

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY 1909

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF MIRACLES

1. **W**HEN we read words like those in John xiv. 12, 'Believe Me for the very works' sake,' we are tempted to call the reference to miracles contemptuous. But the term is too strong. It may not, however, be too much to say that the reference is depreciatory. It is depreciatory by contrast with—

(1) The insight of faith, which saw the Father in the Son;

(2) The 'greater works' of the future (ver. 13).

'Greater' does not there mean works of the same kind on a larger scale. For *these* miraculous works have, in the general belief of Protestantism at least, diminished in amount, rather than increased, with the development of Christianity. The word is qualitative and not quantitative, and it means works of a greater *kind*—such as the new creation by the Word, the growth of faith, the miracles of love, service and sacrifice, the spread of the Church, the overthrow of paganism, the making of a new Europe, the rise of a new ethic and civilization, the huge revolution in the core of society, the inversion and conversion of moral values—the whole moral and spiritual results of Christianity, in which the healing works form but a part. The triumphs of Christ in His Church throughout the world are greater than all the miracles He did—taken as miracles.

I except the Resurrection, of course, on which the Church itself stood. And that was not so much a miracle that Christ did in rising as a miracle that God did on Him in raising Him up.

2. I cannot wonder that texts for the evidential value of miracles should be quoted from the New Testament and from Christ Himself. But in so far as they are evidence at all, its value is mainly contemporary. The function of miracles (apart from their genuine benevolence) was to impress more than to convince. Christ may have referred to them for proof, but it is only in the Fourth Gospel. And, however He may have glanced at them evidentially there, it is hard to think of Him doing them with the evidential motive, instead of being moved by love and pity and *Messianic* power to the prayerful frame in which they were done. It is hard to think of Him going about making proofs instead of going about doing good.

The value of the miracles as proofs, their evidential value, is one that diminishes with the lapse of time, while the real influence of Christianity must grow. It is the nature of their effect to subside—as the impression of any preternatural experience does in our own individual case. If I saw a ghost it would impress me greatly (unless it talked the usual rubbish). Then I should gradually lose the force of the impression. And I should perhaps end by believing that I must have been in some hypnotized, morbid, or otherwise derationalized state at the time, and could not trust myself. I should end by being more sceptical about myself, and what I was liable to, than I was before such an experience revealed my weakness. On the other hand, if I received a real revelation from any *revenant*—something that my conscience and judgement owned to be revelation indeed, and no mere psychological freak—the result would be otherwise. But then the centre of gravity would be in the *nature* and *effect* of the revelation, and not in its abnormal concomitants. It would be in the message and not in the mode of it. The modern concerns the *preternatural*; the real *supernatural* is in the content. And so,

apart from faith in the person and purpose behind the miracle, it is but a piece of the preternatural; it is an output of mere power; and its value to religion is slight, while to superstition it may be great. And taken by themselves (i. e. as proofs), miracles would have much more worth to the spectators than to their legatees centuries and millennia afterwards. Miracles with which spectators *might be made* to help forward things, tend to become, as time goes on, *remorae*. They drag. They may do more to embarrass faith than to support it. One has said, 'Miracles, which were once the foundation of Apologetic, became in time its crutch; and now they have become its crux.' For how can we shut our ears to the volume of modern mind, which says, with Rousseau, 'Get rid of your miracles, and the world will fall at Christ's feet.' It is not half true—indeed, nothing that a man like Rousseau could say about Christ or Christianity in the world could be very true. Were the miracles removed, the scandal and offence of the cross would still remain, as the focus of man's quarrel with God, and the real *remora* of Christianity in the world. The natural man is enmity. The cross is sharp and the world is sweet. The holy is bitter to an easy and healthy world. But, all the same, our apologetic must not be conducted without regard to the real difficulties presented by the miracles to the mind of the day.

3. Apart from the resurrection of Christ (of which we have evidence that we cannot have of the resurrection of Lazarus, because we have personal communion with the risen Christ, and not with Lazarus), the belief in miracles depends on historical evidence (which is an expert matter and not a layman's affair); and on historical evidence, too, which is not complete as an apparatus of proof. Even were it more complete than it is, it is in its nature inadequate. Historic criticism, or evidence, can only establish at best two facts—first, the event (however it is to be explained), and second, the belief of the witnesses that it was done in a supernatural way by God. That it was

really so done no historical evidence can convince us. Criticism cannot follow into the interior of the witnesses' personality and check the processes there in such a way as to make it certain that their belief about the nature and interpretation of the event was right. No history and its evidences can compel us to believe (i. e. none can *prove*) that it was really done by God.

So that, as far as I can judge, in the best quarters it is coming to be generally held that, instead of miracles enabling us to believe in Christ, it takes our faith in Christ to enable us to believe in the miracles. We believe them, first, because of Scripture, and, second, because of experience. We believe them because we can no more cut them clean out of the record of Christ's character without collapse than we could cut a colour out of a soap-bubble. We need them, even if we weed them. And second, when I say it takes our faith in Christ to carry the miracles, I mean by faith in Christ the experience in ourselves of that evangelical miracle of grace and a new creation, for the sake of which all other miracles really existed. It is the revelation that carries the miracle, not the miracle the revelation. Surer than any single Bible fact is the Bible Christ and the Bible gospel.

4. 'Signs' need not be what is called miraculous, if only they produce the impressive effect of miracle in the service of faith. They are arresting rather than attesting. By which all that I mean is this: If they were ever explained (by the progress, say, of psychological science), yet, as done by Christ, the Redeemer, they would be signs still, and very impressive signs, of God's personal and historic grace and salvation. They would be indices rather than arguments (and therefore more valid for their own present than for ours). They do not prove either the redemption or the redeemer; but they are not therefore without their value for redemption. They do not prove the teleology of redemption; they are only intelligible within it. They preach it to the saved, they do not prove it to the lost. They are much more sacramental events

than miraculous (when by miraculous is understood the perforation of a closed natural order). They are more sacramental than evidential. They belong to the religious and not the rational activity of the soul. As proofs of the deity of Christ they are *by themselves* of little value. Indeed, the deity of Christ cannot be proved. Its true response is faith and not assent. It is a faith which flows from tasting Christ's saving grace. Apart from the gospel in Christ miracles are mere exertions of power, which are conceivably possible to Satan. Satan could not, indeed, cast out Satan; Christ alone could do that. But Satan might conceivably cast out his underling demons, as many a potentate has found it useful to repudiate the acts of his own agents, or even to employ them for the *éclat* of repudiating them.

5. Indeed, the whole question of the evidential value of miracles is but part of a larger question as to the evidentiary value of the Bible as a book, its coercive value for the inferential mind. Of course, if everything the Bible writers held true is therefore true, then *cadit quaestio*. If the express word of Scripture is final on every point, *causa finita est*. But miracle is evidence, in the strict sense, only if some such view of the Bible be held. The Bible history, however, is not historical in the modern and scientific sense. It is not evidence like State archives. It was never meant to be. Its demonstration is of the Spirit and of power. Anything so religious as the deity of Christ cannot be proved, because there is nothing so sure as the ultimate and absolute in religion; which in Christianity is identical with the deity we experience in Christ as our Saviour. There is no certainty which could lend certainty to that. The Bible was not intended for a manual of scientific and rigidly accurate history, nor of philosophic. The Bible is there to preach and not to instruct—in the first degree. Its function, as I say, is not evidential, but sacramental. (May I refer here to the first chapter of my Yale Lectures on Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind?) It has to awake, convert, or edify, and not to

prove. (This is quite consistent with the fact that Christianity is, first and foremost, an historical religion.) In Christian history the function of the Bible is to be a means of grace, and not an apparatus, or even a complete material, of proof. History alone cannot give life. Only the gospel, the present Saviour, can. History alone can but sustain and bless life. Christ the Lord and Giver of life is superhistoric. He is historic and more. And it is in the *more* that the centre of gravity lies—in His difference from history and not His continuity with it. Our certainty about Him does not rest on historic methods. The authority of the Bible is one that comes home not to rational but to moral experience. It rests on such experience. Therefore it is useless to refer to its historical authority those who have not owned its religious. Miracles convince but those convinced before. And they can do much more to edify than to evidence. Like the Sacraments, they are not intelligible or valuable or credible apart from the Gospel Word, of which, therefore, they cannot be proof.

6. Evidence is something more certain from which we proceed to something less certain, and so lift it to the certainty of our start. Now, however it may have been once, Christ is to-day more certain than miracles. We experience Christ and the miracle of His new creation; but the miracles He did on earth we cannot experience. The miracles that we believe have all their value from those we experience. A man who has lived through none will not readily believe in any. They will be to him at most but prodigies and magic, where they are not mere legend. But the man who had Augustine's experience for life of *Tolle, lege* will not doubt the possibility, even the antecedent probability, of God surmounting ordinary procedure in a miraculous way, in the process of taking command of the whole of life and history.

Hence we argue from Christ to miracles, and not from miracles to Christ. The risen Christ is a far greater certainty to us than the raising of Lazarus. We argue from the Christ of our new creation to the Christ who could

manipulate creation for its sake. Everything He did with creation was for the sake and service of that new creation. And some of His modes of handling creation were of far more value for His own situation then than for ours now. It was so also with His words, many of which were 'occasional' to the then stage of His work (such as 'Give to him that asketh of thee,' or 'Sell all thou hast and give unto the poor'); and they have but an indirect and constructive value now, which needs much skilled interpretation for proper use. One distrusts those who would force us down to a literal and unadjusted transfer of *precepts* from one who lived so relevant to his own age—their blunt transfer to a situation so very different as two millennia now make ours to be.

7. To-day, then, we approach miracles from a very different point of view. They are one thing to eye-witnesses, they are another to remote readers. We do not rise from them, we descend on them. They are of little use for the world, however much for the Church. It is those who can believe without them who will believe best in them. In itself, a miracle betrays but power. Everything turns on the doer when it is a question of religion. And for religion, for faith, the doer, ever present in Book and Church, is his own evidence. And any other proof loses power in proportion to the distance. The miracles must survive upon a faith which they may once have helped in its youth, but which has outgrown their support, and which can only hold them in belief and honour amid the fiery trial of to-day; as Aeneas bore his old father Anchises upon his reverent shoulders from the flames of Troy. The Church carries them more than they carry the Church. And we believe in the Christ of the miracles before we can really believe in the miracles of Christ.

P. T. FORSYTH.

SWINBURNE

THE death of Swinburne may well arouse in us thoughts of sadness. 'The cease of majesty dies not alone,' and with him passes away a phase in our literature. It is true that his last really characteristic work, the glorious *Tale of Balen*, appeared as long ago as 1896, and that even the *servum pecus* of imitators and parodists is now almost silent; but while he lived the race of the giants seemed not to have utterly departed.

Action and reaction are the law of all life, and in one aspect Swinburne represents a reaction. He was born in 1837; when he came to his precocious maturity the star of Tennyson was in the ascendant, and to some extent his career was determined by a more or less conscious revulsion from the Tennysonian dominance. But he had too much of what he himself called 'self-sufficiency' to be the mere protagonist of a rebellion. He felt, it is true, that after reaching his climacteric in 1842 Tennyson had been recreant to the romantic spirit which he had once so faithfully followed. Particularly did Swinburne feel this with reference to the *Idylls of the King*, with their Arthurian allegory of a Victorian and bourgeois perfection; and he laughs at the insular narrowness which made the hero of Mallory a mere Prince Albert, and which concluded the *Princess* with 'the shrill, unmistakable accent, not of a provincial deputy, but of a provincial school-boy.' Nevertheless, while he never altered this view, and while his *Tristram* and his *Balen* were doubtless largely dictated by the desire to recall the nation to a better ideal of romance than the Tennysonian, he did Tennyson full justice.

To the making of Swinburne, and to his preparation for the part he had to fill, nature and training contributed in different but equally marked degrees. He was born, if ever poet was, a lyrist and a romantic: he would have

sung if he had been quite untaught, but no English poet, Milton and Gray perhaps excepted, ever brought to his task so wide and deep a culture; a culture which began with his very earliest years and continued to the end of his life. He knew a dozen languages and literatures, and he was absolute master of at least three: French, Greek, and English. He wrote French like a Frenchman, Greek like Sir Richard Jebb, and English in the way we all know. He had a memory which was the astonishment of every one who came near him, and which retained enormous passages from all sorts of writers for any length of time. Probably no one that ever lived, even among professional scholars, knew English poetry, or at least the English drama, more widely and more accurately. But he was far from being the slave of his favourites. He disliked the 'botching' of Euripides; but he learnt from Euripides, and his classic plays are more Euripidean than Sophoclean. He cared little for Byron; but he knew his Byron as even Byron's adoring contemporaries did not know him. He despised Boileau and all his school; yet even from Boileau his catholic taste gained something. He has a word of eulogy for Pope himself.

But from his earliest days there were four or five great masters who seized a sway over him that they never lost. Coleridge he never ceased to regard as the master metrist of English lyric poets. 'For absolute melody and splendour it were hardly rash to call *Kubla Khan* the first poem in the language.' Shelley, perhaps his true master, held in his mind 'the same rank in lyric as Shakespeare in dramatic poetry: supreme and without a second of his race.' The Odes of Keats attained 'nearly to the very utmost beauty possible to human words.' As for his idolatry of Victor Hugo, is it not the burden of almost every volume he wrote? But added to all this was a more surprising enthusiasm for the classic verse and chiselled prose of Landor, a man indeed of impressive stature, but different in style and in cast of mind from his admirer. This worship of the great classicist is a type of Swin-

burne's whole genius, a genius primarily romantic and lyrical; but nourished, strengthened, and—we make bold to add—*restrained* by a close and loving study of the classical models. But for the classics Swinburne's poetry would have been a mere chaos; as it is, its passion, its *abandon*, its frenzy has rarely strayed beyond the limits of a moderating art. As the worship of Hugo typifies that rhetoric which was the besetment of Swinburne in his uninspired moments, and which yet saves his worst work from insipidity, so his worship of Landor typifies that restraint which saved his inspiration from self-destructive overflow.

Swinburne has himself, in his Essay on Keats, spoken of the power of *assimilation*—not, of course, imitation—as the sign of an original genius. That Swinburne possessed the imitative faculty scores of passages, both in his prose and in his verse, could be adduced to prove. We might point specially to the story of St. Dorothy in the first series of *Poems and Ballads*. Even here, however, there is more of Swinburne than of Chaucer; for Swinburne's assimilative power was even greater than his imitative. Of this the proofs are innumerable, and we have even seen their number adduced, by critics with more learning than taste, as indications that he was only a manipulator of other men's rhythms and not a creative artist. For example, something like the lilt of 'If Love were what the rose is' has been discovered in a forgotten lyric of Dryden's; another of his measures appears in rudimentary form among Waller's poems; the relation between Praed's anapaests and *Dolores* is plain for all to see. But in every case the inimitable melody lies precisely in the one differential touch that Swinburne has added. Scores of songs have the *metre* of *Rococo*; but whence came the peculiar sweetness which makes us fancy it a new and unheard-of thing? Swinburne borrows, in fact, his melodies as Milton and Virgil borrowed their Homeric similes: he makes them his own. Picking up for a penny a copy of the *Rubaiyát*—then the forgotten work of an unknown author—he saw at a glance the genius in it, went home,

and produced in *Laus Veneris* a poem in the same measure, with something of the same tone, but with all the Swinburnian marks on it. But the measure is, after all, *not* the same. A single touch has converted it into a new one. The centre of gravity of FitzGerald's stanza, like that of Horace's alcaic, is the third unrhymed line. This third line is in *Laus Veneris* made to rhyme with the corresponding line of the next, and thus arises a stanza of eight lines instead of four; a new, linked, and lengthened measure which immediately assumes a character of its own, and challenges a future different from that of FitzGerald's.

