeare—

“ He added to a world another world,  
Which cannot perish till the crack of Doom,”

is one of the happiest couplets. His reflections on the picture of a sleeping maiden are tender and graceful. The conversation between Marion, the heiress who loves Wilfred, and her servant Mary is weak; but Mary and Pluck, the man-servant of the drama, make a marriage which is one of the features of the story. We do not like some words put into the mouth of Lady Grace's infidel, libertine, and brutal father. It seems like desecration for a man who has just killed the husband he was about to force on his daughter, and then stabbed himself, to say—

“ I pray you now, sweet Grace, live good and true,  
See that the higher life goes well with you :  
For in that life enjoyment lies conceal'd,  
Which pious mortals soon shall see reveal'd.”

The drama ends with three happy weddings.

*The Iliad of Homer.* Done into English Verse by ARTHUR S. WAY, M.A. Vol. I. Books I.—XII. London : Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1886.

Some time ago we noted Mr. Way's spirited and faithful version of the first six books of the *Iliad*. We are glad to see that the high level of excellence which characterized it is fully sustained throughout the present volume. We look with eagerness for the completion of the work.

#### ART AND ÆSTHETICS IN FRANCE.

*L'Art* (Paris: J. Rouam; New York: Macmillan & Co.) has been much occupied with Rubens of late. M. Max Rooses, of the Musée Plantin-Moretus at Antwerp, contributes to the December, January, and February issues, four articles full of details, more or less valuable

to the biographer and historian of art, concerning the relations of Rubens and the great printer Balthasar Moretus. The December and January issues contain two interesting articles by M. Charut, of the Institute, on the artistic treatment of demoniacal possession, as exemplified in the works of Italian and Flemish painters, especially Raphael and Rubens. M. Alfred Melani sends from Milan an account of a discovery which he claims to have made of a masterpiece by Mantegna long buried in the museum at Brera. An able monograph (admirably illustrated) on the engravings of Gerard Edelinck, by the Vicomte Delaborde, and the two first of a series of articles on the rich collection of enamels, bronzes, reliefs, and other articles of *vertu* belonging to M. Stein (also admirably illustrated), give especial interest to the February issue.

*English School Classics: Bacon's Essays.* With Introduction, Annotations, Notes, and Indexes. By F. STORR, B.A., and C. H. GIBSON. Rivingtons, Waterloo Place, London. 1886.

There is too much of the editors in this book. It is absurd, in an Introduction to Bacon's essays, which belong wholly to literature, to discuss Bacon's scientific method. This cannot be adequately dealt with in a few paragraphs, and anything less than an adequate discussion of it is worse than useless. The essays which are appended to Bacon's by way of comment, and which are usually much larger than the text they are supposed to elucidate, have frequently very little connection with it. Sometimes, also, they are open to the censure which we have ventured to pass upon the Introduction, of dealing with very high and difficult matters in a very slight, superficial style. This is especially noticeable in the little dissertation appended to Bacon's essay on Atheism. Here we are told that "reason of itself cannot demonstrate the existence of God," a position which we believe to be false, and which at any rate cannot be said to have been yet established. Then follow some off-hand remarks about Theism, Pantheism, "the Spencerian appeal to consciousness," Transcendentalism (on which Carlyle is quoted as an authority), a reference to Jacobi, a quotation from St. Augustine—all in the space of little more than a page. With a liberal use of the pruning-hook the work might be made a useful one.

*Humanities.* By THOMAS SINCLAIR, M.A. London: Trübner & Co. 1886.

"Letters to England," which describe the author's visit to the Continent, occupy one-third of this volume, and have great freshness and originality, though Mr. Sinclair cannot be called an enthusiast. "The



idolatries are to be hated whatsoever form they take," is his protest against hero worship. His remarks on Monaco are singularly wide of the mark, and his utter want of appreciation of St. Paul's character and work shown in the paper on "Humanism," is appalling. The "cold-blooded harshness of the Organization put on mankind in its weak time by the disciple of Gamaliel," is his language in reference to the man who saved the world from the bondage of Jewish ritual. "The Latin Tractate" with which the volume opens, is its weakest feature. The essays are generally suggestive, but readers will find many points on which they must make serious deductions from the writer's claim to be a safe or judicious guide.

*The Story of Catharine.* By the Author of "A Lost Love."  
(ASHFORD OWEN). London : Macmillan & Co. 1885.

This is the story of a secret marriage between a fascinating but wilful heiress and an officer who is both a gambler and a profligate. The result is what every one would expect. Years of bitter trouble await the young wife. She sacrifices everything for her worthless husband, only to find him trying to win the affection of another young lady. The writer manages to patch up a reconciliation at the close of the book, when everything seems at its worst, but it is a very improbable one. It is arranged that the heiress and her husband shall live with her grandfather at his country mansion, but the husband, even after his wife has forgiven all his unfaithfulness and base scheming, "was glad of any valid reason for leaving Nether Gilbert occasionally." This is an unsatisfactory ending to a well-written but unpleasant story.

*Gulliver's Travels into Several Remote Regions of the World.*  
By JONATHAN SWIFT, D.D. Illustrated by above 100  
Designs by Gordon Browne.

*Two Thousand Years Ago ; or, the Adventures of a Roman Boy.*  
By Professor A. J. CHURCH.

*The Lion of the North : a Tale of Gustavus Adolphus and the Wars of Religion.* By G. A. HENTY. With Twelve full-page Illustrations by John Schönberg. London : Blackie & Son.

We have here an edition of *Gulliver's Travels*, suitable for the young and for family reading, the passages which offend against delicacy and decency having been cut out. We are exceedingly glad to see the immortal work thus relieved from the coarseness which marred it, and

recommend this edition with sincere pleasure. The footnotes explanatory of obsolete words and obscure expressions are very useful, and the illustrative designs generally capital. This will be the popular edition with our young people.

In *Two Thousand Years Ago*, young readers will find classical themes wearing the colours of romance. The dry roots blossom on these pages, the dry bones live. The main action of the story belongs to the last years of the Roman Republic, and wonderfully assists the young reader to realize the period to which it belongs. The reading of a fascinating story of this order will give the young scholar a more vivid interest in all his classical work.

In "*The Lion of the North*," Mr. Henty gives an excellent sketch of the Thirty Years' War up to the death of Wallenstein. The story is crowded with adventures of the most stirring kind, told with great skill. All boys will be delighted with Malcolm Græme's soldier-life in Gustavus Adolphus's army, and will gain from it a capital idea of that great struggle. The illustrations are very well executed.

*Eleanor's Ambition.* By SARSON J. INGHAM.

*Waiting; an Allegorical Story.* By SARSON J. INGHAM.

Illustrated by W. Gunson.

*Senior and Junior Scholars' Table and Books.* London : Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School Union. 1886.