The same is true of his metre generally. It is futile to deny him originality; it is more futile to suppose that his rhythms and rhymes sprang up ready made. With the prophetic ear of youth he caught a certain melody, innate in the English language—a melody which it is strange that any one should ever have denied to it. After this melody Byron, Moore, and many others had set out in clumsy and fruitless chase; Praed had occasionally overtaken it, but had used it for lower purposes. It was, we have no doubt, in Shelley that Swinburne first saw its limitless possibilities; the lilt of *Arethusa* recurs again and again among the many waters of his verse; but that something of Coleridge also went to the making of his special music we doubt just as little. It was Coleridge who had reclaimed for English poetry the lost metrical freedom of the old ballad, and had informed this regained freedom with a beauty and a subtlety only to be attained by the most sensitive art; such a beauty, in fact, as had not been heard in shorter measures since the *Pearl*. Following him, Swinburne saw that there yet remained, in the *natural* cadences of English, a vein of melody yet unexhausted, nay, except by Shelley, almost untouched. English unforced metre *naturally* runs in trips and so-called anapaests; the *regular* succession of iambics and trochees is only attained by some degree, more or less pronounced, of violence. To this conception he added the

no less important one of *quantity*, the secret of the harmony of Milton and Tennyson; not, of course, the rigid system of Sidney or Gabriel Harvey, but that *weight* which is as essential to English verse as to Latin itself. Of this mingling of quantity and accent, which never ceases to be English and yet is always Greek, a type can be found in his exquisite *Sapphics*. There we have the *spirit* of Greek quantity married to English accent; no mere lifeless transplantation of classical laws, but simply the same principles observed as would make *any* measure melodious—light syllables in the light places, and weighty in the weighty. On these principles all Swinburne's lyrics, anapaestic or iambic, were alike constructed, and thus it is that they almost invariably sing themselves. This it is that made the choruses of *Atalanta* burst on those who first heard them like a new revelation in the power of sound.

And other writers were not slow to borrow from him the melodies he had opened to their ken. The metre of *Dolores* was taken up by a crowd of imitators, and parodied by many a rhymers. That of the *Hymn to Proserpine* has had a better fate. Appropriated by an original mind, and stamped with a new and vigorous character, it became the metre of Mr. Arthur Way's noble *Odyssey*. As for the songs in *Atalanta*, do we not know that one of them provided the stanza for no less famous a poem than Bret Harte's *Heathen Chinnee*? Could any proof be clearer that the rhythms of Swinburne have become part and parcel of our poetical possessions?

'Rhyme,' says Swinburne himself, 'is the native condition of lyric verse in English; a rhymeless lyric is a maimed thing, and halts and stammers in the delivery of its message.' Rightly then, though he could write blank verse with the best, did he weave into his lyric poems the most wonderful winding webs of rhyme; not scorning the refrain, nor, it is needless to add, neglecting the consonantal rhyme of alliteration. He probably added more new metres to English poetry than any one since Chaucer;

and, from the point of view of skill in rhyme, there has assuredly never been his equal. For an approach to a parallel to the two hundred and sixty nine-lined stanzas of *Balen*, each stanza with but three rhymes, we must go back to the hundred linked stanzas of the *Pearl*. It is true that he refused to tie himself to rigid exactness. We find plenty of 'rich rhymes'; we find in *Balen* the noun *pass* rhyming in Chaucerian fashion with the same word used as a verb; we have *hiss* rhymed with *his*, *ours* with *hours*; nay, in multitudes of cases the very same word does duty twice over. The much-enduring word *was* has to rhyme with *pass* oftener than we care to count; and, on the multitudinous occasions he has to use the word *love*, he must have been glad that no scruples hindered him from compelling *of* and *enough*, as well as *move* and *grove*, to rhyme with it. After this we are not surprised that, in the wonderful *tour de force* Faustine, the rhyme, required no less than forty times, is helped out by pressing *sin*, *wherein*, and the like into the service. Nor would his relationship to the clan of Rossetti be completely manifest unless he had given us in full measure the peculiar rhyme of which Keats in *Endymion* set the fashion, and which was so well ridiculed by Bayard Taylor, but to which, as Swinburne uses it, we confess an attachment:

The hard sun, as thy petals knew,
Covered the heavy moss-water;
Thou wert not worth green *midsummer*,
Nor fit to live to August blue,
O sundew, not remembering her. .

With this mastery of rhyme, with this royal despotism over the resources of the language, he remains (Milton apart) the greatest master of sound, pure and simple, in English; a reed, in Tennyson's words, through which melody was naturally blown. With all this technical equipment, it remains to be seen what was his 'message': and here at once we light on the region of controversy. It is common to say of him that he could not think, that

his sound is a mere echo of nothing. Swinburne himself has indirectly dealt with this charge. 'It is said sometimes that a man may have a strong and perfect style who has nothing to convey worth conveyance under cover of it'; and at this point, in our copy of the book, some echoer of the common criticism has pencilled the comment: 'Thou art the man.' But Swinburne proceeds: 'This is a favourite saying of men who have no words in which to convey the thoughts they have not. But it remains for them to prove as well as assert that beauty and power of expression can accord with emptiness or sterility of matter.' This we believe to be essentially a fair reply. Words that burn *must* imply the thoughts that breathe. And in Swinburne's case the thoughts are there. They are not, it is true, the penetrating thoughts of a Goethe, nor do we recognize in them that strange insight which is the mark of Shakespeare. But he shows thought as lyric poetry understands the word; intangible and impalpable, not easily to be packed into the narrowness of prose, but none the less real and reproductive. It is a shallow criticism which confuses the ethereal with the empty. It must be admitted that, in his verse as in his prose, he often struggles long before he arrives at the consummation he desires; like Spenser, he requires room in which to move; but he almost invariably (to use a convenient slang phrase of our day) 'gets there' at last. And when the garrulity is so musical as his, it may well be pardoned. Many a poem of his may be too long to be unstintedly praised; it is not too long for every verse to be loved. He has not, of course, the condensation of Milton, which longs to wring from every word the fullest meaning, charged with all its associations, that the word can bear; nor could he, like Rossetti, prune down whole volumes into single poems. And yet how few, after all, are the lines that we would willingly miss, even in the longest poems!

Of inspiring themes he had plenty; but—and here we reach the secret of the charge of deficiency in material—

they were too general, too remote, and too subjective to appeal to the many. For example, though he was a true patriot, he was too cosmopolitan to appeal to the English mind as the somewhat insular patriotism of Tennyson so easily did. He loved France too well to have ever flung out cheap sneers at 'the red fire-fury of the Seine,' and he lost many an English admirer in consequence. He loved liberty; but he was as enthusiastic for the liberty of Italy, Hungary, or Russia as he was for the liberty of England. A single verse on some Hampden or Cromwell would have done more for him than all his impassioned poems on Mazzini—a hero as great as either, but not an Englishman. He hated tyranny, and denounced it as the Hebrew prophets denounced the Assyrian tyrants; but the men he denounced were Napoleon III, Caesar, or the Czar, whose despotism did not particularly concern Englishmen. Again, he had the true romantic spirit; as we have seen, it was impossible to him to moralize the story of King Arthur. He would have been as incapable as William Morris himself of turning *Tristram* or *Balan* into a disguised sermon. Hence that kind of appeal which Tennyson could make to his countrymen by such a poem as *Guinevere* was quite impossible to Swinburne. He might have written *The Lady of Shalott*; he would certainly never have tried to write an *Elaine*. He had, as we shall see, no objection to teaching in poetry; he thought with the Greeks that art must justify itself as being useful; but he thought with the Greeks also that the teaching must come naturally, and must in every case be subordinate to the main object of poetry, which is simply to be beautiful. Hence he objected, with Landor, to certain parts of the *Divine Comedy*, not because they are theological, but because they are grotesque or even ugly; and he preferred the *Prelude* to the *Excursion* not because the latter has more philosophy in it than the former, but because the philosophy is unpoetical. On the other hand, the total absence of tangible content did not hinder him from assigning to *Kubla Khan* a place in the very front rank.

It was divinely beautiful, and that was enough. The same canons apply to his own work. The hymn to Proserpine is immortal, not because its teaching is true, but because its expression is beautiful. The 'poems' on the Boer War are condemned, not because they deal with politics, but because they lack the spirit that quickeneth.

Religion, again, was ruled out from his available sources of inspiration and influence, and that too although he was perhaps less pagan than is generally thought. He was an intense admirer of the religious poems of Christina Rossetti, and regarded 'Passing away, saith the world, passing away' as the highest achievement in the difficult sphere of purely Christian poetry. Nor was he deterred from admiring the *Atheist's Tragedy* by the somewhat ferocious and unsparing manner in which Tourneur depicts the crimes of his atheist. But he was certainly Hellene; he was perhaps less religious than any other great English poet. He had many admirations, but only one worship, that of beauty; and this is a poor exchange for the faith and morals which Milton held. It is no complaint against a poet that he does not directly preach religion; but the poet in whom we can discern no undercurrent of religious feeling misses the surest way to touch the universal heart. He could sing with unmatched pathos a dirge over the old faiths; he could sing a kind of Pantheism in *Hertha*; but in both cases the real faith that he sang was different from the ostensible one; his real goddess was the same beauty which he saw equally in romance because it dealt with a transfigured past, and in the Greek belief because it was dead. Still further, much as he loved the *Ode to Duty*, he could not with Wordsworth hymn the divine in nature, because he was far from sure whether nature was divine. Nor could he, like Goethe in *Das Göttliche*, have risen from the contemplation of the moral in man to a belief in the existence of higher beings, moral also, and mighty helpers in the great war between good and evil. In spite of his love of the general, he never seems to have attained to the conception either of good as

a single entity, to be adored as such, or to the still higher conception of good as expressed in a Person. In this respect his utmost faith is represented by his recurring phrase: 'Whatever gods there be.' Few poets, as we shall see, have had a clearer vision of certain *aspects* of the good; few indeed have been more indifferent to the good in itself.

Equally conspicuous in its absence is a belief in immortality, an absence which may well have accounted for his want of interest in ethic as a spiritual principle. And Swinburne, in this respect, went beyond mere agnosticism; he becomes dogmatic in his denial, and even elevates annihilation into a kind of creed, from which some comfort is to be derived. Death, to him, was the end of all, the gift of Proserpina was eternal and unchanging. As he says in that verse which has of late been quoted perhaps oftener than any other: 'No life lives for ever, and dead men rise up never'; we have to be content, nay, we have to triumph, in our 'sleep eternal in an eternal night.' He has none of the sad misgiving of a William Watson at the prospect; none of the awe at 'the apparition, the veiled sign, the beckoning finger bidding him forgo' the fellowship and converse of this world. Secure of the short immortality that fame gives, he welcomed the annihilation which in his belief death must offer him.

Nor, again, can we trace in him, to any profound degree, that peculiar vein of symbolism which fills the thoughts of Maeterlinck, of Hauptmann, and, among ourselves, of Mr. Yeats, 'A. E.', and others who are expressing now in lovely language the inner soul of things. That the invisible is the truly real, that the material, apart from the spiritual, is an inexplicable contradiction, he was of course conscious; but the consciousness did not, as with the poets we have named, underlie every word he wrote, and form the background of all his ideas. To us, indeed, his genius seems to have been, after all, essentially concrete, and to have kept at least one foot always on the solid earth: and this to us accounts for the sensuousness

of much in his most ethereal poetry—a sensuousness which has, indeed, been unduly criticized, but which certainly marks a limitation in his poetic outlook. It is this which forms the true distinction between him and his master Shelley. We do not forget the many poems in which he enters the outer court of such a mysticism; but we do not believe that he ever penetrates into the inner shrine.

At the same time, a certain love of generality, of wide views and immense conceptions, while to be carefully distinguished from mysticism on the one hand and from vagueness on the other, robbed him of many a reader. After his early lyrics of personal passion he came, as is well known, to prefer the Ode, whose very essence is the expression of the feelings of a multitude, of a nation, of a whole species, as contrasted with those individual emotions which a Heine loves to voice. The personality of the vast, this was a conception never absent from his mind at one period of his career. Hence many readers, who saw their own feelings, so to speak, absorbed in the great average, were repelled by him.

But if all this be admitted—and we might add to our list—what a variety of fields of poetry did he not touch! What a multitude of themes did he not find to yield him a marvellous inspiration! Love of liberty and hatred of tyranny, an intense feeling for nationality, the past with its romance, the future with its hopes, the achievements of great and good men, the crimes of bad men—all these furnished him with inexhaustible themes for passionate eulogy or for killing denunciation. Never, in truth, was there a man with a higher power of admiring: wherever he saw excellence of any kind he praised it in almost unmeasured language. He was carried away by the splendour of a genius like Victor Hugo's or of a nobility like Mazzini's, and sighed for more superlatives than the English speech affords, in order to express his limitless admiration.

He had also an equally unbounded hatred of cruelty and oppression in all its forms, and a vigour in denouncing

them never excelled. All his rhetorical force came to the aid of his poetical genius when he started to scarify the Czar, or to hold up to everlasting infamy the murders by which Napoleon the Little made his way to his uneasy throne. And all this is raised almost to the height of prophecy by its union with a sense of the inevitable and universal power of Right. For apparent success, divorced from goodness, he has all the lofty scorn of an Epictetus; and dull indeed must be those who are not stung into some enthusiasm by his splendid indignation and by his magnificent eulogies of virtue, however lowly. We may apply to him surely much of the praise which he himself gave to Morris :

No braver, no trustier, no purer,
No stronger and clearer a soul,
Bore witness more splendid and surer
For manhood made perfect and whole,
Since man was a warrior and dreamer,
Than his who in hatred of wrong
Would fain have arisen a redeemer
By sword or by song.

It is this 'spirit which lends reality to that somewhat dreary series of poems that filled the interval between *Erechtheus* and *Tristram*, and the longer one between *Tristram* and *Balen*. Many of these are empty of everything but splendour of sound, but here and there we light on passages or whole poems that are alive with this nobility of feeling. Even where the *poetical* inspiration is absent, *this* inspiration is often visible. Especially, perhaps, is this the case with the plays, and not least with the great trilogy of Mary Stuart. The charm of *Marino Faliero* lies mainly in its superb and astonishing rhetoric; *Lochrine* and *Rosamund, Queen of the Lombards*, in spite of the extreme repression of the verse, are essentially romances cast into a dramatic form; the tragedy of *The Sisters*, while indeed fine, is pitched in a low key; but *Mary Stuart* is one exact transcript from history, in which, while

the facts alone speak, they are allowed to speak with absolute faithfulness their condemnation of passion and crime. We did not need Swinburne's essay on *Mary* to inform us that in these plays he had done but the smallest violence to fact, and none at all to what he conceived to be the Queen's actual character: and the judgement of fate upon her deeds is accurately echoed in the dramas. *Chastelard* is the tragedy of a young man ruined by love for a beautiful and dominating, but essentially non-moral, woman; one to whom the true heights of pure love are unknown, but capable of the utmost extremes of passion and ambition. *Bothwell* shows us the fortunes of that same commanding woman when she, as was inevitable, falls in turn a prey to a passion for a man more reckless even than herself; and in *Mary Stuart* we see the long-drawn vengeance working itself out, and the story carried through to its foregone and fated conclusion: the death of Chastelard cries for death in turn, and is satiated at last. The moral, though never obtruded, is as plain to read as that of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*; and, that none may miss it, it is pointed by the motto from the *Choe-phoroe*: 'In return for murderous stroke a murderous stroke be given; let him that doeth suffer; so hath been the law from the beginning of the world.' Here, if anywhere, those who deny restraint, ethical feeling, or intellectual power to Swinburne, must often find themselves strangely at fault. Retributive justice has rarely been more plainly preached since Aeschylus. The patient watching of Mary Beaton, through all that 'long, sad score of years' since the death of Chastelard; her ceaseless resolve, 'through all these chances, never to leave her till she die'; and her final bitter satisfaction, are surely among the deepest, truest and most *moral* things in all dramatic poetry.

But the three great motives which inspire Swinburne's poetry, whenever it is really such, are: love, mankind as a whole, and the sea.

As a love-poet the position of Swinburne is unique. No one has apparently described all the emotions of a

lover so fully, or even so realistically, as he; and yet we are forbidden to regard his most realistic descriptions as photographs of his own life. We have his own statement that they are *studies* of passion and sensation, 'neither confessions of positive fact nor excursions of absolute fancy.' Indeed, it is impossible that any one man can have actually passed through *all* the experiences hinted at in these poems; he has obviously projected himself, in certain cases, as far out of himself as Browning in *Men and Women*. On the other hand they are *genuine* studies; they are not mere literary imitations of a French *genre*. *Laus Veneris*, for example, perhaps the most strongly censured of them all, is on the one hand a dramatic monologue based on an imagined situation, and on the other a hymn of passion fully realized and set on fire by the appropriating power of the poet. Thus these poems differ from those of Goethe, Heine, and others in being more impersonal; and yet the study is so exact, the poet makes himself so one with the subject described, that even the love-poems of Goethe and Heine, nay, those of Burns himself, appear less actual. The delusion is due to that concreteness in Swinburne's genius on which we have already touched.

Strange to say, it is precisely these love-poems, so strongly censured for their realism, that have been fixed upon by one of Swinburne's keenest critics to prove the thesis that he never expressed emotions of his own, but always, like a professional letter-writer, those appropriate to some one else; and this, says the critic in question, proves his inferiority to Burns. But this judgement needs to be very carefully qualified. The poems are *sincere*; they are felt to the inmost depths of the poet's being. But if the critic means that their sincerity is *poetical* sincerity only, he is probably right. They are passions artistically remembered, as an old man remembers with advantages the deeds he did at Agincourt. It would be foolish to deny that he had been at Agincourt: it would be equally foolish to believe that he had been quite so

heroic as he makes out. Throughout all these poems, as another excellent critic has observed, emotion always preponderates over sensation, and the idea often over the emotion. They are studies of moods, intellectually analysed but imaginatively pictured; and the same hand that has drawn the delirium of love has also, with equal power, drawn the weariness of satiety, the pang of separation, the agony of remorse. We can no more take literally these poems than those others in which the longing for death—a longing patiently endured for forty years—is thrown into imperishable words.

The second great motive, a feeling for mankind as a whole, played the main part in Swinburne's poetry during the interval between the appearance of *Poems and Ballads* and the return to Greece in *Erechtheus*. No poet can afford to be too definite; but on the other hand, if he has no definite idea before his mind he runs the risk of losing himself in mere vacuity. The solid substratum of Swinburne's poetry of humanity was found primarily in Italy and secondarily in France. And as France tended to dwindle in his mind into Victor Hugo, so Italy tended to concentrate, nay, to dilate, itself into the noble, colossal, but perfectly balanced figure of Mazzini. The crimes of Napoleon III were to Swinburne largely summed up in the banishment of the great poet; and Swinburne's denunciations of the Second Empire were often but a rendering into English of the terrible *Châtiments* of Hugo. In Mazzini, similarly, Swinburne saw the incarnation of what he regarded as best in the man of politics; and this it was that gave definiteness, edge, and body to ideas which might otherwise have faded into cloud. Swinburne's poetry, in fact, like Italy itself, was saved from anarchy by Mazzini: and this too while, with a true instinct, he kept to the poet's part of inspiring others, and left details to the men of action. Thus the Italian poems are eulogies, well deserved it is true, rather than either essays or criticisms. It was natural, therefore, that when the crowning aim of Mazzini failed of accomplishment, Swin-

burne's panegyric, doubtless already embryonic in his mind, had to seek another theme on which to express itself. True liberty, as he understood it, had not been achieved: the work was maimed and imperfect. When, therefore, Italy, though freed from foreign domination, became a kingdom and not a republic, Swinburne held his hand, and reserved his triumph for the true consummation as it took place in France ten years later. His *Ode on the Proclamation of the French Republic* is the real sequel to his Italian poems. These are the works which link Swinburne with Shelley on one of his sides, as the love-lyrics link him with Shelley on another.

The final and perhaps most pervasive of all the influences that have moulded Swinburne is his passion for the sea. It would be instructive to count the number of allusions to the sea, by way of simile, metaphor, or general reference, that lie scattered throughout the whole work of Swinburne. It is certain that no English poet has felt the wonder of the sea, in all its moods, as he has done. The fury of it spoke to the Northumbrian as it spoke to the author of *Andreas* a thousand years before; its beauty and softness, visioned from his early Isle of Wight home, were clothed by his fancy in all the dreaming languor of the Idle Lake as seen by Spenser. And it was the sea *itself* that appealed to him. As Mr. James Douglas has said, 'Most of our poets, from Campbell to Kipling, regard the sea either as a stage for our naval heroes, or as a material for metaphor, or as a stock-pot of sentiment, or as a reservoir of rhetoric. But Swinburne did for the sea what Wordsworth did for the land. His clean rapture in the sea is free from literary affectation.' This is as true as it is well expressed. What touch of falseness the keenest scent for rhetoric may discover in other of Swinburne's poems is absent here. Death was the love of his youth; Italy of his manhood; the sea he loved from his earliest days to his last: it was to his outer eye what Greece was to the eye of his mind, and it supplied to him the concrete image in which all his tempestuous ideas

glassed themselves. From contact with the sea, like his own Tristram in the glorious and often-quoted passage, his poetry gained an overflowing and irresistible life :

And scarcely seemed its life a part of earth,
But the life kindled of a fiery birth
And passion of a new-begotten son,
Between the live sea and the living sun.

It is difficult, indeed, to part from so enthralling a subject as this. But, after all, to analyse great poetry is to run the risk of destroying it. Even Swinburne's own criticism, so penetrating and illuminating, was often content with simple admiration. Poetry to him, as to Shelley, was 'a power which comes and goes like dream, and which none can ever trace.' We shall, therefore, make no further attempt at criticism. Still less shall we say a word in pity or censure. We prefer to end on a note of gratitude. 'Render thanks to the Giver, England, for thy son.' Like Swinburne himself, when he wrote of the 'frayed wings' of Villon, we would rather be glad in what he did than waste our time wondering what he might have done. 'Ave atque vale.'

For thee, O now a silent soul, our brother,
Take at our hands this garland, and farewell.

E. E. KELLETT.

THE SPHERE OF THE MYSTIC SENSE IN MODERN SPIRITUAL LIFE¹

IF the question, 'Does spiritual insight keep pace with material knowledge?' results in disappointment; if, while men are eagerly exploring and utilizing the physical universe, they are failing to avail themselves of the spiritual world within and without, we are compelled to inquire the reason why. Is our spiritual capacity at fault—inadequate, or undeveloped; or is it frustrated by counteracting conditions? The problem is vitally important.

Assuming man's spiritual nature, and the fact that he is placed in a spiritual realm, there must needs be a connexion between the two. Whether the power which connects them is a separate faculty of the soul, or the mind exercising itself in special relations, may be a mystery. But that man has a sense which makes him conscious of the invisible, spiritual, and eternal world is self-evident. This sense might be regarded as the eye of the soul—only that while it sees visions it likewise dreams dreams. It has also an ear for the harmony of the universe, and is at times like a sensitively strung nerve, which vibrates with the movements of the life which surrounds it. The natural history of this faculty is the history of mysticism. On this wide field we must not enter, but a few of its guiding principles concern us :

The Spirit of God is within all the outward phenomena of the universe, which is a manifestation of His essence, and is impressed with His image. Man is in himself a world created from the life of God and stamped with His likeness.

¹ The first article, entitled 'Does Spiritual Insight keep Pace with Material Knowledge?' appeared in October 1908. The Development and Education of the Spiritual Sense may be dealt with subsequently.

Between man and the universe—the microcosmos and the cosmos—there are sympathetic mutual relations.

Seeing that the soul partakes of the divine nature, it is ever seeking Him as the complement of its life and the perfection of its form. In Jesus Christ the Logos we have the fullness of the Godhead bodily.

The soul can approach God directly—know Him intuitively, and realize the divine life through its experience.

The energy which seeks and assimilates the divine essence is love. Love attains its perfect strength by self-surrender, and can only be united to God when self has been abandoned.

In every created thing there is a tincture of the divine essence and a trace of His image. Man is therefore drawn to beauty, harmony, and visible life, and by them his nature is nourished and expanded.

The infinite is enshrined in the smallest object, and the eternal within the briefest moment. You can

See a world in a grain of sand,
And a heaven in a wild flower;
Hold infinity in the palm of your hand,
And eternity in an hour.

And yet around the rim of man's consciousness there lies a borderland of mystery. However clear his vision and profound his experience at any time may be, below the plumbed depth of his knowledge is the unfathomable, and behind the ridge of the delectable mountains is the beyond.

As we follow the history of these ideas we can trace their powerful influence not only on theology, but on all systems of thought and conceptions of the universe. The history of mystical religion is the record of the highest efforts of the race. It is the biography of its noblest characters—Clement of Alexandria, St. Basil, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventura, Francis of Assisi, Thomas à Kempis, St. Catherine, St. Theresa, Fénelon, Mme. Guyon, Henry More and George Fox are some of the names on its roll of renown. It also reveals the great spiritual forces which have preserved the element of the divine in material

conditions. It must, therefore, have a sphere of service in the spiritual life of the twentieth century. The true spiritual life of to-day is simply that portion of the divine life of which we are conscious—all that we have received and assimilated. It reveals itself in thought, feeling, and action. It may be much or little. It is, at best, only part of the whole, as the fertilizing raincloud is only something of the vapour which is in the sky, or as the honey stored within the hive is only part of the sweetness in the heather spread over the moorland.

As all life presses into form it must be regarded as a unity with features of its own. This rounded spiritual life might be termed the Church, but not the Church visible—as many souls have vitality who are not numbered within its pale, and in all these is the light which lighteth every one that cometh into the world. Still, all those who have received this life and light are sympathetically united. It may be unconsciously to themselves. But they are not so many separate points of radiance—they make a star.

Seeing that all spiritual life is invisible, we cannot estimate its volume. We are able to form some idea of the light which comes down from the sun on a summer's day, and of the amount of heat which the earth may absorb; but we can have no adequate conception of the spiritual influences that are moving upon men and women at any period of time, nor how far they may have been accepted, unless we trace their manifestations in character and conduct. The religious spirit of the present day is perplexing partly because it is shaping itself in many forms, and partly because those forms are in transition. If a generalization may be attempted—— It is energetic, inquisitive, philanthropic, but deficient in inward vitality. Its activities are beyond its strength. Its ideals are not lofty, and yet its target is higher than its aim. It is hampered by the calculation of issues. Its convictions are too lukewarm to be creative, and its offers are beyond its resources. These symptoms are unmistakable.

'Tis life whereof our nerves are scant.

There are two ways by which this energy may be supplied from the eternal source—(a) directly, and (b) through communicating channels. As we are drawn directly to the fountain of life, there are three steps of approach :

1. The first is *desire*—the instinctive stretching of the soul towards the true, the beautiful, and the infinite. It is the divine essence within seeking the divine fullness. In its simplest manifestation it is almost passive, but it always includes susceptibility and the capacity of response. The longing soul may wait in stillness for the touch of God as the flower for the fertilizing pollen in the passing breeze.

This elemental conception of what we regard as prayer may give us some friendly assistance in our consideration of a phase of our present religious experience. The formal practice of prayer in privacy and in the home is decreasing. The habits of our forefathers have not descended to their children. We seldom wrap our cloaks around us for a night-long vigil. The little sound-proof closet in every Covenanter's home has no place in our domestic architecture. One by one our sacred household fires are dying out, and even in Scotland such scenes as that described in the *Cottar's Saturday Night* are rapidly vanishing. The attendance in our places of worship is also diminishing. The classes who frequented them are beginning to stay away—the masses as a whole remain outside.

This triple tendency is alarming. So far as it betrays a lack of interest in the spiritual and absorption in the material, so far as it denotes a religious sense dormant or decaying, the symptoms are deplorable. The revival of the true spirit of prayer in the heart of the nation is a vital necessity. But whether this spirit of prayer will ever manifest itself again in precisely similar forms, or to the same degree, is open to question. May not some part of the apparent changes in our habits of devotion be owing to the growth of an enlightened conception of the inward nature of communion with God? We may scarcely be conscious of the change in our thinking, or be free to acknowledge it, but the idea of prayer as a sensitive and

responsive personal desire is assuredly working its way. It is finding allies in the newly adopted methods of communication between man and man. Now that neither vocal sound, nor paper, nor bodily contact are required for the transmission of our requests or our acknowledgements—now, indeed, that the reality of thought transference has been scientifically established—we can readily believe that the burdened spirit may express itself without spaces of time, or ordered words, or formal attitudes. 'The breathing of a sigh, the falling of a tear, the upward glancing of the eye' may be pathetic and effective signals, and even without them the soul may draw to itself the glance of an ever-present sympathy. Indeed, there may be some reason to fear that the simple spirit of devotion is not feeling quite at home in the atmosphere of the churches. Our houses of prayer are far too often places for ritualistic display, intellectual disquisitions, and social entertainments. But beyond these considerations this cardinal truth inscribed on the mystic charter of direct and inward fellowship with God is emancipating our minds from many preconceptions and prejudices. We are realizing that the spirit of the Father is everywhere—that men are not shut up to worship Him in this Nonconformist mountain or in that Established Jerusalem. Wheresoever two or three are gathered together He is in their midst, and where, indeed, there is only one, that soul is His habitation.

2. The second way of approach is by *vision*. The soul realizing its personality seeks a personal God. It is restless until it beholds Him. In such a mood the mind, while sensible that God is everywhere, instinctively strives to focus the rays of the divine presence to a burning-point in its own consciousness. It seeks for God within. If there is one service more than another for which we should be grateful to the long line of mystic saints, it is their insistence on the truth that the soul may see its Maker in whose image it was made. In the second and third centuries, when men who had been 'suckled in a creed outworn,' and had been taught that the gods were many, and

that they dwelt on Olympian heights, or in the grove, or by the stream—and had turned wearily away from their vain pursuing—Philo, Origen, and Dionysius proclaimed that He of whom they were the real offspring visited the temple of the human mind. When, later, a spurious Christian faith had resuscitated the dead spirit of paganism, and had put before the forlorn and bewildered penitent a multitude of graven and painted images, mediaeval saints like Eckhart, St. Bernard, and the author of the *Theologica Germanica* insisted on the privilege of personal and inward fellowship. Such testimony is needed still. The scientific philosophy of to-day is suggestive and illuminating, but it is not satisfying. Monism may bring us away from the blind alley of agnosticism, and from the barren waste of materialism, and spread before us 'matter or infinitely extended substance and spirit, or sensitive and thinking substance as the two fundamental attributes or principal properties of the all-embracing divine essence of the world: the universal substance'—and all this the spirit of the seeker after God, as far as he can comprehend it, may steadfastly believe. But he will ask for something more than inarticulate and impersonal vastness. His one absorbing craving inspires him with a sense of individuality. For the moment all his being is an embodied aspiration. It is, therefore, only natural that the conception of God as an infinitely extended substance, however akin to his own nature that substance may be, should be entirely alien to his hope and desire. He is longing to be told:

Speak to Him, for He hears; and spirit with spirit can meet.

This doctrine of the interior vision is common to all mystical thought. It was no new idea—Seneca believed it when he said:

God is near thee. He is with thee: a holy Spirit resides
within us.

But the Christian mystic had clearer light on the way of attainment. He always insists on purity as the essential condition. The revelation is a continuous process.

According as the heart becomes cleansed it mirrors the divine image with ever increasing clearness, as when the ancient refiner beheld his reflection in the molten silver.

However the vision may vary in distinctness, it never fails to impress itself upon the soul—creating an experience which is supreme and immovable, and entirely independent of any verification from the word of an outside witness. Tennyson so describes it:

I found Him not in world or sun,
Or eagle's wing, or insect's eye;
Nor through the questions men may try,
The petty cobwebs we have spun.

If e'er, when faith had fall'n asleep,
I heard a voice—Believe no more;
And heard an ever-breaking shore,
That tumbled in the godless deep,

A warmth within my breast would melt
The freezing reason's colder part;
And, like a man in wrath, the heart
Stood up and answered, '*I have felt.*'

The secret of the mystics' serene and childlike joy lay in this consciousness of an indwelling Father. If it would but penetrate our present-day experience it would expel its pessimism and allay its fears. It would light up the eyes that are sad from the watching of changeful things with a celestial radiance. When St. Day of Cornwall was asked why he was always so merry, he had one reply: '*I have my God, and no one can take Him from me.*'

3. The third and ultimate stage of the soul's contact with God is *union*. The forces which bring them together are mutually exercised. The divine Spirit sees the image of Himself in the human soul. The soul yearns to find itself in God. When the fellowship is complete, it is union and not absorption. The mind, and heart, and will of the child find their true orbits within the circle of the all-wise and loving will of the Father. It is love which effects the union, for it is love alone that can animate

Two souls with but a single thought,
Two hearts that beat as one.

It is love, too, of the highest kind that pours itself forth entirely and to the uttermost, hoping for nothing again. There is the note of a joyous abandonment in many of the mystic souls who tell their love. One who had a calm and lucid mind exclaims :

'Let the length, and breadth, and depth, and height of my love unto Thee be like Thine unto me. Let undrained and immeasurable abysses be hidden in it. Let it be more vehement than flame, more abundant than the sea, more constant than the candle in Aaron's tabernacle that burned day and night.'

Here is a desire so fervent that only one thing could possibly kindle it. It is love that awakens love.

Love is divine, and scorneth worldly pelf,
And can be bought with nothing but itself.

It is at this point that we are able to understand why the cross was ever before the eyes of the mystic saint, why he saw on all things visible and invisible the sprinkled blood of the atonement.