Miss Ingham's stories have gained a wide and well-deserved reputation. These pretty books will therefore be welcomed by many young people. Both stories will have a happy influence on their readers. The interest and power of the story are well-sustained, but there are some passages which need revision. "In your heart's innermost" is a strange expression to come from the pen of a practised writer. The tablets are excellent. The pictures are attractive, and the questions suggestive. In such a convenient form they will be of great service to teachers.

*Every-day Life in South India; or, the Story of Coopooswamey; an Autobiography.* London : Religious Tract Society. 1885.

This is the story of a Hindoo boy who was led to renounce heathenism and is now a catechist in South India. We have seldom read a more interesting missionary book. It is singularly fresh, and gives a graphic description of the actual life of a Hindoo home, with its religious feelings and its social surroundings. It also conveys an admirable idea of the transition stage through which India is now passing. Ancestral beliefs

are losing their hold, and education is gradually bringing the people over to Christianity. No more delightful missionary book than this could be found.

*Simon Holmes, the Carpenter of Aspendale. The Secret of the Mere; or, Under the Surface.* By J. JACKSON WRAY.  
London: James Nisbet & Co. 1885.

These interesting stories will have a hearty welcome from a wide circle of readers. They teach many important lessons in a pleasant way.

#### WESLEYAN CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Reminiscences of the Early Life and Missionary Labours of the Rev. John Edwards, fifty years a Wesleyan Missionary in South Africa.* Second Edition.
2. *Siam and the Siamese as described by American Missionaries.*
3. *The Opposite House, with other Stories for Cottage Homes.*  
By ANNE FRANCES PERRAM.
4. *'Twixt Promise and Vow, and other Stories.* By RUTH ELLIOTT.
5. *Some Aspects of the Blessed Life.* By MARK GUY PEARCE.
6. *Wayside Wisdom; or, Old Solomon's Ideas of Things.* By the  
Rêv. JOHN COWELL. London: T. Woolmer. 1886.

1. We are glad to welcome a second edition of Mr. Edward's autobiography. It is a wonderful record of devoted work north of the Transvaal and in Cape Colony, which will be read with unflagging interest. Some valuable glimpses of native life among the Bushmen and Griquas are given.

2. *Siam and the Siamese* is a description of the country and people rather than a record of missionary labour. It is one of the most entertaining and instructive books that could be put into the hands of young people, and will give all readers an insight into the customs of this wonderful country, such as they could scarcely gain elsewhere. The illustrations are specially good.

3. *The Opposite House*, which gives its name to Miss Perram's collection of stories, is by no means the best; but all are good, some very happy and attractive. Its beautiful get-up makes this just the book for a present.

4. Ruth Elliott's new volume, *'Twixt Promise and Vow*, is full of

capital stories. They are racy, well-written, and teach many happy lessons in a happy style.

5. Some of the twelve papers in Mr. Pearce's volume have already appeared in the *Quiver* and *Sunday Magazine*. Now that they are grouped together they will find a place among favourite books of devotion, and will comfort many a sick chamber by their restful and precious words. Mr. Pearce is here seen in his happiest vein. His papers are worthy of their title, and catch the various aspects of the blessed life with singular felicity.

6. Mr. Cowell's book is well worth reading by old and young. It is full of shrewd, racy, pithy sayings upon subjects of great importance to those who wish to make the best of life.

### *Cornhill Magazine* (January, February, March).

The short papers on general topics in these numbers are superior to the fiction. Mrs. Oliphant's "Queen Eleanor and Fair Rosamond" is decidedly unpleasant and unsatisfactory; but such articles as "A Novelist's Favourite Theme," the graphic description of Adam's Peak given in "Samanala and its Shadow," and above all the delightful articles on Natural History, should be read by all who wish to spend a pleasant hour. The capital paper on "Autographs" should not be overlooked.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

*Fruits and Fruit-Trees, Home and Foreign. An Index to the Kinds valued in Britain, with Descriptions, Histories, and other Particulars.* By LEO H. GRINDON. Manchester: Palmer & Howe. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1885.

MR. GRINDON'S book is like an old-fashioned English orchard. His trees are neither Dutch-trimmed, nor stripped of parasitical growths, nor planted in rigid geometrical order. Ancient lichens, delicate little poems in moss, festoons of graceful climbers, clustered masses of mistletoe, with old gable-ended houses, and rustic garden-gates, and little banks of primrose and violet, relieve the monotony of scientific description. We know of no popular science-teacher who more deftly interweaves so many diverse materials as this pleasant writer. He is at once botanist, gardener, cook, etymologist, archæologist, and herald. It is true that occasionally there is a touch of pedantry in his learning, and the reiteration, not

of facts, but of methods of grouping, a little palls upon the reader. Yet, on the whole, the effect is pleasing. Here and there a sentence needs the pruning-knife or a strand of bast; and this kindly office we hope Mr. Grindon may quickly have the opportunity of discharging. For slovenliness, in ever so small a degree, cannot be tolerated in a book which has some claim to rank as one of the prose-poems of our natural history literature.

Preachers and cottagers, to say nothing of amateur and gardeners economists, will find the book full of useful information. The former may gather explanations of Scriptural allusions, and lovely little parables of Nature. The latter may learn how to select fruit-trees for their gardens, and how to utilize the wild fruits with which Nature has enriched our woods and lanes. Not a little of the fruit-lore in which the book abounds will be novel to most readers. Many popular errors and prejudices are here exploded. How few, for instance, know that the mountain-ash is not an ash at all, but a pear, and that its clusters of red berries are not poisonous but perfectly wholesome, as the birds eagerly testify; or that the laurel is not a laurel, but a plum, its leaves and stones poisonous, but the flesh of its fruit good for tarts and jam; an anomaly which it shares with the yew, and, indeed, with the peach and other kinds of stone-fruit. Who would dream of discovering any connection between "the husks that the swine do eat" and the locust-beans upon which the children of the very poor spend their stray farthings, and a goldsmith's "carats"? Or, between the "dulcimer," which figures among Nebuchadnezzar's musical instruments, and the elder, out of which a winter's hot-drink is still concocted in rural England? These are specimens, selected at random, of the surprises which await the reader. There is not a fruit grown in our gardens or hedge-rows, from the Ribstone pippin to the blackberry, nor a fruit sold in our shops, from "pears at fifteen guineas a dozen" to the crinkly little ground-nuts, so delightful to the children and their friends in the monkey-house, which is not here discoursed upon, both historically and botanically.

### *Historical Sketch of the Distribution of Land in England.*

With Suggestions for some Improvement in the Law.

By W. LLOYD BIRKBECK, M.A., Downing Professor of the Laws of England in the University of Cambridge.  
London: Macmillan. 1885.