'That cross,' says Thomas Treherne, 'is a tree set on fire with invisible flame that illuminateth all the world. The flame is Love : the love in His bosom who died on it.'

To such as he the shedding of the Saviour's blood was the very life of God poured forth. That life was essential vivifying love diffused throughout the universe—Love incarnate set free through self-surrender—Infinite Life conveyed by infinite self-sacrifice. Lady Juliana in her Norwich retreat saw through the narrow slit in her cell a memorable sight :

'Behold and see the vertue of this precious plenty of His dear worthy blood. It descended down into Hell and brake her bonds, and delivered them all that were there which belongeth to the court of Heaven. The precious plenty of His dear worthy blood overfloweth all earth, and is ready to wash all creatures of sin which be of good-will,

have been or shall be. The precious plenty of His dear worthy blood ascendeth up into Heaven in the blessed body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and there is in Him bleeding—praying for us to the Father, and is and shall be as long as us needeth.'

These sentiments so vividly expressed may almost shock our modern susceptibility. But should our Protestant Christendom put out of sight, as it is in danger of doing, the physical facts of the agony and bloody sweat, the cross, and passion on the tree, the truth with which they are associated will assuredly relax its hold upon our convictions.

We still retain the hymns, 'When I survey the wondrous cross,' 'There is a fountain filled with blood,' and 'Rock of ages, cleft for me,' but we are singing them not with the rapture of a present conviction, but with the tameness of a recollected emotion.

The consequences are apparent. In all the forms in which our modern life is manifesting itself the absence of passion is sadly significant. In art, music, poetry, the drama, and even in politics, there is ingenuity, industry, and surprise, but where is the fire? Where is the vehemence in our preaching, the glow of our experience, the fervour of our praise, the earnest importunity of our prayers?

The fountains of the passion and life of any period are from within. They well up from the spiritual experience of the faithful minority.

The Church has always inspired the spirit of the age. The mystical fire of a passionate love from generation to generation has, like the unseen radium, imparted warmth to the spiritual climate of the world. The source of that heat is the fire of redeeming love. We may avert our eyes from the crimson banner of the Salvation Army as it flutters in our streets, but the two words upon it have an undying meaning, and are inseparably allied—*blood* and *fire*.

The second road along which the Mystic soul approaches God is the meditating universe—comprising nature and

the lives of his fellow man—and indeed of all creatures. It is the way of ascent to God. It is the channel of life from God. As to his natural environment, the world of matter is ministering to his life in all its forms. The universe is instinct with energy. Man is a microcosm in sympathy with the universe. The alliance between his physical nature and matter is intimate. The sympathy between his spiritual being and the spirit underlying matter should be equally real and equally felt.

It is by our spiritual sense that we are united with this outward soul of things. It is the key which unlocks the treasures of the universe. The magic flower or password of ancient folklore which opened the solid rock and revealed a gallery of gold and gems, was probably its popular symbol. It is this sense within childlike hearts which establishes a loving relationship between them and the powers of nature. St. Francis is their spokesman :

‘Praised be my Lord with all His creatures, and especially for our brother the sun and our sister the moon. Praised be my Lord for our sister, water, and for our brother, fire.’ But this sense is not merely perceptive—it is receptive also. Nature responds to the heart that loves her. The beauty, harmony, and strength of her life are poured into our lives. ‘You can never,’ says a mystic poet of the seventeenth century, ‘you can never enjoy the world aright till the sea itself floweth in your veins, till you are clothed with the heavens and crowned with the stars.’

It is by the education and enlargement of this spiritual faculty that we may hope to increase, illumine, and harmonize human experience. This childlike spirit always precedes the greatest discoveries in the natural world. The treatise of Jacob Behmen, the mystical shoemaker, about the first three principles of eternal nature, gave Isaac Newton his clue to the three first laws of motion.

This simple susceptibility holds the secret of immeasurable happiness scarcely yet imagined. In his *Pageant of Summer* Richard Jefferies says, ‘My heart is fixed firm and stable in the belief that ultimately the sunshine and

the summer, the flowers and the azure sky, shall become, as it were, interwoven into man's existence. He shall take from all their beauty and enjoy their glory.'

As our spiritual nature is developed this inheritance will enlarge. The true and perfect manhood of Jesus of Nazareth explains the mystery. His human soul, filled with the divine spirit, was in full accord with the life and harmony of the universe. He was in company with the beasts in the wilderness—the lily of the field revealed to Him her beauty, and the sparrow his simple trust. He walked on the waves of the sea, and the winds obeyed Him—the cornfields and the vines unveiled their mystery. The sun did not smite Him by day nor the moon by night. He was in league with the stones of the field. When He gave up the ghost the sun was darkened and the rocks were rent.

A still fuller way by which the spiritual possession of men is increased, and by which they may approach nearer the source of their common life, is through their intercourse with one another. There is one animating spiritual energy through all, experienced in varying degrees. The individual is not an isolated unit, but is linked to all others by an invisible bond of sympathy. The good of one is the good of all. The fullness of the aggregate is the completeness of the individual.

Our longing for Christian unity is therefore much more than a sentiment. It is the irresistible impulse of a spiritual instinct. It is the love in souls that are alike stretching out to love, which is akin wherever it is found. It can only be satisfied by union. No imaginary advantages accruing from variety will ever make amends for the separation which is caused by conflicting aims and mutual suspicions. No individual who is a party to that divisive spirit can reach the full stature of his manhood, and no section of the Christian Church that shares it can attain its richest development—seeing that the lines by which the common life is maintained and diffused are shattered. Besides, it is only in the fullness of her life that the Church can win the world—unless the bar of steel be charged with magnetism it will not draw to itself the scattered particles.

There is but one way of effecting a real union. We may lay too much stress on a common form of words, a common platform for consultation, a common field for work. They are invaluable adjuncts if the inward vital thread of fellowship be there. They are, however, intrinsically outward. The tie which binds is spiritual. It is love which implies and secures oneness. Where its energy diffuses itself a mutual yearning is created which draws all kindred souls together, as Charles Wesley puts it in his poetic prayer :

Touched by the loadstone of Thy love,
Let all our hearts agree;
And ever towards each other move,
And ever move toward Thee.

Again, as we realize the solidarity of the human race, we shall feel that the roots of our spiritual growth go back into the past and stretch forth into the future. If our religious sense enlarges the frontiers of consciousness, it will do so in a circle and not in a straight line. We shall feel that we inherit the spiritual life which has come down to us through the generations. We shall come into touch with the spirits whose hearts throbbed with the life of love, and who have left it to us as an inalienable inheritance. We shall do this not only as Wordsworth would have us—when

In our halls is hung
Armoury of the invincible Knights of old,

but by that subtle sympathy which will transport us back to the scenes of their life and conflict, and enable us to take into our experience and growth the vital influences which they created then and there—as Dante walked and talked with Virgil. We Englishmen must be free, or die, not only because we

speak the tongue
That Shakespeare spake; the faith and morals hold
Which Milton held,

but inasmuch as our minds are in unison with the unchangeable element of thought and feeling in which they worked and are swayed by the tides which they helped to set

in motion. If we had met the boy Blake when he came home from the field and said he had seen Ezekiel under a tree, we might have smiled incredulously. But not one of Sven Hedin's audience of learned men were sceptical when the traveller told them the other day that, as he sat on the banks of the trans-Himalayan Indus, while it sang its eternal songs between the rocks—the same melodies as in Alexander the Macedonian's time—he had a feeling that the fate of his own life through this river in some little way got connected with Alexander's, although 2,200 years were lying between.

As for the grave and thoughtful Thomas Treherne, he lived over again the deeds of former generations and recalled their scenery. 'When my soul is in Eden with our first parents, I myself am there in a blessed manner. When I walk with Enoch and see his translation, I am transported with him. I can see the children of Israel passing through the sea. I can enter into Aaron's tabernacle and admire the mysteries of the holy place.' Is it too much to hope for that in some not too distant time every Christian will have his All Saints' Day, and that when his transfiguration moments come he may find that on his Tabor the great spirits of the past may visit him?

But our eyes are turning to the future. There is a growing feeling that each generation of men should live for those who are to follow. Before every worker in this passing day there has arisen a vision of a federated humanity—a living association of men so welded together as to make one perfect unity. So many of diverse minds and at different times have seen this sight that we may be certain it is no unsubstantial dream. Paul wrote confidently of the ideal man with his completeness of stature. Tennyson saw 'a single race, of a single tongue,' and heard the murmur of 'universal ocean softly washing all her warless isles.'

H. G. Wells, one of the clearest thinkers in the driest light, makes confession of his faith—'The essential fact in man's history, to my sense, is the slow unfolding of a sense of community with his kind, of the possibilities of

co-operation leading to scarce dreamt-of collective powers, a synthesis of the species, of the development of a common general idea, a common general purpose, out of a present confusion. We, you and I, are not only parts in a thought process, but parts of one flow of blood and of life.'

'The outlook was never brighter than it is to-day,' says the modern neo-platonic mystic, Sir Oliver Lodge. 'Many workers and thinkers are making ready the way for a second advent—a reincarnation of the Logos in the hearts of all men. The heralds are already attuning their songs for a reign of brotherly love.'

With the vision of her Lord as one that serveth, the Church is girding up her loins for service. She may feel instinctively that the realization of her life depends upon its sacrifice for the salvation of the perishing. But self-interest is not the Christian's motive. Every soul that has seen love and surrendered to love is moved by it to love. The man who is conscious of his mystic union with the Spirit of God recognizes the image of God in every fallen brother. Tauler stayed in Strasbourg battling with the black death which was slaying the common people. The heart of the gentle, sensitive Suso went out in sympathy to the Magdalen in the streets.

The true spirit of mysticism was never self-centred. Asceticism which ended in self-abasement was an unhealthy fungus, and not a natural growth. Whenever the mystic ascended his 'ladder' it was not that he might be elevated above his fellows—have a wider prospect—breathing a clearer air. He had a sword and trowel in his hand.

Love thinketh not itself to please,
Nor for itself hath any care;
But for another gives its ease,
And builds a heaven in hell's despair.

The sustaining force of this valiant passion is wholly spiritual. It may rest on the solidarity of the race and on the brotherhood of man, but the love of the brethren is derived from the love of a common Father through our elder Brother. Although John Wesley was impatient with

some phases of William Law's mysticism, he was himself a mystic of mystics. In one of his sermons he says, 'A poor wretch cries to me for an alms. I look, and see him covered with dirt and rags—but through these I see one that has an immortal spirit made to know, and love, and dwell with God to eternity. I honour him for his Creator's sake. I see through all these rags that he is purpled over with the blood of Christ. I love him for the sake of his Redeemer.'

If we retain our union with the indwelling Spirit and constantly feed our strength at the secret sources of His energy, we need not fear that either Nonconformists or Conformists will become too political. It was the almost seraphic Fletcher of Madeley who wrote to Benson, 'I am unaccountably launching into Christian politics, a branch of divinity too much attended to by some, and too much neglected by others.' But we must remember that pilgrims to that Shropshire parsonage have been shown the trace of the breath of his unceasing prayers upon his study walls.

The prospect on the threshold of the Twentieth Century is sublimely inviting and the movements in the world encouraging. A strange earth-wave flowing from east to west is bringing the nations nearer together in a craving for constitutional freedom, and there are signs that European peoples, although retaining their outward distinctions, may ere long become one confederated commonwealth.

As we give ourselves to hasten on the coming day of a regenerated and united race, our hearts will be enlarged, and something of the splendour of that day may come out to meet us, as branches of fruit from the New World drifted towards its discoverers.

As we individually and unitedly agree to build the temple of the new humanity, each contributing his bit of love and work, we shall enrich our own life by the effort, and instead of perishing like the coral insect in the rising reef, we shall ourselves as living stones be built up a spiritual house.

EDWARD J. BRAILSFORD.

THE CARLYLE LOVE-LETTERS

The Love-Letters of Thomas Carlyle and Jane Welsh.

Edited by Alexander Carlyle, M.A. With numerous illustrations. Two Vols. (London : John Lane. 1909.)

THE hundred and seventy-six letters which form the bulk of these handsome and superbly-edited volumes cover the whole period of the Carlyle courtship from the May of 1821 to the October of 1826. From a literary point of view, not many of them are to be compared with the best of the letters which both the writers wrote in the maturity of their powers; but they are full of human interest, and form a valuable addition to English literature and national biography. Together with the editor's introduction, annotations, and appendices, they give the *coup de grace* to the 'Froude legend,' based on the idea that the Carlyles never truly loved each other, and end, it may be hoped, a bitter and protracted controversy. In the circumstances, the publication of the letters in full was not only justifiable but imperative, and the world is now indebted to another 'able editor' for this rich repository of material for romance, for character study, for miscellaneous entertainment of a rare and varied kind. The hero as lover did not come within the scope of Carlyle's famous lectures, but out of these sincere, enthusiastic letters might (with equal genius) be carved an essay or a story that would fill the vacant place. With adequate space at our disposal they might have formed the basis and the starting-point of a character study supplementary to the masterly appreciation of Carlyle, and, incidentally, of Mrs. Carlyle and of their marital relations, which Dr. Rigg contributed to this REVIEW in April 1885. Within our present limits they may perhaps agreeably be used to illustrate the salient characteristics of the

two chief factors in this certainly unique and, on the whole, delightful literary tragi-comedy of real life.

When the correspondence opens, Carlyle was almost unknown as a writer. His mind was still chaotic, his thought obscure and immature, his heart tumultuous with conflicting passions, and his style unformed. But he is in love, in deep, absorbing and transforming love; his heart is purified; his fine imagination is enkindled; light dawns upon and vivifies his darkened intellect; order issues out of chaos; beauty in the 'footing treads' of his fair *Blumine* when she appears within the garden of his soul. 'Was she not to him in very deed a morning-star; did not her presence bring with it airs from heaven? . . . Pale doubt fled away to the distance; life bloomed up with happiness and hope.' Under the spell of his new enchantress the love-smit man of genius found expression, now in prose and now in verse, and soon began to show those powers of vivid, graphic speech which placed him in the forefront of the writers of all time. In these early letters there are signs of what was coming in the books which, for a generation, were to startle and electrify the English-speaking world. There is no fine writing wherewith to dazzle and to captivate the maiden who had won his heart; but everywhere are passages that now in any English audience would be instantly pronounced Carlylean; gleams of humour, aphorisms, literary judgements, Rembrandt-like portraiture, and Dantesque description, such as form the staple of his riper work. Pithy, pregnant sayings lie embedded in the pages: 'Freedom is the very life of man'; 'The very search for peace, in some degree is peace'; 'Few except the indolent are ever hurried'; 'Literature' (that is, as an avocation) 'is the *wine* of life; it will not, cannot be, its *food*'; 'In labour lies health of body and of mind; in suffering and difficulty is the soil of all virtue and all wisdom.'

Among these early literary judgements, perhaps the most remarkable and quotable are those upon his favourite authors at the time: Chateaubriand is 'the finest genius

and the greatest fool in France'; Sismondi is 'a lively, dapper, elegant little fellow, full of good sense and learning and correct sentiment . . . a clever man, with rather less talent than Jeffrey, and about ten times as much knowledge and culture'; Gibbon has but 'a coarse and vulgar heart, with all his keen logic and glowing imagination and lordly irony; he worships power and splendour; and suffering virtue, the most heroic devotedness, if unsuccessful, . . . has little of his sympathy. To the Christians he is frequently very unfair.' It speaks volumes for the soundness of their moral nature that both the lovers were revolted and disgusted by the *Decameron*. On reading Boccaccio's description of the plague, Miss Welsh thought it 'extremely powerful,' and, on perusing one or two of the tales, she thought the work had been belied; but, she adds, 'the third was enough: I will never open the book again'; and Carlyle commends her resolution: 'I like you better for dismissing that ancient sinner Giovan Boccaccio: he is a wicked knave with all his talents, and intellectual pleasure may be dearly purchased at such a risk.' Of his prime favourite and the loadstar of his literary life the young enthusiast has much to say. Miss Welsh tells him that she does not think she shall like Goethe 'unless he improves greatly. He has fire enough, but it is not the celestial fire of Schiller.' But Carlyle insists that he is 'the only living model of a great writer. The Germans say there have been *three* geniuses in the world since it began—Homer, Shakespeare, and Goethe! This, of course, is shooting on the wing; but after all abatements their countryman is a glorious fellow. It is one of my finest day-dreams to see him ere I die.' And again:

This Goethe has as much in him as any ten of them: he is not a mere Bacchanalian rhymester, cursing and foaming and laying about him as if he had breathed a gallon of nitrous oxide . . . but a man of true culture and universal genius, not less distinguished for the extent of his knowledge and the profoundness of his ideas and the variety of his feelings, than for the vivid and graceful

energy, the inventive and deeply meditative sagacity, the skill to temper enthusiasm with judgement, which he shows in exhibiting them. Wordsworth and Byron! They are the Christian Ensign and Captain Bobadil before the Duke of Marlboro'.