A brief, clear, and interesting account of the rise, growth, and development of the English land system. Any one desiring to thread his way through the maze of real property law could hardly have a better guide. In this little book of only a hundred pages Professor Birkbeck tells us what to think of "arbitrary rules"—to use Sir J. F. Stephen's amusing

description of some of the provisions of the Settled Land Act of 1882—"arbitrary rules providing that the difficulties arising from the logical interpretation of statutory substitutes for technical evasions of statutory attempts to prevent the evasion by legal fictions of the practical application of a false principle shall be set aside." In the later chapters there are many valuable hints and sober suggestions that our land reformers might do worse than read and ponder and—adopt.

*The Land Question: its Examination and Solution.* By T. J. ELLIOT, M.R.A.C., Professor of Estate Management at the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester. London: Cassell. 1884.

This is not a treatise on the various questions pertaining to the tenure and culture of land, but an attempt to prove, by the history of a single farm on the Pembroke estates, near Salisbury, that farming was a profitable occupation from 1850 to 1873. So far as the farm in question is concerned, the evidence seems conclusive enough. Nearly a hundred pages of schedules are given, containing the minutest details of income and expenditure, and the most elaborate calculations and analysis. The calculations are extended to the year 1884 with similar results. Using a very big "if," and addressing himself directly to tenant farmers, the author says: "If you use *sufficient* capital, you will be able to compete with low prices and stand safely against a series of bad seasons. . . . This is shown to be so in the case of the Wilton House Home Farm, and it is on this fact alone I claim that I have *solved*, so far as agriculture is concerned, 'The Land Question.'"

*Scientific Illustrations and Symbols. Moral Truths Mirrored in Scientific Facts.* Designed for the Use of the Senate, the Bar, the Pulpit, the Orator, and the Lover of Nature. By a Barrister of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1885.

These illustrations are arranged in alphabetical order and furnished with an index to all general topics, and another of natural objects, technical terms, &c. A letter at the end of each paragraph guides any student to the author by whose writings it has been suggested. In a short preface the compiler of this book pleads that scientific facts will sometimes be more forcible than anecdotes for the pulpit and the platform. There is certainly a splendid store of racy and fresh matter here. The paragraphs are concise and pointed. Morals are given briefly, sometimes they are made so clear that the heading supplies the whole application. The

slanderer is compared to those African scorpions whose bite is highly dangerous at first. The constitution, however, becomes hardened to its effects, so that the suffering is less on every subsequent occasion. "Moral Sentinels" is the happy heading given to a description of the little bird of the Antilles which warns man of the movements of the lance-headed viper, a most poisonous, prolific, and noiseless snake. The leopard's care to sharpen its claws every day against a tree before going after its prey supplies a lesson on forethought. This book will furnish pleasant reading for leisure moments, as well as excellent illustrations.

*Outlines of Natural Philosophy.* By J. D. EVERETT, D.C.L.  
F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Queen's  
College, Belfast. London : Blackie & Son. 1885.

Dr. Everett has already proved himself fully competent for work of this sort by his *Elementary Physics*, his translation of Deschanel's *Natural Philosophy*, and in other ways. Many books on Physics have recently been produced, but there was still needed a thorough and systematic introduction to the numerous sciences included in Natural Philosophy. Professor Everett has supplied this want, and we feel sure that the lucid style of its language and the admirable engravings which illustrate almost every point, will make the book widely welcome. Mechanics, hydrostatics, heat, light, sound, magnetism, and electricity, are all dealt with in a non-technical manner, and the latest inventions and researches are familiarly explained. There is, of course, barely any attempt at a mathematical treatment of the subjects concerned, for that would have destroyed the distinctive character of the book. As a plain and complete introduction to such works as those of Deschanel, Ganot, Todhunter, &c., it is scarcely possible to imagine anything more suitable, and we congratulate both teachers and students who may be fortunate enough to have such a book placed in their hands.

*The Ocean.* A Treatise on Ocean Currents and Tides and their Causes, Demonstrating the System of the World.  
By WILLIAM LEIGHTON JORDAN, F.R.G.S. Second Edition, Abridged and Revised. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

This learned treatise shows a thorough grasp of all the theories of ocean currents and the mathematical principles involved. Mr. Jordan has a luminous style, so that even this difficult and abstruse subject is made clear and interesting to readers who cannot follow every detail of the work. Eighteen plates and five woodcuts, some of them of great value,

materially assist to a full understanding of the text. This book is described as a second edition; but Mr. Jordan's views were published to some extent as early as 1866, and the first edition of the present work was, to a great extent, a third edition of his *Treatise on the Action of Vis Inertia in the Ocean*, revised and partly re-written. Book X. of the present edition, which formerly contained simple suggestions as to the action of vis inertia in the heavens, has been carefully completed, so that Mr. Jordan claims that he has now made it a "demonstration" of the subject. All the theories which have been formulated to account for ocean currents are discussed there. Mr. Jordan propounds and illustrates his own. He holds that the motion of the earth's surface round its axis, from west to east, causes a motion of the water which lies along the earth's surface in the contrary direction—that is, from east to west. This westward pressure is constant, because it is due to a fixed and unchanging influence, and at the equator, where the earth rotates at a speed of a thousand miles an hour, it is, of course, much greater than that exerted on an equal mass of water lying about the poles. The westward pressure is also stronger at the surface of the ocean, than at a great depth below. We cannot follow Mr. Jordan through all the stages of his inquiry, but a good sample of his method may be found in chapter xiii., where he takes the late Admiral Fitzroy's statements about tidal hours, and shows how all harmonize with his own theory. No one can claim to be abreast of this subject who has not mastered this judicious and learned work.

*The Three Reforms of Parliament: a History—1830–1885.*

By WILLIAM HEATON, Editor of Cassell's *Concise Cyclopaedia*. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

*A History of Constitutional Reform in Great Britain and Ireland.* By JAMES MURDOCH. London: Blackie & Son. 1885.

As a matter not of curious interest merely, but of serious political duty, many of the newly enfranchised electors will no doubt desire to acquaint themselves with the various stages in the movement towards perfect Parliamentary representation, which has been so marked a characteristic of our national life during the last half-century. For this purpose they cannot do better than read the two books that we have selected for notice and commendation. Neither of them seems to have been written with any conscious bias, or for any merely party purpose, and both of them are as impartial as the history of recent events can reasonably be expected to be.

Mr. Heaton's chapters have grown out of the paragraphs of a lecture delivered by him in the North of England, and his style has all the



directness and vivacity of spoken speech. So captivating is the style, indeed, and so well selected are the points on which the author dwells, that, in spite of the "dull surfeit" (caused by a superabundance of the "nectar'd sweets" of political oratory), beneath the pressure of which we approached the book, we were led on from page to page—through the shameful fields of "Peterloo," past the frowning Cave of Adullam, through the Hyde Park railings, refreshing ourselves in the Tea-room of the House of Commons, listening to the greatest statesmen of the Victorian era, watching Mr. Disraeli educating his party, trembling while the Earl of Derby takes the famous "leap in the dark," by which, to mix the metaphors, he "dishes the Whigs," until at last we reached the climax of this "strange, eventful history," and found ourselves in presence of one of the most interesting, critical, perplexing, and important political situations of the century. Lest we should convey an erroneous impression of Mr. Heaton's book, however, perhaps we ought to add that whilst the story of Reform as told by him has all the charm of romance, it has also all the seriousness and nearly all the accuracy of history. Useful abstracts of the Acts of 1832 and 1867, and copious extracts from the Act of 1884-5, together with the Schedules appended thereto, lead up to the excellent index that fills the last half-dozen of the 300 pages of this attractive and most useful book.