Of his early sorrows as a writer, Carlyle gives his pupil and *fiancée* many a glimpse: 'The cooking of a paragraph is little better than the labour of the goldmaker; I sweat and toil and keep tedious vigil, and at last there runs out from the tortured melting-pot an ingot—of solid pewter.' Comparing translation with original composition, he says, 'It is not unpleasant work, nor is it pleasant. Original composition is ten times as laborious. It is an agitating, fiery, consuming business when your heart is in it. I can easily conceive a man writing his soul out of him; writing till it evaporates "like the snuff of a farthing candle."' The most Carlylean passage in the volumes is in a letter from Hoddam Hill, June 1825:

Earth, sea, and air are open to us here as well as anywhere; the Water of Milk was flowing through its simple valley as early as the Brook Siloa, and poor Repentance Hill is as old as the Caucasus itself. There is a majesty and mystery in Nature, take her as you will; the essence of all poetry comes breathing to a mind that feels, from every province of her empire. Is she not immoveable, eternal, and immense, in Annandale as she is in Chamouni? The Sun comes forth to sow the Earth with Orient pearl; Night, the ancient Mother, follows him with her diadem of stars; and Arcturus and Orion call *me* into the infinitudes of space as they called the Druid Priest or the Shepherd of Chaldea. . . . Sometimes something in the shape of conscience says to me: 'You will please to observe, Mr. Tummas, that time is flying fast away, and you are very poor and ignorant and unknown, and verging towards nine-and-twenty. What is to become of you in the long run, Mr. Tummas? Are you not partly of the opinion that you are—an ass?'

And perhaps the best example of his vivid portraiture is to be found in one of the editor's notes containing an extract

from Carlyle's little-known story, *Cruthers and Jonson*. It is a literary portrait of Miss Welsh fit to be placed beside the picture of 'Blumine' in *Sartor*, for which the same enchanting model evidently sat :

Bright, airy sylph ! Kind, generous soul ! I could have loved her myself if I had seen her. Think of a slender delicate creature—formed in the very mould of beauty—elegant and airy in her movements as a fawn ; black hair and eyes—jet black ; her face meanwhile as pure and fair as lilies—and then for its expression—how shall I describe it ? Nothing so changeful, nothing so lovely in all its changes : one moment it was sprightly gaiety, quick arch humour, sharp wrath, the most contemptuous indifference—then all at once there would spread over it a celestial gleam of warm affection, deep enthusiasm—every feature beamed with tenderness and love, her eyes and looks would have melted a heart of stone ; but ere you had time to fall down and worship them—poh ! she was off into some other hemisphere—laughing at you—teasing you—again seeming to flit round the whole universe of human feeling, and to sport with every part of it. Oh ! never was there such another beautiful, cruel, affectionate, wicked, adorable, capricious little gipsy sent into this world for the delight and vexation of mortal man. My own admiration is, how in the name of wonder Jonson ever got her wooed !—I should have thought it the most hopeless task in nature. Perhaps he had a singular skill in such undertakings : at any rate he thrived. The cynosure of neighbouring eyes, the apple of discord to all bachelors within many leagues—richer many of them and more showy men than Jonson—preferred Jonson to them all. Perhaps, like Desdemona, she loved him for the dangers he had passed : at all events, she loved him—loved him with her whole soul, the little cozen—though it was many a weary day before he could determine whether she cared one straw for him or not.

It would be impossible in fewer words more accurately to describe the lady Carlyle wooed and won as she is revealed in her own letters. Would that she had left to us a portrait of her wooer from her not less vivid and

artistic pen ! Here and there, as in the letter to her aunt shortly before their marriage, she lets us see her real thought of him. After surmising that her aunt has heard sufficiently from her friends of Carlyle's poverty and humble birth, she adds, ' And if they happened to be vulgar-fine people with disputed pretensions to good looks, they would, to a certainty, set him down as unpolished and ill-looking. But, a hundred chances to one, they would not tell you that he is among the cleverest men of his day ; and not the cleverest only but the most enlightened ! that he possesses all the qualities I deem essential in *my* husband, a warm true heart to love me, a towering intellect to command me, and a spirit of fire to be the guiding star of my life.' In a letter to Carlyle, a few months earlier, she says, ' It is now five years since we first met—five blessed years ! During all that period my opinion of you has never *wavered*, but gone on deliberately rising to a higher and higher degree of regard ; and (what is perhaps still more convincing of its well-groundedness), in the seventeen months that I have held myself your affianced wife, I have never for a single instant doubted of the wisdom of my choice. Nor has *your* attachment proved itself less steadfast than mine, tho' far more unaccountable. For you have loved me, not in blindness of my thousand faults, but in spite of them ; for the sake of my one redeeming grace, the faith that is in me. Oh, without doubt, we shall be happy as the day's long ; happier in our little home at Comely Bank than kings and queens amid the gilding of palaces. Are you believing ? I could easily convince you with my eyes and my kisses ; but ink-words are so ineloquent !' And, after twenty years of married life, according to unpublished evidence in possession of the editor, she wrote to her husband, ' I have grown to love you, the longer the more, till now you are grown to be the whole universe, God, everything to me.'

But the best materials for a portrait of Carlyle as man and lover are to be found in his own letters. Examples of his humour may be gleaned from many a sparkling page. He

agrees with his affianced bride in shrinking from the wedding, and thinks it a pity they cannot both fall asleep and awaken married. Nevertheless, 'we must be married with our eyes open, by some flesh-and-blood minister of the Church of Scotland, and join hands "before many witnesses," and whisk away in post-chaises, and in short suffer a short (taste) of Purgatory, before we can expect to arrive in heaven.' To pass the time and screw his courage to the sticking-place before the fatal day, he betakes himself to Kant and plunges into the deeps of the transcendental philosophy, but soon exclaims, 'I am fallen, fallen from the pure regions of Art into the boggy Syrtis of session clerks, and tailors, and post-keepers; and I feel too clearly that till the great day is over, I can neither think of one thing nor another to any purpose.' His manly independence comes out frequently, but by the way, and in no silly mood of vanity. He often repeated to himself the advice of Quixote, 'If it be but a crust of bread and a cup of water that heaven has given thee, rejoice that thou hast none but heaven to thank for it!' He gloried in 'the privilege of being independent,' and resented nothing more through all these years of toil and struggle than the hints of help that sometimes came to him. 'A man that is not standing on his own feet in regard to economical affairs,' he said, 'soon ceases to be a man.' On another occasion, scouting the idea of a sinecure to be obtained through the good offices of Edward Irving, he exclaims, '*Keineswegs!*' (By no means!) 'It is no part of my plan to eat the bread of idleness, so long as I have the force of a sparrow left in me to procure the honest bread of industry. Irving, too! Good Irving! His thoughts are friendly, but he expresses them like a goose.' Not even from Mrs. Welsh, to whom Miss Welsh had made over her small patrimony, was he anxious that they should be indebted. 'Indeed, indeed, my dearest,' he writes in prospect of their marriage, 'we do nowise require assistance from her. Providence (glory to His name!) has made me sufficient for myself; and if I pray to Him, it is not for more money, but for

more wisdom, with which even less money would be sufficient. . . . By the cunning of my right hand I can earn for myself, and those that like to depend on me, sufficient food and raiment : I ride my own serviceable courser along his Majesty's highways, as free a subject as wears them ; owing no man anything but love ; hating no one, fearing no one ; and not so stinted even that on occasion I cannot part my morsel with a "needier fellow-man," and cause the heart of the poor to bless me. There are many squires and dukes in this world that cannot say so much.'

Carlyle's practical sagacity is manifest throughout the correspondence, but specially in his guidance of Miss Welsh in her literary aims and studies, and in the general conduct of her life. When she had made her choice between 'plain living and high thinking' and a fashionable worldly life—no doubt on his advice—he tells her she has chosen 'like a prudent woman no less than like a heroine.' 'I dare not promise that your life will be free from sorrow,' he continues ; 'for minds like yours deep sorrows are reserved, take the world as you will : but you will also have noble pleasures, and the great intention of your being will be accomplished. As a fashionable fine lady, on the other hand, I do not see how you could get through the world on even moderate terms : a few years at most would sicken you of such a life ; you would begin by becoming wretched, and end by ceasing to be amiable.' With reference to her conduct towards her mother, his advice is worthy of St. Francis de Sales. That great expert in the direction of souls would almost certainly have used such words as these : 'For your mother, do not let her unkindness afflict you : answer it by contrary conduct ; if you think it foolish and harsh, be you the more wise and gentle. This is to overcome evil with good, the only proper weapon to resist it with.' When they are both awaking from their day-dreams and beginning to resolve to live more human lives, what could be finer, wiser, nobler than his words : 'All this is in you, Jane ! You have a heart, and an intellect, and a resolute decision which might

make you the model of wives, however widely your thoughts and your experience have hitherto wandered from that highest destination of even the noblest woman. I, too, have wandered wide and far! Let us return, my dearest! Let us return together! . . . What is genius but the last perfection of true manhood? The pure reflection of a spirit in union with itself, discharging all common duties with more than common excellence, extracting from the many-coloured scenes of life in which it mingles the beautifying principle which more or less pervades them all? The rose in its full-blown fragrance is the glory of the fields: but there must be a soil, and stem, and leaves, or there will be no rose.' All which shows the fundamental sanity of the man, and illustrates his growing insight into human nature and his perception of the meaning and the worth of human life. Could any Christian director have supplied Miss Welsh's soul with food and guidance more appropriate and more Christian than that which Carlyle furnishes in the reflections we are now about to quote?

How wild are our wishes, how frantic our schemes of happiness when we first enter on the world! Our hearts encircled in the delusions of vanity and self-love, we think the Universe was made for us alone; we glory in the strength of our gifts, in the pride of our place, and forget that the fairest ornament of our being is 'the quality of mercy,' the still, meek, humble Love that dwells in the inmost shrine of our nature, and cannot come to light till Selfishness in all its cunning forms is banished out of us, till affliction and neglect and disappointment have sternly taught us that self is a foundation of sand, that we, even the mighty *we*, are a poor and feeble and most unimportant fraction in the general sum of existence. Fools writhe and wriggle and rebel at this . . . and they leave the Earth without ever feeling that the spirit of man is a child of Heaven, and has thoughts and aims in which self and its interests are lost from the eye, as the Eagle is swallowed up in the brightness of the sun to which it soars.

As a lover, Carlyle was a match for Miss Jane Welsh—

in passionate devotion, in sacrifice of self, in patience and persistence and accommodation, in all the arts and mysteries of 'management.' His was love at first sight. It is impossible to read his first letter, written almost immediately after his introduction to her by Edward Irving, without an inclination to exclaim in the language of *Sartor*, 'Poor Teufelsdröckh! it is clear to a demonstration thou art smit: the queen of hearts would see a "man of genius" also sigh for her; and there, by art-magic in that preternatural hour, has she bound and spellbound thee.' Thenceforth

Day was her doing, and the lark
Had reason for his song; the dark
In anagram innumerable spelt
Her name with stars that throbbed and felt.

Her love was of slow growth. It was hampered by conflicting interests and entanglements. Her social position and connexions were much superior to Carlyle's; she had many suitors and some strong attachments; in one of the most exciting of her letters she confesses that at one time she had been 'passionately in love' with Irving; her mother for a long time frowned on Carlyle, and did all she could to hinder his advances; Miss Welsh herself seems to have had a rooted aversion to marriage; at his first approaches as a suitor, she tells Carlyle that she will never, never be his wife, adding, 'I have too little romance in my disposition ever to be in love with you or any man, and too much ever to marry without love'; even when she had fallen in love with him, and after her love had deepened into an 'eternal passion,' she looked forward to their union with a 'shiver.' But the 'Everlasting No' of social pride and possibly of natural antipathy melted, in 'The Centre of Indifference,' beneath the pleadings and attentions of her ardent lover, and was gradually transformed into the 'Everlasting Yea' of promise and reality. 'Oh, I do love you,' is the tenour of her later letters, 'I do love you, my own friend, above the whole earth; no human being was ever half so dear to me, none, none.' Carlyle's

devotion deepened, but it never faltered, and it was evidently true and noble as it was spontaneous and entire.

Of course, the lovers quarrelled. With their history and temperament, this was inevitable; any other issue would have been miraculous. They were too sincere and earnest not to quarrel—too naphtha-blooded; too quick-tempered, sharp-tongued, and high-spirited; too self-willed; too much themselves. They were both of them spoilt children; both of them were highly strung and seldom in good health. No wonder ordinary mortals found them sometimes, as Carlyle's mother said of him, 'gey ill to live with.' No wonder that they quarrelled with each other, seldom seriously, but once or twice up to the verge of separation. Their courtship was a sort of *krieg-spiel*. They quarrelled systematically, as if on purpose and on principle. Early in their friendship, while their love was still supposed by Miss Welsh to be 'platonic,' Carlyle writes to her: 'Heaven bless you for thinking that "we shall never quarrel more!" I myself design that we shall quarrel many thousand times before all is done; each quarrel to last for fifteen minutes at the utmost, then we to kiss and agree, and be better friends than ever. Any longer feud I would not for the world. . . . "Angry at you!" My dear Jane, I was never angry at you in my life, and do believe I never shall be seriously so. I cannot understand what sort of clay the man is made of that could be angry at you: I would have him drummed out of the earth as an interloper and a counterfeit.' Later, they bombarded each other with hints at counter-attractions and with stories of rival suitors, the lady usually firing the first shot and being the last to retire. Their courtship was one long campaign; it was a series of mutual conquests and capitulations. They quarrelled before marriage, and they quarrelled after marriage, and not until their epitaph was written could it be said, 'Their warfare is accomplished.'

But it is easy to take all these misunderstandings and adjustments far too seriously. Unlike their most mis-

guided and unfortunate biographer, these heroic spirits were eminent for humour, sense, and sanity, and their lovers' quarrels ended in an ever-deepening understanding, trust, and love. It is impossible to read their ante-nuptial correspondence in its entirety without endorsing the verdict of the editor, that 'These letters tell "the old, old story as it has never been told before," and that "they prove that there was in the hearts of the writers a deep and abiding love for each other; . . . and that each was to the other not only the best but the only real helpmate that could have been chosen from the whole circle of their acquaintance.' The man or woman is to be pitied that can read the final words of Thomas Carlyle to Jane Baillie Welsh with undimmed eyes or unbelieving heart:

'The Last Speech and *marrying* words of that unfortunate young woman, Jane Baillie *Welsh*,' I received on Friday morning, and truly a most delightful and swan-like melody was in them;¹ a tenderness and warm devoted trust, worthy of such a maiden bidding farewell to the (unmarried) Earth, of which she was the fairest ornament. Dear little Child! How is it that I have deserved thee; deserved a purer and nobler heart than falls to the lot of millions? I swear I will love thee with *my* whole heart, and think my life well spent if it can make thine happy. . . . O my own Jane! I could say much; and what were words to the sea of thoughts that rolls through my heart, when I feel that thou art mine, that I am thine, that henceforth we live not for ourselves but for each other! Let us pray to God that our holy purposes be not frustrated; let us trust in Him and in each other, and fear no evil that can befall us. My last blessing as a Lover is with you; this is my last Letter to Jane Welsh: my first blessing as a Husband, my first kiss to Jane Carlyle is at hand! O my Darling! I will always love thee.

T. A. SEED.

¹ Her last words had been: 'And this is my last letter! What a thought! How terrible, and yet how full of bliss! You will love me for ever, will you not, my own husband? and I will always be your true and affectionate Jane Welsh.'

THE POOR LAW AND ITS REFORMATION

Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress. (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1909.)

IN December 1905 the King, on the recommendation of the late Government, appointed a Commission of two ladies and sixteen gentlemen to inquire into the laws relating to the relief of poor persons in the United Kingdom, and the means adopted for the relief of distress, and to consider whether any modification of these laws was advisable.

This Commission has sat 208 times, it has examined over 1,300 witnesses, and its members have made more than 800 visits to workhouses and meetings of Guardians in the three kingdoms; and after an inquiry extending over three years and two months, at last it agreed to disagree, and in February of this year presented two reports, the majority report signed by fourteen of their number, and a minority report signed by four of the Commissioners.