Mr. Murdoch covers more ground than Mr. Heaton, and goes over it more slowly and minutely. Whilst the latter only deals with the period immediately preceding the Act of 1832, and gives an account of the three great Reforms and some of their results, the former goes back to the origins and looks into the future of Parliamentary Government, and treats his subject throughout with greater fulness and detail. Here is the list of contents:—1. Theory of Political Government; 2. Contests for Supremacy by the Three Estates; 3. Their *status quo* in 1688; 4. Position of the Country at that Time; 5. Periods of Reform; 6. Reform, its Results and Further Objects; 7. Index.

It would be impossible to convey any idea of the wealth of information garnered in these 400 pages; but we may note that in the body of the work an admirable abstract is given of almost every speech of any importance delivered in Parliament or out of it on every side of the question during the period of Reform. By his painstaking research and careful digests and voting lists and summaries, Mr. Murdoch has laid political students especially under very large obligations. His book is of permanent interest and value.

*Justice and Police.* By F. W. MAITLAND. *English Citizen Series.* London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

This book gives just such an account, precise and comprehensive, yet not overloaded with detail, practical, yet never unmindful of historical ante-

cedents, technically accurate, yet expressed for the most part in untechnical language, of the existing machinery for enforcing civil and criminal justice within the limits of England and Wales, as the English citizen, who is desirous of becoming better acquainted with that portion of his legal environment, may read with advantage. The style is clear and pleasant.

*The Laws concerning Religious Worship ; also Mortmain and Charitable Uses.* By JOHN JENKINS, a District Registrar of the High Court of Justice. London : Waterlow Bros. & Layton. 1885.

Mr. Jenkins published a few years ago a work on the *Laws relating to Public Worship*. This book, relating generally to the same subject, will meet a want often felt by others besides lawyers. It contains a chronological narrative of Ecclesiastical Legislation in England from the Conquest to the present time ; a compendium of the Law of Mortmain and Charitable Uses ; and summaries of the Law concerning Ministers of Religion and Trustees of Charities. We need say no more by way of showing its value. The student of ecclesiastical history, in particular, will find it a complete and very valuable index within the extensive range which it includes. It is not a costly book.

*Our Administration of India, being a Complete Account of the Revenue and Collectorate Administration in all Departments.*

By H. A. D. PHILLIPS, B.C.S. London : W. Thacker & Co.

The District Collector is the chief factor in the machinery of Indian administration. He carries out the laws and regulations made by Viceroy and Secretaries of State, Councils and Parliaments. It is in his hands that the welfare of India and the honour of England lie. In eleven chapters Mr. Phillips gives a complete epitome of the civil, in distinction from the criminal, duties of an Indian Collector. The information is all derived from personal experience. A polemical interest runs through the book, but this does not detract from the value of the very complete collections of facts and statistics given. The author has evidently felt his honour, and that of his order, touched by the attacks recently made from many quarters on Indian administration. We neither wonder at nor complain of his zealous defence of the official class. It is only from such rivalry that we can learn the facts on both sides. There is only one sentence to which we take serious exception. It is this :—"The educated classes no more represent the people of India than Mr. Hyndman's band of Socialists, or the Birmingham caucus, represents the people of England." Such a sweeping condemnation is

unjust in the highest degree to a class which, if it includes extremists, also includes all that is progressive in Hindu society, and which no British Government can ignore. We hope that Mr. Phillips will be encouraged to fulfil his promise to give a similar description of the collector's criminal jurisdiction.

*Jottings from the Pacific.* By W. WYATT-GILL, B.A. London : The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

Mr. Gill's book has an appropriate title—*Jottings from the Pacific*. In the first part, "Days from Home," many glimpses are given of the horrors of heathenism among the islanders of the Pacific. The description of the fate which befell the people of Mauke, in revenge for a murder they had committed, is ghastly. Their enemies organized a man-hunt. When they had seized a number of the people they forced them to gather fire-wood and make ovens. The miserable victims were clubbed and roasted in the ovens they had prepared. Next day the hunt was resumed, and the awful scene repeated!" Infants were snatched from their mothers' arms, then killed, and cooked with their parents. Such scenes bring into bold relief the blessed change which Mr. Gill has to describe. His second part, "Bible Truths Illustrated by Native Preachers," gives an entertaining description of the oratory of the Pacific. A native speaker cannot open his lips save in parable, song, or proverb. Humorous allusions, historical references, and laments for the dead are mixed together in seeming confusion, but with a well-defined purpose and with thrilling effect. In the grand weddings of olden times the bride used to walk to her new home over the prostrate bodies of her husband's clan, who lay with their faces on the ground. The bridegroom walked over his wife's people. A native preacher pressed this custom into his service, much to the astonishment of Mr. Gill. "Tread boldly, brethren," ran this singular exhortation, "on the prostrate body of Jesus; for He is our only way to the Father. Trust your entire weight, with all your burdens, on Him: He will not wince or cry. Only thus shall we safely arrive at the home of the redeemed." The zoological and botanical notes will be a mine of wealth for lovers of natural history. The sword-fish often works mischief in its hot pursuit of its prey. A young man seated in a canoe was dangerously wounded by one of them, which was pursuing a flying fish, and struck its formidable weapon through both sides of the canoe. His knee happened to be in the way, and was pierced above the joint. The young fellow limps to this day. The last part of the volume is headed "Miscellanea." Some curious customs are described, and four pages of South Sea Riddles given. Mr. Gill's book is a treasure-house of facts for missionary students and speakers. The style of binding makes it a companion volume to the interesting narrative of *Work and Adventure in New Guinea* which we noticed in our October number.

*Abyssinia.* Translated from the German of Dr. HENRY W. J. THIERSCH. By SARAH M. S. PEREIRA. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1885.

This little book traces the history of Abyssinia from the earliest times down to last April. Dr. Thiersch suggests that Tirhakah's approach, which led to Sennacherib's hasty retreat from Jerusalem (II. Kings xix.), may have been due to community of belief with the Jews. This suggestion he supports by the history of the Ethiopian eunuch. It was a universal law in the East that the slave must adopt the religion of his master. Therefore, he argues, that Candace must have professed the Mosaic faith. The strange Christianity of this country is described with great care. Gobat's mission, King Theodore's madness and cruelty, the work of the English expedition under Sir Robert Napier, and the later history of the country, are topics of special interest, and are treated in a most interesting way. The translation seems to be excellently done. If the subject had been broken up into chapters of some kind it would have been better.

*Assyria: its Princes, Priests, and People.* By A. H. SAYCE, M.A., Deputy-Professor of Comparative Philology, Oxford. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

This is the seventh volume of the timely series entitled "Bypaths of Bible Knowledge." Mr. Sayce is eminently qualified for such work as this. His suggestive preface shows how thoroughly he has mastered the bearing of Assyrian history on the Old Testament books. The five chapters are devoted to the country and people: Assyrian history; Assyrian religion; art, literature, and science; manners and customs; trade and government. We have seen no handbook on the subject to compare with this. It is singularly interesting. The last chapter gives a graphic sketch of manners and customs which will be highly appreciated by all who wish to see the Assyrians as they really were in the days when they played such a large part in the history of Israel and Judah. We commend this book to the attention of all Bible students. They will find it invaluable. The illustrations, mostly full-page reproductions taken from the British Museum, are admirably executed.

*The Dwellers on the Nile; or, Chapters on the Life, Literature, History, and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians.* By E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, M.A., Assistant in the Oriental Antiquities, British Museum. London: Religious Tract Society. 1885.

This is one of the most valuable books yet issued in the series entitled "Bypaths of Bible Knowledge." Fascinating is the only word to de-

scribe the text and abounding illustrations. In eleven chapters Mr. Budge covers a vast area of Egyptology. The sketch of the literature will surprise those who have formed an idea of the Egyptians as a stolid people. "The Tale of the Two Brothers" is full of imaginative power. An excellent idea of the hieroglyphics, and the way in which they have been deciphered, is given in this most interesting volume.

*Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament*; together with a Complete Vocabulary, and an Examination of the Chief New Testament Synonyms. Illustrated by Numerous Examples and Comments. Revised and Improved Edition. London: Religious Tract Society. 1886.

Dr. Green's Handbook has rendered such service to theological students that we are glad to welcome this excellent revision. It is now the most comprehensive manual on the subject. The most important facts are marked by thicker type, the revised version is constantly referred to, the vocabulary has been entirely reconstructed, and quotations of the text are now generally given from Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament. The concise, yet clear way in which all information is given, is specially noteworthy. Every student who is beginning to read the Greek Testament should have this volume in his hands.

*The Throne of Eloquence: Great Preachers, Ancient and Modern.* By E. PAXTON HOOD. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

Mrs. Hood has had to write the dedication of this volume. Her husband has gone to join the company over whose life-work he here lingers with a loving hand. A lecture which the author gave to Mr. Spurgeon's students grew into his well-known volume, *Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets*. Before that he had published his *Lamps of the Temple*, in which appeared an exceedingly appreciative paper on Mr. Spurgeon, then just rising into fame. To him therefore this volume is appropriately dedicated. With Mr. Hood preachers and preaching were themes that never lost interest. When his earlier works got out of print, he resolved to gather up all that he considered best and most worth preservation in three or four volumes. This is the first. A second, on *The Vocation of the Preacher*, which he did not live to finish, will follow. Some of the scene-painting of this book is in Mr. Hood's best style. Bossuet's extemporaneous sermon in the great Parisian *salon* is an admirable word-picture; so is the slighter glimpse of Wesley in Gwennap Amphitheatre. We are glad to find a defence of Jeremy Taylor from the depreciation of some who comment severely on his rhetorical style.

It would scarcely be possible to find finer sermons than some of his. Why, however, is the chapter headed "Jeremy Taylor, usually called the English Chrysostom of Divines"? The two last words are needless, and spoil all. Young preachers will find this one of the pleasantest volumes they can put on their shelves. All its readers will spend some happy hours with an old friend, and catch his enthusiasm for the great ambassadors of the Cross.

*A Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (A.D. 1450-1885). By Eminent Writers, English and Foreign. With Illustrations and Woodcuts. Edited by Sir GEORGE GROVE, D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

This is the twenty-first part of the *Dictionary of Music*, which is now drawing towards completion. The present instalment extends from "verse to water-music." A glance at the articles headed the "Violin," "Violin-playing," and "Wagner," will show the special excellencies of this work. For musicians it is invaluable, but all readers will be glad to have such judicious, exhaustive and entertaining articles as those to which we have referred. Fifty-seven closely printed pages are devoted to Wagner. They abound with interesting biographical particulars, as well as careful summing up of the distinctive merits of the great composer. The "Violin" is an attractive subject. Mr. Payne has handled it well. The principal makers in this country, the methods of making and repairing, and all other information, will be found here. We are glad to notice a protest against the craze for old instruments, which has sometimes gone to such foolish lengths. The great "Violin-players" are admirably described in another article. The reference we have had to make from time to time to other parts of this work have increased our estimate of its fulness and accuracy.

*Classified Gems of Thought, from the Great Writers and Preachers of all Ages.* In Convenient Form for use as a Dictionary of Ready Reference on Religious Subjects. By the Rev. F. B. PROCTOR, M.A., King's College, London. With a Preface by the Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.

The short Preface contributed to this volume by Dr. Wace puts the reader at once into sympathy with the purpose of his colleague's work. Mr. Proctor, in an admirable Introduction, says that "the attempt has been to make it as readable and as attractive to the general reader as a magazine." He has not failed in this attempt. The extracts are made

with great taste from a wide field of reading, and arranged alphabetically, with two indexes, so that any subject can be referred to in a moment. This is one of the best books of its kind we have seen.

*The Prayer-Book: Psalter: Pointed for Chanting, and with Chants adapted thereto, or specially composed for this Work.* By Sir HERBERT OAKELEY, M.A., Mus. Doc., LL.D. London: James Nisbet & Co.

Sir Herbert Oakeley's suggestive preface deserves careful attention from all students and directors of church music. His pointing shows how carefully he has handled that great problem of Psalmody. The original and the selected chants form a repertory of music which will be greatly prized by all choirs and congregations.

*Conversation: Why don't we do more good by it?* By the Rev. S. G. BOWES, B.A. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1886.

A timely and practical book, which is sure to please its readers, and help them to become more useful. Like Mr. Bowes' excellent volume of "Information and Illustration," which all should secure, this book is full of racy extracts, which make it very pleasant reading.

*Platform Aids.* London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1886.

The brief Preface to this unique volume states that it is "an attempt to supply a great and obvious blank." It consists of speeches culled from newspaper reports. The anonymous compiler has certainly made up an interesting volume, which will preserve many a fine passage that might otherwise have lain buried in newspaper files. To read one of the extracts before making a speech may refresh and stimulate a speaker; but the book will be not less welcomed by all who wish to renew the happy impressions made by such men as Dr. Tait, Dr. Punshon, Dr. Moffat, and Dr. Livingstone. It is arranged under five heads: Home Work, Foreign Missions, Bible Distribution, Temperance, Miscellaneous.