Parturiunt montes; nascitur

not by any means a 'ridiculus mus,' but a

Monstrum horrendum informe, ingens, cui index ademptum

in the shape of a Blue Book of 1,238 closely printed folio pages, weighing 7½ lb., which is to be followed by forty similar volumes of some 14,000 folio pages, containing the evidence on which the reports are based. One is irresistibly reminded of Macaulay's comments on Nares's *Life of Lord Burleigh*: 'Such a book might, before the Deluge, have been considered as light reading by Hilpa and Shalum; but, unhappily, the life of man is now but three-score years and ten, and we cannot but think it somewhat unfair' of the Commissioners 'to demand from us so large

a proportion of so short an existence.' Nevertheless, a student who will devote to these reports a large proportion of his short existence will be amply rewarded for his pains; in particular, the first chapter in Part VI of the majority report, on 'Social and Industrial Developments since 1834,' is a mine of wealth which cannot be neglected by any one who studies modern economic history.

It is a commonplace with historians and politicians that almost every existing institution is connected with a more or less remote past; and in this twentieth century the administration of the Poor Law is based on a statute of the first year of the seventeenth century. By this Act of Parliament the churchwardens and overseers of every parish were

to raise . . . a convenient stock of flax, hemp, wool, thread, iron, and other ware and stuff, to set the poor on work; and also competent sums of money for and towards the necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old, blind, and such other among them being poor and not able to work.¹

For almost two centuries this parochial system was in full working order; the overseers and some of the leading inhabitants of the parish met in the church after evening prayer on Sundays, and there decided what sums should be raised, who should be relieved, and how the parochial workhouse should be managed. Often they contracted with an individual for the general relief of all the poor in the parish, and sometimes, in the latter years of the eighteenth century, they sent wagon-loads of their pauper children to be bound apprentices in the Lancashire cotton-mills. But under the strain of the Napoleonic wars this system broke down; food rose to unheard-of prices, but wages did not rise in proportion; and the Berkshire magistrates invented a scheme whereby the deficiency in the wages of the agricultural labourer should be supplied out of the poor rates; until within a year or two after Waterloo

¹ 43 Eliz. c. 2.

almost all the agricultural labourers of the country were dependent on the poor rates, which in some places were twenty shillings in the pound. Some idea of the intolerable burden of the poor rates in the early years of the last century can be obtained from a few figures: from £2,000,000 in 1785, the amount expended in Poor Relief grew to double that figure in 1802-3, to £6,356,000 in 1813, and to £7,870,000 in 1818, and even in 1832—seventeen years after Waterloo—it amounted to £7,036,000.

Naturally this intolerable burden attracted the attention of the Reformed Parliament, and in 1832 a Royal Commission was appointed, whose report inspires the strict administrators of to-day. In the first place they laid down the principle that the situation of the able-bodied pauper should 'not be made really or apparently so eligible as that of the independent labourer of the lowest class.'¹ In other words, all relief was to be deterrent, in order to induce people to rely on their own resources, rather than apply to the authorities for relief. To carry out this principle they recommended that, with certain exceptions, 'all relief to able-bodied persons and their families, otherwise than in well-regulated workhouses, shall be declared unlawful and shall cease.'²

But other alterations of the law were recommended: the Commissioners advised the grouping of parishes into unions, on the lines of certain adoptive Acts of the previous century; except in cases of sudden and urgent necessity, the actual granting of relief should be taken out of the hands of the overseers and entrusted to a Board of Guardians elected by the parishes in such a way as to give increased voting power to the richer men in the parish. Instead of the general mixed workhouse, containing all classes of those who were not relieved at their own homes, they advised a sufficient number of institutions to enable the inmates to be properly classified.

Strange to say, however, the Poor Law Amendment

¹ *Report*, p. 74.

² *Ib.*

Act of 1834, which followed upon the presentation of the Report of the Commissioners, enacted as a positive provision one only of these suggested reforms—that by which the administration of relief was entrusted to the Guardians. The chief effect of the statute was to create a body of permanent Commissioners with absolute power of issuing orders for the management of the poor, with the proviso that they could not interfere in any particular case. For the first ten or twelve years of their existence these Commissioners issued orders in bewildering perplexity; the new Unions were created, and it is interesting to note that in a large number of cases the Union boundaries followed the boundaries of the Hundreds, territorial divisions whose boundaries were drawn in the first days of the Saxon Conquest; new workhouses were erected, and regulations issued for their government, and outdoor relief to able-bodied persons was prohibited; but it must be noted that in a very short time the suggestion that separate institutions should be allotted to separate classes of paupers was ignored. The suggestion had been adopted in the rural Union of Westhampnett, near Chichester, of which the Duke of Richmond was chairman.

Certain descriptions of paupers should be sent exclusively to each (i. e. of the old parish workhouses), and it was intended to retain the large workhouse at Westhampnett for the able-bodied alone. . . . The house at Yapton was at first intended solely for the aged, that at Aldingbourne for the children and that at Pagham for the aged and infirm. . . . It was found that four workhouses would be quite unnecessary. . . . There could not be the same diligent supervision of the management of the house, the same attention to the treatment of the inmates, nor the same regularity of accounts, as there might be if the whole establishment were concentrated under one roof.¹

And it would seem that by 1839 the Central Authority had definitely abandoned the principle of classification by institutions.

¹ *Report*, p. 735.

A further principle was deduced from the Report of 1832, that it was the duty of the Guardians to relieve destitution and destitution only. Possibly the Central Authority (the Poor Law Commissioners, the Poor Law Board and the Local Government Board) never laid this principle down in so many words, and it is certain that they never defined destitution; but it was commonly understood that

an applicant must be really destitute of means from his own resources to obtain food, raiment, and shelter, and in need of all these for his immediate necessities, and that unless he is so, the authorities cannot interfere.¹

On this the Minority Report says—

It will be seen that to the Destitution Authority (as they call the Poor Law Authority) it is not the actual mental or physical condition of the patient, but the absence of material resources, that is the governing consideration.

When the law was thus laid down, the Guardians found themselves restricted to giving help to those who were absolutely without resources, and this help was necessarily such that the condition of its recipients should be less eligible than that of the independent labourer of the lowest class. Hence, however much they might desire to give curative treatment, they were powerless to give anything but the veriest minimum.

But as the nineteenth century advanced, the needs of society and the conscience of society advanced likewise; and of late years the tendency has been for the Legislature to entrust to other bodies powers of granting what are in effect other forms of relief; new bodies were created to deal with sanitation and education, and when it was found to be to the advantage of society that those who were suffering from infectious diseases, and could not pay for medical treatment, should be conveyed to public hospitals at the public expense, so as to avoid infection to others, and that it was to the interest of society that the underfed

¹ Mackenzie's *Poor Law Guardian*, *qu. Report*, p. 1018.

children who from weakness could not learn their lessons should be fed at the public expense, powers of granting these forms of relief were conferred on the sanitary and education authorities respectively.

The power of providing material and opportunities for setting the poor to work has never been taken from the Poor Law Authorities, and in the eighteenth and early years of the nineteenth centuries manufactories of sailcloth and coarse linen were carried on in many workhouses; but of late years provision of opportunities for labour by the Poor Law Authorities have been few, except in the large towns, or at times when the population of a whole countryside has been out of work. (It goes without saying that every inmate of a workhouse is set to such work as he is physically fit for.) But such work has disfranchised the worker, in accordance with the principle that the condition of the able-bodied pauper shall be less eligible than that of the independent labourer of the lowest class; and therefore other means have been adopted of providing work for the unemployed. Municipalities, charitable agencies, and distress committees have vied with each other in providing work for the workless, but the majority of the Commissioners agrees with the minority in denouncing such relief works as being economically unsound, and therefore demoralizing to the workers. Men were employed on jobs for which they had no aptitude or training, and, being paid by the hour, received much more than the market value of their labour.

The Borough Surveyor of Blackburn . . . estimated that where an ordinary man would do 5s. worth of work, an 'Unemployed' would only do 1s. worth.

At Liverpool work which cost £2,000 was only estimated as worth £350 to £400.¹

Again, while the certified lunatics are under the control of the Lunacy Committee of the County Council, the feeble-minded and epileptics are in the custody of the

¹ *Report*, p. 381.

Guardians, and are detained in the same workhouse as the sick and aged. Finally, although by their doles of out-relief the Guardians grant what are practically pensions to the aged poor, the Legislature has created a new system of old-age pensions, which are administered by the Revenue Officers and Committees of the County Councils.

As a consequence of this policy of conferring powers of relief on other bodies, there is considerable overlapping; the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing; one child of a family may be in a Poor Law School; a second may have been sent by the magistrates to a reformatory, an institution under the control of the Home Secretary; a third may be living at home, and receiving meals from the Education Authority; a fourth may be a patient at the Fever Hospital of the Sanitary Authority; while the father may be employed on the relief works of the Statutory Distress Committee. And if this overlapping is possible where relief is being given from public sources, much more is it almost unavoidable in a district where there are many endowed charities and charitable agencies. And here attention should be called to Mr. Hancock Nunn's valuable *Memorandum* on the Hampstead Council of Social Welfare, a voluntary Council representing all the Churches (except the Salvation Army), the Friendly Societies, the Trade Societies, the Endowed Charities and the charitable agencies of the borough, by which means of assistance are linked up, and the risk of overlapping is avoided.

On other grounds, the Poor Law Authorities are the objects of much criticism. It is said that they take a narrow view of their duties; but we have seen that this narrowness is the result of the principle adopted by the Central Authority that it is the duty of the Guardians to relieve destitution, and destitution only. And the most bitter critic must admit that as regards the sick and the children most of the Authorities take a very enlightened view of their duties; bed for bed, the Poor Law Infirmarys are not

inferior to the endowed and voluntary hospitals of the country, and it should be remembered that the former provide 100,000 beds, as against the 25,000 beds of the latter.¹ And, in their respective spheres, the careers of the boys sent into the world from the Poor Law Schools compare favourably with the careers of those who have been educated at Eton and Harrow. It is said that they are corrupt, and if West Ham and Poplar are to be taken as typical of the whole country, such an accusation would be well founded; but West Ham and Poplar are two only out of the 643 Poor Law Authorities in England and Wales, and it would be grossly unfair to base a general charge of corruption against the whole body of Guardians on the evidence produced in these two cases. They are charged with extravagance, and instances are produced of workhouses costing £286 and infirmaries costing £415 a bed; but they are also charged with parsimony, because there are Unions which expect old people to keep body and soul together on half-a-crown a week and a loaf. And they are charged with lack of method: no sufficient inquiry into the circumstances is made, scales of relief vary from Union to Union, and often from one meeting to another of the same Board; and while one Board will exact the uttermost farthing from relatives liable to contribute, its neighbour may take no action against any, even a rich son; when out-relief is granted, no conditions are laid down as to the sanitary or moral surroundings of the recipient. And the indictment of methods of out-relief in the Minority Report goes far to substantiate these charges. But it must be remembered that the Central Authority has never laid down a standard of the minimum necessary for existence.

At the same time, the workhouse has ceased to be deterrent in character, and is becoming more attractive; the wards are well lighted and well warmed, the walls are brightly decorated, and the furniture comfortable; games

¹ *Report*, p. 875.

and tobacco are provided for the old people, and the tasks of work are none too hard; and this attractiveness has been increased since Mr. Chaplin issued the new Dietary Tables in the autumn of 1900. Far from the position of the able-bodied inmate of the workhouse and his family being less eligible than that of the independent labourer of the lowest class, the victuals provided for him in the workhouse are far superior to those he could obtain if he retained his independence. Some years ago the present writer prepared a table showing that the cost of the food of an able-bodied man with an able-bodied wife and four children in the Oxford workhouse amounted to 16s. 2d. a week, while, according to recent Government returns, the food of an artisan with a wife and three children averaged 14s. 4½d. a week,¹ and that of an agricultural labourer with a wife and four children averaged 13s. 4½d. a week.² In particular it should be noticed that the pauper's family would receive 40½ pints of milk a week, while the artisan would receive 5½ pints, and the agricultural labourer 4 pints. One result of the greater attractiveness of the workhouse is to be seen in the second diagram in the Majority Report, showing that since 1900 the numbers of persons in receipt of relief has been gradually increasing.

It is not, therefore, surprising to learn that in the interval between the years 1871-2 and 1905-6 the Poor Law expenditure has increased from £8,000,000 to £14,000,000, and the expenditure per pauper from £7 12s. 1d. to £15 12s. 6d., and that the number of paupers has almost doubled; although, on the other hand, the rate of pauperism has diminished from 31·2 per 1,000 of the population in 1871-9 to 22·2 per 1,000 in 1896-1905. And on these figures the majority comment—

It is very unpleasant to record that, notwithstanding our assumed moral and material progress, and notwithstanding the enormous annual expenditure, amounting to

¹ *Blue Book on British and Foreign Trade and Industrial Conditions*, 1905, Cd. 2237.

² *Return on Wages of Agricultural Labourers*, 1905, Cd. 2376.

nearly sixty millions a year, upon poor relief, education, and public health, we still have a vast army of persons quartered upon us unable to support themselves, an army which in numbers has recently shown signs of increase rather than decrease.

Such, then, according to its critics, is the Poor Law of the present day; restricted in application, competing with and overlapping the relief given by other authorities, at the same time deterrent and attractive, extravagant and parsimonious, 'too good for the bad and too bad for the good,' is such a system to be mended or ended?

The majority of the Commissioners, considering that these defects are due to the characters of the administrators, recommend an elaborate scheme of amendment; the minority, considering that the defects are inherent in the system, wish to abolish the Poor Law Authorities, and divide their functions among what we have called the competing authorities.

In several points both reports are agreed; they both recommend that the county or county borough shall be the administrative unit of the future, and that relief shall no longer be administered by Guardians specially elected for the purpose, but by a committee or committees of the county or county borough councils. The majority recommend that a statutory committee of these councils should be created for the purpose of taking over all the functions of the Poor Law Authorities; the minority recommend that these functions should be absorbed by the existing committees of the councils, and that the care of the children should be entrusted to the Education Committee, the sick to the Health Committee, the feeble-minded and epileptics to the Lunacy Committee, and the aged to the Pensions Committee.

The scheme of the majority appears to be based on the system established by Mr. Balfour's Education Act of 1902: the Public Assistance Authority¹ is to be a statutory

¹ Both majority and minority are adepts in the coinage of new terms, forgetting that 'new presbyter is but old priest writ large.'

committee of the county or county borough council, and is to consist, half of persons nominated by the Council, and half of co-opted members who have had experience in Poor Law and other methods of relief; its duties will be the general organization and maintenance of Public Assistance within the county; but this Public Assistance is to be administered by committees acting for the urban or rural districts of the county, and composed of persons nominated by the urban and district councils, and in cases where there is a Voluntary Aid Committee, by that Committee, and at least one-third of these committees should be women.

Side by side of the Public Assistance Authorities and Committees are to be created Voluntary Aid Councils and Committees, on somewhat similar lines to those of the Hampstead Council for Social Welfare, which shall organize all charities and charitable agencies, and shall assist cases which do not appear to be suitable for public assistance, or are referred to them by the Public Assistance Committees. In this way it is thought that overlapping between public assistance and private charity will be avoided; but it is not obvious how the majority propose to prevent overlapping between the Public Assistance Authority and the competing authorities.

As regards methods of relief, the present general mixed workhouse is to be abolished (this recommendation is common to both reports), and separate institutions are to be set up for (1) children, (2) aged and infirm, (3) sick, (4) able-bodied men, (5) able-bodied women, (6) vagrants, and (7) feeble-minded and epileptics. Except in cases of sudden and urgent necessity, out-relief is to be given only after careful inquiry, a counsel of perfection which is now professedly followed by all well-administered Boards of Guardians. The majority further recommend a reform the need of which has been felt at all times by all Boards—the power to remove, under due precautions, to an institution persons in a state of neglect. Then there is a series of recommendations as to medical relief, which is to be

organized on a provident basis by means of a committee appointed by the Public Assistance Committee, the Health Committee of the County Council, and the local branch of the British Medical Association, with power to co-opt members. Every inducement is to be offered to the working classes below a certain wage to become members of a provident dispensary, and such membership shall confer the rights of (1) treatment by a medical man of their own choice, (2) provision of adequate medical attendance at a rate within the reach of the members, and (3) institutional treatment upon a recommendation of the dispensary doctor. The Public Assistance Authority is to have power to pay the dispensary subscriptions of certain classes who cannot afford to pay them. But this scheme is criticized by the minority, who say that the power to choose one's own doctor would lead to preference being given not necessarily to the cleverest, but to the man who was most lavish with medicines and medical comforts.