*Magnetism and Electricity.* For the use of Students in Schools and Science Classes. By H. C. TARN, M.C.P., F.S.Sc. Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers. 1886.

An excellent little book, with abundant illustrations, written expressly to prepare beginners for the elementary examinations of the Science and Art Department, and the Educational Code. Mr. Tarn is an experienced

teacher, who knows the points that need most careful elucidation; and he has made his work both clear and full.

*A Pronouncing Vocabulary of Modern Geographical Names, nearly Ten Thousand in Number, with Notes on Spelling and Pronunciation, and Explanatory Lists of Foreign Words which form part of Geographical Names.* By GEO. G. CHISHOLM. London: Blackie & Son. 1885.

This little handbook supplies a great want. The proper pronunciation of each name is given by spelling it as it should be sounded, and marking the accent. The introductory notes on spelling and pronunciation, and the explanations at the end of the book, are excellent.

*Chambers's Geographical Reader.* Standard VII. London and Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers. 1886.

The Ocean and the Heavens are treated here in so pleasant a style that this book is charming. There is a treat in store for all who read its interesting narratives and descriptions. The *Geographical Readers* are now complete, and should be on the shelves of every home library.

*The People's Day. An Appeal against a French Sunday.* By WILLIAM ARTHUR. London: Bemrose.

This valuable argument and appeal is republished in its order as one of the series of its author's works now in course of republication. It is one of Mr. Arthur's ablest productions, and is as appropriate to the present time as it was to the period of its original publication, now many years ago. Since that period, however, the character of the French Sunday has apparently, to some extent, improved. Many attempts have been made in the meantime to break down the sacred character of the Lord's day in England. If as yet these attempts have not succeeded, it has been in part because the country has been kept well supplied with such arguments as are forcibly stated in this excellent small book.

*Hinduism Past and Present.* With an Account of Recent Hindu Reformers, and a Brief Comparison between Hinduism and Christianity. By J. MURRAY MITCHELL, M.A., LL.D. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

In *Hinduism Past and Present* we have a clear, comprehensive sketch, a veritable *multum in parvo*, by an eminent master of the literature and mythology of Hinduism. We know not where the general reader or the young student can find a summary to compare with this.



## SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN PERIODICALS.

**R**EVUE DES DEUX MONDES (December 15).—Baron Hübner gives a graphic account of his "Six Weeks in Oceania." The first part is devoted to Norfolk Isle and the Fijian Archipelago. The Baron expresses his opinion that England in taking possession of Fiji has done a good action which promises to yield an abundant return. He pays many tributes to the noble Wesleyan missionaries who ventured among the cannibals. Thakambau, in his first years of heathen rule, is described as an abominable tyrant, who caused the five widows of his deceased father—his mother among them—to be strangled in his presence. He had eaten twenty thousand tongues all taken from enemies killed in or after battle. Baron Hübner was introduced to Thakambau's daughter—the Princess Andiquilla—by Mr. Langham, the head of the Wesleyan Mission, who has exercised, he says, almost supreme authority in some crises of Fijian history. Mr. Webb also made a very favourable impression upon the visitor. "Intelligence and energy were painted upon his honest figure. Like his *confrères*, he has been a sturdy pioneer of civilization."

(January 1.)—The second part of Baron Hübner's "Six Weeks in Oceania" is a description of Samoa. The commerce of the Samoan Group is chiefly in the hands of two great German houses, "The German Trade and Plantation Society," represented by Herr Weber, and the firm of Ruge & Co. Both are Hamburg houses. They have great estates, and send the produce of the isles to Europe, or from one island to another, in German vessels. Almost all the European residents in Samoa are employed under these companies. Their vast capital, their activity and high reputation, combine with freedom from serious competition to give them almost entire control of the trade. Baron Hübner says he has carefully watched the German colonists in all parts of the globe. The German is generally intelligent, always frugal, sober, economical, patient, persevering, courageous. He does not expect rapid gains, and does not like to risk what he has in grasping after it. The Anglo-Saxon is more enterprising, and his ventures are often successful. The German advances more slowly but more surely, and becomes so firmly rooted that nothing can wrench him from the soil. He is generally better prepared for his work than an Englishman in the same social scale. The Baron thinks the German and the Scotchman must divide the honour of being, as cultivators of the soil, the first colonists in the world. Neither the English nor the Germans show any trace of decadence. But England has an advantage over its great rival in its vast command of capital. In any history of Oceania Baron Hübner shows that the missionaries will fill an important page. He recognizes the devotion of the Wesleyan missionaries, who were first in the field, and says that in Fiji they are public characters. He adds that they have been accused "of carrying on commerce, of being traders. I am assured that this assertion has slight foundation. It is true they add to their revenue by means of a tax which the natives furnish in natural products, and which are sold publicly; but the sums thus realized they employ in great part for the good of their converts." The missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant, he regards as philanthropists in the best acceptation of the word. They serve, each in his own way, the noblest of causes. "If they fulfil the task which they have undertaken, they will deserve well of humanity."

(January 15.)—M. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu writes on "Colonial Rivalries—England and Russia." He shows that a force of expansion, unparalleled since the days of Columbus, urges Europe to extend her empire in all directions through the Old World and into Oceania. He regards England and Russia as the two great colonial Powers of the world, each having its own method. England colonizes the sea-coasts by its vessels and merchants; Russia works inland by its agriculturists and its Cossacks. The article shows how much both countries desire peace. The Czar's difficult position, and his anxiety for the good of his people, are dwelt upon. The results of war would not repay Russia. Even if she gained Afghanistan, it would only be after a long struggle; and she could not possibly establish herself at Calcutta or Bombay. "The great Asiatic peninsula is a country of too maritime a character for a Power like Russia, which is essentially continental, to reign there in peace, exposed to the attacks of British fleets."

(February 15.)—M. Gaston Boissier, in "A Last Word upon the Persecutions," clearly shows, by the nature of the case, and the documents in existence, that the doubts about the extent and terrors of the early persecution of the Church which came into fashion with Dodwell's "De paucitate martyrum," published in 1684, are entirely unauthorized. He proves that the historians of the Church have in no wise exaggerated the sufferings of the early confessors. M. Boissier writes in an impartial spirit, simply as an historian who wishes to ascertain the facts, so that his testimony will carry weight with all candid readers. He shows how persecution has sometimes rooted out the truth which seemed likely to live and grow in a country. "But once at least force has been vanquished; a belief has resisted the power of the greatest empire the world has ever seen; poor people have defended their faith, and saved it by dying for it. It is the grandest victory which the human conscience has ever gained in the world." He asks why any one should try to diminish the significance of that struggle; why Freethinkers, who pride themselves on their defence of toleration and liberty, should have taken a foremost part in this attack. Impartial study of the history is against such views, and the sublime suffering of the Church, from Nero to Decius, is a true book of martyrs, for the Freethinker as well as the Christian.

LA NOUVELLE REVUE (December 15).—In "The Society of Madrid" there are some interesting particulars about the Spanish Press. The Government censorship has been very severe, but, despite actions and imprisonments, the journalists generally contrive to say what they please. Stories and romances with imaginary names are pointed against members of the Government, so that the people easily understand what is meant. *El Progreso*, one of the three great Opposition papers, has had a chequered history. All its writers are in prison; its director has fled the country. *El Imparcial*, another journal, reached a circulation of 40,000—an enormous circulation in Madrid. Its director managed to gather the best talent round him, but one fine morning all his staff—compositors, writers, &c.—quitted him, and within a week set up another paper. *El Imparcial* keeps up its circulation, however. *La Epoca* is the firm supporter of the throne and Señor Canovas. It is admirably conducted, and numbers all the best people of the country among its readers. Almost every politician has his journal. The result is that—except the Carlist organs, which have a vast circulation, and are supported by the priests—most of the papers have a constant struggle for existence, and only live by subventions from the chiefs of the party they defend. It is a remarkable fact that the anti-Clerical journals have as much success as the Carlist organs. The papers which are devoted to the bull-fight, with coloured lithographs and full details of that brutal pastime, are very popular. Canovas is described in these letters as a man of middle height, somewhat ugly, and with a violent temper. He is an early riser, a great worker, a rapid speaker, and an enthusiastic collector of old books, with a splendid library. He is an admirable talker, and much sought after in society. Señor Castelar is a bachelor. He is a prose-poet with the soul of an artist. The music of his words charms all listeners. The language of Cervantes has never had a more admirable organ nor a greater interpreter. He is a Republican, whom no one can reproach with change of views; he has a horror of bloodshed, and only wishes the Republican ideal to realize itself by force of argument. He is a religious man, who loves the festivals of the Church, though he hates priestcraft and tyranny. His circle includes all the notabilities of science, art, and literature, and the leaders of society contend together for the honour of having the national orator at their tables.

(January 1.)—The letters on "Society in Madrid" describe the army and the marine; the orders of chivalry; the literature, the academies, and the theatre of Spain. There is scope enough here, but the letters have little interest. The navy is dismissed in nine lines. The fact is, Spain has not an admiral worth the name, and neither finances nor administration to form a marine. Decorations are part of a man's ordinary toilette in Spain. All the world is chevalier there. The names referred to in the letter on Spanish literature, with the exception of that of Castelar, are almost entirely unknown in this country. Most of the historians are arrayed against fanaticism; their work is an endeavour to soften the harshness of Clericalism, and reconcile present and past.—Eugène Davis pleads the cause of Irish legislative independence. He describes the situation of parties and the result

of the Irish elections; refers to the opinions expressed by Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, and others. He says he has reason to believe that Mr. Parnell is ready to lend the Liberal party his support if they promise to establish an Irish Legislature in Dublin. The Home Rule programme demands the repeal of the legislative union voted in 1800. Ireland would then have complete legislative independence, the English army would remain in the country, and all Imperial business would be managed at Westminster. Mr. Davis tries to show that this arrangement need awaken no fear in England. If it should not be conceded, he shows how the party will resort to organized obstruction, and holds out the threat of "the Irish-American Nemesis." England will, he thinks, be constrained in self-defence to grant Ireland its request.

(January 15.)—The letters on "Society in Madrid" are finished in this number. Spain, the writer says, is the country of *vice versâ*. The grantees are democratic and gay; the people are aristocratic and dignified. The famous Spanish *morgue* found only now and then in the grand seigneur is constantly met with in the homes of the *bourgeois*. The Virgin seems to attract to herself all the religious feeling of Spain. Every season, every stage and act of life bears witness to her influence over the popular mind. The women of the middle classes indulge their love of finery at the cost of home comfort. The dinner is sacrificed to the bonnet. A sketch is given of Herr Bauer, the representative of Rothschild in Madrid. This Jewish gentleman occupies a high position in society, and his house is the resort of all the leading artists and literary men, as well as of all the fashion of Madrid.

(February 1.)—L'Abbé Moreau, formerly Almoner of La Grande-Roquette, gives some painful glimpses of habitual criminal life in a paper on "The World of Prisons." Before his experience at La Grande-Roquette, he fancied that thieves were only made by pressing need. He soon found out his mistake. The world of rogues is no mere legend. There are living in the midst of us, he says, men who are convinced that theft is a legitimate trade because it is lucrative, and because they know no other. With them, stealing is a passion. This class is numerous enough to cause grave anxiety; it increases every day, and forms a serious danger for society, because of the close ties which unite its members to each other.

(February 15.)—Madame Michelet has placed in the hands of the editor of this Review her late husband's notes on "Germany: its Geographical and Moral Duality." The eminent historian embodies in them the result of a rapid tour along the Rhine. The north lies low; the southern half of the empire is mountainous. In the low country the people are reflective, and analyze character carefully; in the south there is more spontaneity. The northerners are independent; the people of the south are swayed by feudal customs and instincts. Kant's critical method represents the philosophy of the north—everything is brought to the bar of reason; in the south, man is lost in Nature, Nature is lost in God. Schelling represents its philosophy, which is a poem rather than a criticism. The provinces of the Rhine have one thief to every 400 inhabitants; in Pomerania there is only one to 6,500. The more stolid nature of the north is evidently a safeguard against crime. The people dwelling on the banks of the Rhine, who strike all travellers by their vivacity and energy, are more susceptible to the influences which tend to crime.

DEUTSCHE RUNDECHAU (January).—"The Popular Movement in Berlin: its Organization and its Leaders," by Franz Holzerland, is an exhaustive account of the growth of Social Democracy. January 10, 1877, opens the history of this movement. On that day 31,522 men met at Tivoli, and marched in thirty battalions to record their votes in the parliamentary election for Berlin. In 1871 the Social Democrats numbered 2,058; in 1874, 11,279. It seemed as if they would carry everything before them. In 1884 there were 68,535. Herr Holzerland shows the strength of the movement in each of the electoral circles of the city. The first had only 821; the second, 9,282; the third, 6,344; the fourth, 25,386; the fifth, 2,444; the numbers in the sixth are not given, but the Democrats, who were very weak there, are gaining ground. The fourth district is the great stronghold of the Socialists. They polled 25,386; the Liberals, 13,524; the Conservatives, only 10,734. In two divisions where poverty and want are most at home, the Democrats have 13,606 and 5,505 voters; Conservatives and Liberals together only number 8,854 and 3,772. Such soil best suits the movement. In quarters

where the State officials and nobility and wealthy people live, there is a vastly different result. The sketches of less-known leaders in this vast organization are of great value for any one who wishes to study this remarkable phase of German life.