That this summary of the recommendations of the Majority Report is very slight will be at once admitted by the writer, but the points dealt with are those which appear to be the salient features of their scheme. It would appear that both the majority and the minority have been so appalled by the problems of urban poverty that they have disregarded the question of rural poverty, and have evolved schemes which, while they are possibly applicable to the towns, are not easy of application to the country. The experience of the working of the Education Act of 1902 in the rural districts leads us to believe that the transfer of the administration of Poor Relief from the popularly elected Boards of Guardians to Committees of the County Council will be a step backward. The Guardians are accused of being extravagant, but the Education Committee of the County Council is far more extravagant; all over the kingdom the Education rate is rising fast. It would be ruinous to the ratepayers to require them to erect seven institutions in place of their general workhouse, and if it is suggested that the workhouses of a county might be linked up so that

one workhouse could be utilized for one class, and another for another, we shall have to run counter to the sentiment of the country folk, who will not want to travel ten miles in one direction to see their sick mother, and twenty miles in the other direction to see their feeble-minded son. The main object of the majority report is to secure administrators of a more enlightened type, men who will be guided by neither fear, favour, nor affection; and it may be suggested that if it is necessary to stiffen the backs of the administrators of the Poor Law, this might be done by adding to the present Boards a proportion of members nominated by the County Council. It is the opinion of not a few observers that the administration of the Poor Law has steadily deteriorated since the Local Government Act of 1894, when the property qualification of the elected Guardians was abolished, and the County Justices were evicted from their seats on the Boards.

But the more important recommendations of both reports have been left to the last, the recommendations dealing with able-bodied pauperism: and here, again, we find points of agreement. Both reports recommend the establishment of Labour Exchanges, so that it can be easily ascertained where there is a surplus and where a demand for labour; both recommend that boys should be kept at school till they are fifteen; both recommend that the national and municipal demands for labour should be regularized, and that the municipalities should carry out their improvements in the winter or at seasons when employment was dull; and both recommend Detention Colonies for those who will not work, on the lines of the well-known examples in Belgium and on the Continent. The majority further recommend the teaching of physical drill in schools, and a scheme of insurance against unemployment, possibly on the lines of certain German schemes that they have examined, while the minority make three further suggestions: that no young person under eighteen years of age shall be employed for more than thirty hours a week, and that all so employed shall attend school for thirty hours

a week; that the terms of the Regulation of Railways Act, 1893, should be at once amended so as to enable the Minister of Labour to require the prompt reduction of the hours of labour of railway, tramway and omnibus workers, if not to forty-eight, at all events to sixty hours a week; and further that £40,000,000 should be set aside every ten years for schemes of afforestation, coast protection and land reclamation to be carried out by the Board of Agriculture exclusively in the lean years of the trade cycle by the most suitable labour attainable, taken on in the ordinary way at the rates locally current for such work. They also advise the creation of a new Cabinet Minister in the person of a Minister of Labour, who should control the Labour Exchanges.

The ratepayer, however, searches these 1,238 pages in vain for one item of information which to him is all important: what are these reforms going to cost?

Our summary of the history of the Poor Law during the nineteenth century reminds us forcibly of the history of the municipal corporations during the eighteenth century. For some reason or another, probably owing to the caricatures of the Poor Law drawn by Charles Dickens in *Oliver Twist*, the Poor Law service has been regarded by the 'man in the street' with contempt and distrust; the demagogue at the street corner has always found it easy to raise a cheer by a gibe at the Guardians. And this distrust has penetrated from the street to Parliament, with the result that many forms of relief have been entrusted to other authorities. Similarly, in the eighteenth century, our municipal corporations were justly treated by all outside the select circles with contempt and distrust, for their corruption and malfeasance. And during the eighteenth century, services which should have been performed by these corporations were entrusted to bodies of commissioners elected for these purposes; police, lighting, paving and sanitary services were thus allotted to special bodies. Although the Municipal Reform Act of 1835 did much to rehabilitate municipal corporations in the public esteem, yet it was not

till these special bodies had been abolished and their functions absorbed by the municipal corporations, that the latter were fully restored to public confidence. It would therefore seem that the teaching of history is against the minority scheme: the analogy of the municipal corporations would suggest that instead of the Poor Law being absorbed by the competing authorities in the shape of the various committees of the county and county borough councils, it should absorb them, or rather so much of their functions as overlap the relief administered by the Guardians of the Poor.

Apart from the differences in method recommended by these reports, there appears to be a fundamental difference in principle. The majority seem to believe that of all the virtues that a man can practise the noblest is self-reliance, and that recourse should be made to outside help only when such is absolutely necessary; but the minority report gives one the impression that it is the duty of society to supply all a man's wants, whether these are the result of unavoidable misfortune or of the applicant's laziness and vice.

It is not, however, necessary to wait for legislation before carrying into practice many of the reforms suggested by these reports. Few Guardians who read them but will find some point on which the practice of their Board can be improved; and it may be suggested that no legislation is required for the inception of Voluntary Aid Committees or Councils of Social Welfare, whereby all the charitable organizations of a city or district may be linked up, and opportunities found for that personal service and influence without which money is spent in vain.

A. BALLARD.

CALVINISM AND CRITICISM

Doumergue, *Jean Calvin: Les hommes et les choses de son temps* (only three vols. out of four published; 1899, 1902, 1905. Bridel, Lausanne.)

Irwin, *John Calvin*. (London: R.T.S. 1909.)

Williston Walker, *John Calvin*. (London: Putnam. 1906.)

Kampschulte, *Johann Calvin, seine Kirche und sein Staat in Genf*. (Leipzig; Vol. I, 1869; Vol. II, 1899.)

A. M. Fairbairn, *Calvin*. (Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, 1903.)

Kuyper, *Calvinism*. (Amsterdam: Hoveker and Wormser. 1899.)

THE city of Geneva is to commemorate on July 10 the quatercentenary of its greatest citizen, John Calvin. His star has shone with cold, clear light in the constellation of the world's great masters for four centuries. Is its light waning? Does he represent a dying world in the theological firmament? This question may linger with haunting cadence in the minds of many who loyally join in the notable celebrations now due of the bright rising of Calvin's star in a clouded sky four hundred years ago. None will question, however, the greatness, meet for most distinguished recognition, of the man and his work. No theological thinker has more profoundly influenced his fellows. Owing to the laborious research of Kampschulte, Professor of History at Bonn, and more particularly of Doumergue, Professor of Theology at Montauban, whose three sumptuous volumes, with some eight hundred illustrations, are the latest and greatest authority on Calvin's life and work, we are more closely in touch with the first-hand sources for his history than at any other period.

The forces Calvin quickened mastered Europe and moulded America. His teaching has passed like iron into the blood of the modern nations. Mark Pattison writes, 'In the sixteenth century Calvinism saved Europe.' Speaking of Geneva he adds, 'In that narrow corner was concentrated a force which saved the Reformation.' 'John Calvin,' says Von Ranke, 'was the virtual founder of America.' 'Lacking,' writes Renan, 'that vivid, deep, sympathetic ardour which was one of the secrets of Luther's success, lacking the charm, the peerless languishing tenderness of Francis of Sales, Calvin succeeded in an age and in a country which called for reaction against Christianity, simply because he was the most Christian man of his generation.' Lord Morley writes, 'To omit Calvin from the forces of Western evolution is to read history with one eye shut'; and in the same passage, comparing Calvin with two of the strongest names in the struggle for political liberty in England, Hobbes and Cromwell, he says that, 'in power of giving formal shape to a world, they are hardly more than names writ in water.' Hooker, Anglican as he was, declared that 'Calvin was the wisest man the French Church ever had.' The men who bore his name maintained his fame in history. Bancroft asserts 'the fanatics for Calvinism were fanatics for liberty.' Froude adds his testimony: 'They attracted to their ranks every man in Western Europe who hated a lie. . . . Whatever exists at this moment in England or Scotland of conscientious fear of doing evil is the remnant of the convictions which were branded by the Calvinists into the people's hearts.' This is sufficient eulogy, considering the variety and contrariety of sources from which it comes. But it may be well to glance at several concrete proofs of Calvin's greatness. The 'Aristotle of the Reformation,' he produced before he was twenty-seven the *Institutes*, the most complete system of theology that Christendom had seen, which gave a much-needed coherence and stability to the loose group of doctrines the Reformers had established. 'Calvin was one of the greatest interpreters of Scripture who ever

lived,' simple, severe, scientific, critical, anticipating some of the best principles of modern exegesis; his commentaries will probably outlive his system. He was a master of style, and one of two or three writers who released the French tongue from its commingling Latin, and made it the lucid and graceful speech Pascal and Bossuet used with such skill. M. Brunetière considers the *Institutes* without rival as models of 'vivacity of reasoning,' and 'precision and appropriateness of terms.' As an educationist Calvin established the college which is now the University of Geneva. His ethical austerity, quickened by fervent piety, made him the spiritual director of half Europe, whilst the extraordinary grasp and logical coherence of his thinking so mastered the minds of men that he became the theological dictator of the Reformed Church, a 'pope in Geneva' rivalling the Pope at Rome. He made every man in Geneva sign a confession of faith, leaving him no sanctuary save exile. He faced the logical issue of his scheme of damnation without horror, even as he chose his wife without passion.

It is difficult for a generation like our own, in love with the theory of personal magnetism, to understand how the world came to be shaken by a theologian whose personality was as repellent as his genius was commanding, a man 'who would not suffer us to love him.' Yet the fact remains. He was an autocrat in one of the sturdiest democracies of the period. When reluctantly he became preacher, censor, and master of Geneva, the city was scandalously immoral. Kampschulte, himself an Old Catholic, admits the evil morals of the ecclesiastics. Doumergue has proved from the registers of the Council of Geneva that the priests of the Madeleine kept houses for prostitution, and others frequented houses of ill-fame. Yet of this city Knox wrote, 'In other places I confess Christ to be truly preached; but manners and religion to be so sincerely reformed I have not yet seen in any other place beside.' Michelet says, 'This astonishing asylum between three nations lasted by its moral force. No territory, no

army; nothing for space or time or matter; the city of the mind, built by Stoicism on the rock of predestination. . . . To every people in peril Sparta, instead of an army, sent a Spartan. It was so in Geneva. To England it gave Peter Martyr, to Scotland Knox, to the Netherlands Marnix; three men and three revolutions.'¹

These tributes only tithe the testimony that the history and the heroism of the last four centuries are eager to utter to the greatness of Calvin and Calvinism. And yet Rousseau, not Calvin, is the modern hero of Geneva. The city he redeemed and ruled has forgotten him. He was buried there, but no man knows his grave. The *supposed* spot in the Plain-Palais cemetery is a neglected patch, worn by no pilgrim feet. The house, provided for him by the city, in which he dwelt in his great days, has fared but little better than that in which he sleeps his last sleep. Its site is known, but the house itself has been pulled down, and its successor bears over the doorway the significant inscription, 'Bureau de Salubrité.' Until the present year a tablet in the Cathedral was his only memorial. But if the irony of the suggestion may be forgiven, there is now another memorial. In 1903, on the spot where in 1553 Servetus was burnt by Calvin at Champnel, near Geneva, an expiatory monument was unveiled. It was erected by members of the Reformed Churches throughout Europe and America, 'duteous and grateful followers of Calvin, our great Reformer, yet condemning an error which was that of his age, and strongly attached to liberty of conscience, according to the true principles of the Reformation and of the Gospel, have erected this expiatory monument.' Is this cry 'peccavimus' and its due penance prophetic of recantations the future may witness of the doctrine as well as of the deed of the great Reformer? There is pathos in it, if not prophecy. It recalls certain careful conclusions which sympathetic and scientific historians of Christian doctrine have emphasized in recent works. Professor Fisher, of

¹ *Histoire de France*, X, pp. 483-4.

Yale, writes, 'It is plain to keen observers that, in the later days, both within and without what may be called the pale of Calvinism, there is a certain relaxing of confidence in the previously accepted solutions of some of the gravest theological problems.'¹ And Professor Orr says, 'In a theological respect there is undoubtedly a side of Calvin's system which urgently calls for rectification and supplement; this side (the doctrine of predestination), I think I may safely say, is not a conception in which the Christian mind can permanently rest.'² Further, if I may quote Dr. Fisher again, 'The reduction of the area of Calvinism, and its partial disintegration in communities where it had long been established, is a fact which challenges attention. If we go back to the dawn of the seventeenth century, we find that the Reformed or Calvinistic creed, to say nothing of its prevalence in Bohemia, Hungary, and other regions of less note, was dominant in Switzerland, the Palatinate, Holland, the Protestant Church of France, of Scotland, and in England, where, to the end of the reign of Elizabeth, the theological influence of Calvin was a controlling power.'³ The keenest critics of Calvinism admit that it has been the most dominant creed of Christendom; it created a region of human life entirely its own; strength and progress have marked its presence in national life; it created Scotland and liberated England; it gave an heroic nationality to the Netherlands; it is enshrined in the noble but fateful romance of the Huguenots; it sailed with the Pilgrim Fathers and became the impulse of the marvellous civilization of the Western world. How, then, are we to account for the facts, which friend and foe acknowledge, that the days of its dominance are past; that apology has succeeded prestige; that its creed and discipline have fallen into discredit? Even Hodge, their sturdy champion, prefers 'the term Augustinianism to Calvinism because of

¹ *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 549.

² *Progress of Dogma*, pp. 292, 293.

³ *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 551.

the reproach of Calvinism.' And Froude, their eloquent historical apologist, is compelled to write, 'After being accepted for two centuries in all Protestant countries as the final account of the relations between man and his Maker, it has come to be regarded by liberal thinkers as a system of belief incredible in itself, dishonouring to its object, and as intolerable as it has been in itself intolerant.' Neither theologian nor historian can turn a deaf ear to the chorus of interrogation such a reaction calls forth; for neither of them has completed his task when he has stated with precision his facts. They have a meaning; they must be explained. Calvin and his creed have not been condemned merely by antipathy.

The main purpose of this article is to suggest briefly and tentatively the direction in which we may look for some of the causes which have rendered the Calvinistic system ineffectual in our generation. The one word which gives unity to these causes is Criticism. Used either in its technical or general sense it will be found to combine most of the phenomena manifest in the transition. The Reformation began in the assertion of the right of Criticism. The principle of Solidarity had failed to maintain itself against the claims of the individual; its dominion in Church and State through a thousand years was broken; national ideals rose in opposition to imperial obedience; and as the Holy Roman Empire broke up into independent states, the Roman Church lost its ecclesiastical unity in the schisms of the Protestant communions, and its doctrinal oneness in their formulated Confessions of Faith. The individual was now the recognized unit; the principle of private judgement was triumphant. But the principle that had established the Reformation in the hands of the theologians threatened in the hands of the philosophers to disestablish it. The movement which had been a revolt from dogma reverted to dogma. Confessional creeds were formulated and laid with binding authority upon the individual judgement and conscience. This new constraint, however justifiable by the necessity of conserving the

gains of the Reformation and of giving cohesion to its loose and fragmentary discussions of doctrine, could not continue long without a protest. Criticism awoke to fresh duties and privileges. It asserted the right to apply the principle of private judgement to matters outside the distinctively theological sphere. Philosophy, for instance, which had been content through the mediaeval period to serve as the handmaid of Theology, interpreting and justifying her doctrines to the speculative and practical reason, now claimed her liberty to live her own life and to work in her own sphere. This was done without a suggestion of antagonism to the Church; it simply expressed the joyous release the Renaissance had given to the intellectual faculties. But it was the birth of modern philosophy, and Criticism is the term which best expresses its function and methods. Systems of doctrine, whether political or theological, became the objective of the newly enfranchised thinker. And as Calvinism was the most completely articulated and reasoned system in the theological sphere, and contained specific doctrines suspected of serious limitation for the liberty of human nature, it was the one most likely ultimately to meet with a developed antagonism. Indeed, the Calvinistic system, just because it was a system made to be binding upon the individual, was regarded as a sin against the supreme principle of the Reformation, a reversion to type, which, as private judgement attained its manhood, would be challenged and repudiated.