(February.)—Dr. Paul Gussfeldt gives his "Reminiscences of Prince Frederick Charles of Prussia." On the return of the doctor from his travels in Africa he received a cordial invitation to sup with the Prince. From that time they kept up close intercourse. The reminiscences are slight, but they set the Prince in a most attractive light. The dashing cavalry officer was a great reader, who mastered his books, and often discussed them with his friends. His kindness of heart and courtesy to his guests are shown in every line of these notes. The last telegram which he sent to a friend just before his death shows that he was "not unprepared": "Bethink thyself, man, that thou art dust and ashes, and again must become dust and ashes."

USZERE ZERT (January).—"The Aristocracy of Hungary" is an anonymous article of great value, written by one who is evidently qualified to treat such a subject. He says that all confidence in the endurance and prosperity of both the State and the people rests on the lower classes. The aristocracy have little influence on the masses, and are in a state of decadence. The Hungarian noble is generally a bold rider, a passionate gambler, a generous friend of women, and of the dance. Some are good landlords, and thus render valuable service to the country; but in most cases sports of various kinds absorb nearly all the time, strength, and income of the noble. "Horses, hounds, women, and card-playing exhaust the material, moral, and social prosperity of the aristocracy." A high moral tone is, however, found in some of the younger members of the nobility. These young lords seek foreign universities, undertake scientific journeys, endeavour to extend their views and knowledge, and interest themselves in important questions of agricultural and social reform. The magnates have little influence on the intellectual and material productiveness of the country. Some names may be mentioned which seem to contradict this statement, but they are only rare exceptions. The best Hungarian artists must seek their bread in foreign lands: if a magnate does seek the general improvement it is often a matter of ostentation rather than of true interest in the people. The Hungarian gentry are in a decaying state. Once they were the pride of their country; now they are one of its weak elements. They have no more pleasant excitement than a parliamentary election. It has been estimated that every election costs them at least four million florins. This has ruined many estates. Efforts have been made to raise the gentry to some of their old eminence, but the reform must come from within. If they are ever again to become the glory of Hungary, their morals and ways of life must undergo a thorough reformation.

THE (AMERICAN) PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW (January).—Professor Knox, of the Union Theological College at Tokijo, in Japan, writes on "The Missionary Problem in Japan." From 1859 to 1872 he says that little progress was made; then a brighter time began. The last thirteen years have been crowded with great events. In 1877 the various Presbyterian missions in Japan organized the "United Church of Christ." "The missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, of the Reformed Church in America, and of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland remain distinct, but the converts form one native organization." The seven years' experience has shown the benefit of this union. When a few converts have been made, a church is at once formed, with elders and deacons. It assumes all current expenses. If necessary, the missionary acts as a stated supply, but this arrangement is recognized by all as temporary. A native pastor is soon chosen, and henceforth the missionary only acts as friend and counsellor. Fifteen out of the thirty-six congregations have ordained pastors; the others only wait for duly qualified men. The missionaries are engaged in educational and strictly evangelistic work, leaving the churches to the native ministry. In the presbytery, native ministers and missionaries meet on equal terms. There is constant progress in order, efficiency, and self-restraint. In 1872 there was only one church, with nine members; now there are four presbyteries, thirty-six congregations, twenty-three ordained ministers, 3,003 members. The contributions for church purposes alone were about £1,300 in 1884. The article illustrates the waste of power caused by divided effort. In

Tokyo twelve missions are at work. Only two have fairly adequate strength. There are six schools for young men, and five theological seminaries, but no school has a full teaching staff. If united, two schools might easily do the work of all.

(AMERICAN) METHODIST REVIEW (January).—The notice of Bishop Wiley is of great interest. In early youth he lost his voice by his exertions during a great revival, so that he turned to medicine instead of entering the ministry. His marriage afterwards barred the door against him, but after seven years of study and practice he was sent as a medical missionary to Foochow. Three years later he returned to New York as a widower, with shattered health, but he never forgot his old mission-field, and as pastor, editor, and bishop, laboured unceasingly to increase the sympathy with China in the United States. He made an episcopal visitation tour to China in 1884, and died in the country where his first wife was laid to rest thirty-one years before.—Reference is made in the Review to Archdeacon Farrar's recent visit to the States. "Probably no man, since Dean Stanley visited America, has received such marked consideration from the American public, and imparted so much of his own thought to us, as Archdeacon Farrar. His wide range of interests has given him auditors from the most diverse classes of persons. His sympathetic, scholarly discussions of purely literary topics—his broad, firm enunciation of religious convictions in his sermons—his tact and un-British readiness in impromptu remarks on various occasions—his hearty participation in the deliberations of the Americo-Anglican Church, and, finally, his bold utterances upon the question of temperance, have altogether placed him within the touch of 'all sorts and conditions of men.'"

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH (January).—Some interesting facts on "Church Extension" are given in this number. The vast growth of the Western States is taxing every energy of American Methodism. Emigrants crowd into the district from the Mississippi to the Pacific. All the forces of mischief are busy; drinking saloons and gambling hells abound. In 1882 the Church Extension Scheme was adopted by the General Conference. Its report for the year ending March 31, 1885, shows that the General Board helped thirty-four churches with grants of £2,700, loans of £3,500; the Conference Boards granted £3,750 and lent £4,200. On an average, four churches are aided every week in the year. This is a good beginning, but the vast growth of the country demands much more vigorous effort.

THE CENTURY MAGAZINE (January, February, March).—In the January number the articles on "Pointers" and "Feathered Forms of Other Days" supply pleasant reading in natural history. Mr. Benjamin's "City of Teheran" is finished. The article on Barye, the Parisian sculptor, who died in June, 1875, is crowded with illustrations of the work of this modest, painstaking, and brilliant artist. The sketch of Castelar, the national orator of Spain, by Mr. Armstrong, is a brilliant piece of writing, and a supplementary paper adds further particulars. Taken together, these articles give a fine portrait of a noble man whom all must respect. "John Bodewin's Testimony" grows in interest, and Frank Stockton's original papers deserve more than a passing word of praise.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE (January, February, March).—Mr. Benjamin's valuable papers on Persia enrich both *Harper* and the *Century* this quarter. No student of Eastern life should overlook them. Moncure Conway's long hunt for the man who was said to have been one of Shakespeare's pall-bearers may be said to set at rest a question which has stirred many a Shakespearean student. The whole matter is now proved to be a myth. The article on petroleum headed "A Lampful of Oil" gives a wonderful picture of the romance of trade. "East Angels" is a powerful story, and Mr. Howells' "Indian Summer" ends as every one would wish. Sir Edward Reed's article on "The British Navy" in February reviews the whole condition of our fleet with singular force. No one who wishes to know the state of our defences should overlook this most interesting article.—HARPER'S YOUNG PEOPLE (February, March).—This delightful magazine seems to become more and more entertaining. The March number leaves nothing to be desired.