The course of criticism started by the wider application of 'private judgement' and its issues in the increased emphasis laid upon the human in the relations subsisting between God and man, may possibly be indicated by four familiar terms—Cartesianism, Methodism, Arminianism, Humanitarianism. It will be seen that these are not stated in chronological order; the order mentioned may perhaps better indicate their significance as a criticism of Calvinism. Virtually, though not formally, Cartesianism was the first criticism of Calvinism; and this chiefly, but not entirely, because it first states the philosophical principle which

underlay Arminianism and Methodism, i.e. that supreme regard must be paid to the testimony of consciousness in the interpretation and estimation of all truth. Descartes, a thinker within the pale of the Church, realizing his liberty of private judgement, and following its impulses, entered upon a course of independent speculation upon the sources of reality and authority. He founded a new era by enunciating the principle of philosophic doubt. Universal doubt is a method of demonstration. Everything yields to a process of doubt until we reach in the end that which resists the solvent, the bare reality which it is no longer possible to doubt. The irreducible minimum reached is personal identity, the reality of self—*cogito ergo sum*. That is fundamental; it is experience. Experience, therefore, and not logical deductions from *à priori* positions, is the test of truth. From this basis of unchallengeable certainty in the consciousness of one's own existence the work of reconstruction must begin. Only that which stood the test of rationality could be used in the rearing of the fabric of reality. As Descartes settled in Amsterdam in 1629, his principles rapidly influenced theology. Their merit was that they emphasized the human, the value of the experimental; their peril was that they tended towards scepticism. How Cudworth and Clarke, and their school in England, and Leibnitz in Germany laboured to preserve faith by elaborating a belief in God and His moral government on a rational basis, and how Wolff and his school went further and sought to furnish rational demonstration of specific doctrines, is well known. Thus it became easy for Illuminist or Deist to urge that as religion had now been rationally demonstrated, its establishment as a system of pure Naturalism was a sufficient apologetic and exposition. The effects of these positions in the countries where Calvinism was most influential were different. In Germany Wolffianism held a severe sway until relieved by the more genial and cultured humanism of Lessing and Herder. In France the sentimental naturalism of Rousseau and the sceptical attacks of Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists swept

positive theology and supernaturalism before them. In Holland a rationalized Arminianism easily passed into a chilling Socinianism. With these changes the prestige of Calvinism diminished, and was never fully restored. In England the situation was saved from the complete dominion of Deism by Butler and the apologists, and by Wesley and the Methodists. But neither of these forces redeemed the position for Calvinism. The eighteenth-century historians assure us that the *Institutes* of Calvin depreciated as a standard in proportion to the rise in influence and popularity of Butler's *Analogy*. Butler dealt with probation, but it was the probation of the individual, not the Calvinistic doctrine of the probation of the race. As between the interest of solidarity and individuality, the latter provided issues more immediate and profound, and consequently the living interest of the Calvinistic controversy tended to decline.

Although the exaggeration by Deists of the Cartesian principle of the appeal to consciousness as ultimate in religion profoundly disturbed the conditions of religious thought in the eighteenth century, it was this principle that afforded for Methodism, as emphatically the religion of individual experience, a philosophic continuity with the thought of the age. And it is, we venture to suggest, the reaction against Calvinism produced by the rapid growth and popularity of Methodism which has proved the most potent and persistent criticism of that system amongst the English-speaking peoples. The forces which made Methodism unmade Calvinism; as one waxed in influence the other waned. To trace, therefore, the rise and progress of Methodism is to state the modern periods of decadence in Calvinism.

Whether Wesley was consciously or unconsciously influenced by the Cartesian philosophy is uncertain; but it is certain he felt the authority of its presence in the common current of contemporary thought. It was in the air. To Wesley, as to Descartes, reality was found ultimately in experience. The testimony of the religious conscious-

ness was the credential of truth in the life of the soul.

How Methodism was saved from the development of the Cartesian principle as it passed into the hands of Locke and Hume it would lead us too far afield to discuss. It is sufficient to notice the interesting suggestion that the Cartesian criticism of reality became the starting-point of the Methodist criticism of Calvinism. In applying to spiritual phenomena what philosophy had applied with such different issues to rational processes, Wesley does not appear to have been haunted by any forebodings as to whither the principle with which he was in such eager sympathy might lead, if pursued as a rational method to its logical end. It was not that Wesley's rational method was defective, but man was more than a reasoning creature. There was something within him wiser than his brains. If Wesley, in his appeal, laid stress upon the heart with which man believeth unto righteousness, he did not neglect the appeal to men of reason. The whole of the contents of man's complex personality had a share in the function of providing for authoritative decisions concerning the things of God. With this endowment of capacity for receiving or rejecting the 'things which are freely given to us of God,' man's relation to the redemption by grace was not the obedience of assent, but the obedience of response. The energy of his faith wrought with the grace given him of God, and rendered it efficient for his salvation. Calvinism urged, as Rome had done, the obedience of assent, the sufficiency of submission; Methodism urged the obedience of response, the efficiency of co-operation. The independence of man was not absolute, as the Deist insisted, in exaggeration of the Cartesian principle, neither was his dependence absolute, as the Calvinist declared, in defiance of it. His nothingness in presence of the eternal decrees left the deeper realities and prerogatives of his consciousness unrecognized and unexplained. The Methodist appeal to the value of the individual consciousness and its authority registered in experience was a return to

the root principle of the Reformation which the revived Augustinianism of Calvin had interfered with. And so it came to pass that the criticism of Calvinism by Methodist preachers and writers was not confined to the voluminous and vehement controversial pamphlets of the period. It justified itself in the general emphasis it placed upon the internal and the human in opposition to the demands made by Calvinism for the unconditioned authority of the external and the divine. This became popular and powerful in the Methodist preaching, which called every man to repentance and to participation in the common grace of God; in the doctrine of a universal atonement, and in the election of faith as against the election of an immutable decree. Moreover, the Methodist testimony to conscious salvation, and the gradual growth in influence amongst the evangelical Churches of its doctrine of assurance, steadily weakened the authority of Calvinism, with which a satisfying doctrine of personal assurance was inconsistent. For if salvation was an external process in the divine mind, independent of subjective conditions in the recipient, the certitude that it was his was impossible, apart from a specific personal revelation in external form. No subjective experience in himself could warrant the confidence of present salvation and assure him of his participation in the hope of the life eternal. On the other hand, Wesley clearly taught that no consciousness of salvation could be valid as assurance except for the present moment. Final perseverance, therefore, found no testimony in consciousness, and in consequence the Methodists declared against it. A present faith alone could secure a present salvation. In this way they guarded the persistence of the moral integrity of the believer, and offered a logical criticism against the Calvinistic doctrine of Final Perseverance and its perilous tendencies to Antinomianism. The means, also, of assurance, which was by the direct witness of the Holy Spirit with the spirit of the believer, was in harmony with the work of the selfsame Spirit to whose ministries of grace the whole processes of salvation from first to last were ascribed. His

operations were universal; His will was the salvation of all men, 'chiefly of them that believe.' In the unregenerate He revealed Himself by the strivings and wistful yearnings of prevenient grace; in the regenerate as 'the full assurance of understanding to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, which is Christ,' and as the impartation and seal of the life eternal. This, again, was a further criticism of the objectivity of the Calvinistic decree by the appeal to personal experience, certified not mediately by logical inference, but immediately by the personal witness of the Spirit of God.

As the Methodist criticism of Calvinism by its appeal to the authority of experience found its initiation, however unconsciously to its preachers, in the Cartesian criticism, so it came to find its justification and verification in another system of philosophical criticism—the Kantian. The principles of Locke, carried, in the scepticism of Hume, to their issue in a denial both of objective and subjective reality, demonstrated how unsatisfying was entire dependence upon the rational principle. The inexorable logic upon which Calvinism depended for its strength was seen to be a sharp weapon of the adversary of all reality. To be left to the sheer strength of a syllogism was to be in peril of universal scepticism. A system like Calvinism, which gave infallible authority to the rational principle, apart from the fuller contents of consciousness, whether it was applied to God or man, came perilously near the subtle nescience in theology which was now profoundly afflicting philosophy. This paralysis of reason as the instrument for the discovery of certainty awoke Kant from his 'dogmatic slumber,' and ultimately opened the way to a renewed criticism of Calvinism as a purely objective system. The epoch-making *Critique of Pure Reason* effected the transition to the modern era in theology, in which Calvinism, as an articulated system, has slowly lost its hold upon the intellect and conscience of the age. Under Kant's attack the defences of dogmatic rationalism fell. Pure reason could not know reality.

Though it seemed at first fatal to theological certitude, Kant's *Critique* was the philosophic sign that spiritual religion was re-born. The religion of experience was on the rock; the system of external decrees authorized only by deductive processes was on the sand. For Kant provided proof of the unreality of the processes which sought objective certainty, and showed with pitiless severity the deceptive security of the Wolffian method of reaching truth by clear ideas alone. But his doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, the impossibility of our knowing anything of being in itself, established in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, was supplemented by the proclamation in the *Critique of Practical Reason* of the autonomy and absoluteness of the moral consciousness. This was one of the signs that the spirit of man was in process of awakening to personal responsibility and authority in ethical and spiritual life. The certainty that the good is completely independent of all theories of the good—the force within of a 'categorical imperative'—was the enfranchisement of moral manhood. The superficial dogmatism of older schools in philosophy and theology was dispossessed, and the human spirit driven back upon itself in search of a new principle of knowledge. Experience was the test of reality. The depreciation of the value of theoretic reason was met by emphasis on the moral nature of man which Calvinism had distrusted and disinherited. The testimony of the Practical Reason to God, Freedom, Immortality is the vital element in modern thought on religion and ethics which has quickened the pulses of theological speculation during the last century, and aroused its energies as a criticism of Calvinism. Such criticism, of course, by the Kantian principle is indirect. Kant's attitude to all religion of revelation was that of a pure rationalist. Religious doctrines as such were not in his system. But his uplifting of the august authority of the moral consciousness has enriched and ennobled all subsequent theological expression. From this enrichment Calvinism, as a distinctive system, has been self-excluded; it had no need of such authority; it was built on other

foundations; it conceived the emphasis upon the human to be a reflection on the sufficiency of the divine.

We cannot refer here to the brilliant succession of the Hegelian teachers who have developed Kant's severely critical doctrine under idealistic influences, nor to the rich humanism of Goethe and his friends. All of them present their own phase of the ageless problem of reality with which the modern theologian must reckon. They have not made it easier, however, but harder, for Calvinism to adjust itself to dominant movements. It would be easy also to suggest how the newer Psychology, deeply founded in the appeal to experience as ultimate, has strengthened the criticism of Calvinism as a system of objective doctrine. Although in the hands of some eminent exponents the new science has reinforced the Calvinistic principle of determinism, yet its absolute dependence on human consciousness as the sphere of all its investigations and the source of their authority discounts the sufficiency of the external decrees. The doctrine of the sub-conscious self, which is now a well-accredited psychological reality, and its implications in the psychology of conversion and other spiritual processes, is unfriendly to the Calvinistic exposition of these phenomena. The claim of Professor James that 'apart from all religious considerations there is actually and literally more life in our total soul than we are at any time aware of,' again enlarges the sphere of the authority of the human and strengthens the mystical element in religion which has always been, personally and historically, a criticism of the sharp and hard definitions of Calvinism.

Neither the subjective philosophy nor the Methodist experience, however, provided the formal criticism of Calvinism, though their indirect criticism, we believe, largely accounts for its increasing impotence. The more formal and systematic criticism of Calvinism is associated historically with Arminianism, which was a theological and ecclesiastical revolt against its specific doctrines. Arminius and his followers regarded Calvinism as open to attack on

two sides—the side of God and the side of man. They considered the Calvinistic treatment of these fundamental realities to be disproportioned and ethically unfair. Their criticism was urged as much in the interests of man and of morality as of theology. Indeed, Arminianism was at the bottom an attempt to formulate a protest against Calvinism from a distinctly ethical standpoint. It renewed the sense of reality, which Calvinism had gravely depreciated, to human responsibility, and pleaded that the conditions of reward and penalty must be essentially moral. More definitely its criticism centred about the familiar five points. Arminianism insisted on the ethical incompleteness of the Calvinistic view that predestination was absolute and unconditioned. The divine will is supreme, but its supremacy is moral. The essential difference between the elect and the reprobate was moral. The decree to salvation was conditioned by the foresight of faith; the decree to reprobation by specific demerit in the reprobate. The limited atonement was met by the position that redemption was accomplished for all, but made efficient by faith. The total depravity of human nature in the Calvinistic system, involving bondage of will, and inability for any spiritual good, was challenged by the Arminian criticism that depravity was a bias which left the will free and man responsible for his own destiny. Against the Calvinist's view of irresistible grace, the Arminian urged that the divine action was mediate through the truth, and therefore moral and persuasive, as distinguished from physical and necessitating. In general, the constant and consistent note of the Arminian criticism was conditionalism. A mediating system throughout, it provided a philosophical *via media* between naturalism and fatalism. Absolutism in any form is its persistent opposite. It was firmly based upon two positions—the dominant demand for equity in the divine procedure on the one hand, and upon such a reference to the constitution of man's nature as will harmonize with the obvious facts of his history and experience on the other. It opposed a

system ethical and human throughout to the Calvinistic conception of justice which was based solely on the supremacy of the rights of God. Over against these Arminianism set the rights of man as essential to perfect justice. Moral principles condition consistently the manward activities of the divine will and set human limits to the divine action. The moment the idea of equity is admitted to a place in the consideration of the relations of man and God the old absolute unconditionalism of Calvinism becomes untenable. If justice reigns and its principles are common to God and man, the condemnation of man for a sin that was committed without his personal knowledge or responsibility, and a salvation which had no regard for the personal will or choice of the recipient, were alike intolerable. Man was not a mechanism involved in the impersonal and unmotivated motion of non-moral creatures. His destiny could not, therefore, be deduced by logical processes from the premiss that God is the sovereign will, which can do as it pleases; for He has chosen to create man free and responsible, and His attitude towards him will consequently be conditioned by the nature He has made. If this be moral, man will not be dealt with as if it were merely physical. Arminianism, however, as a system separable from Calvinism and in antagonism to it either theologically or ecclesiastically, does not definitely account for the decay of Calvinism; its reign was too brief. But as a vitalizing and genial influence suffusing itself through all the discussions of the relation of God to man, its disintegrating force upon its rival system has been very great. It has led especially to the gradual softening of the harsher forms of theological definition which is now manifest in the deeply humanitarian spirit characteristic of our day, and which is itself probably the most potent criticism Calvinism has to encounter in the modern mind.

We have only space left for the briefest review of the elements in the group of critical solvents at present being applied to Calvinism, which may be roughly classed as Humanitarianism. It would be interesting to suggest the

philosophical lineage of these influences in the teaching of Schleiermacher, the prince of modern theologians, and their expression in the value-judgements of Ritschl, which mark afresh the measure and authority of the contents of the spiritual consciousness. Although Schleiermacher has close affinities with Calvinism in his doctrine of absolute dependence, and hesitates to sanction the personality of God, his method of resolving religious conceptions ultimately into feeling is one of the springs of the humanitarian spirit, which has led to the release of theological thought from the colder intellectualism of the Kantian doctrine. The subordination of knowledge and will to feeling provides a starting-point for the interpretation of the divine in terms of love, which has now become a dominant theological method. The humanity of God has become an exalted element in the standard of judgement applied to the divine activity; and the interpretation of God in terms of human personality is ultimately incompatible with the Calvinistic claims. The modern teaching on the Fatherhood of God is itself a criticism of Calvinism, which means more than it is possible to state. This criticism of Calvinism—the conception that God is not primarily will, but love, is directed not so much against the Sovereignty of God—that surely stands, and must always stand. It applies itself most truly to the sphere in which the Sovereignty is exercised. The error it exposes is the profoundly significant mistake of restricting sovereignty to will, and of subordinating love to sovereignty of will instead of recognizing the supreme lordship of the Eternal Love. It is the idea of God behind the idea of predestination that gives vehemence to the critical objection to the doctrine. Love must be enthroned, and whether the sphere be creation, providence, or grace, will is regulated by love. The fact also that through the historical and scientific spirit of modern times theology has become Christo-centric is also a criticism of the Calvinistic position. Instead of beginning with a conception of God which is abstract and metaphysical and coming down to Christ, the tendency is to begin with

the earthly manifestation of Christ, and to work up through Him to a conception of God. This gives the idea of the divine a content incompatible with the Author of the absolute decrees.

The strength of the Calvinistic doctrine of God has been the exaggeration of the divine transcendence. The modern emphasis upon the complementary truth of the immanence of the divine cannot leave the Calvinistic apologetic where it stood. Its doctrine of God always determines the character of a theology. To reduce the harshness of the antithesis between the natural and the supernatural, to see God in the processes of nature, thought, and history, while yet infinitely transcending them, is to find a point of view from which the relations of God and man are seen in more perfect unity. This must always challenge the Calvinistic conception of the opposition between the divine and human, nature and grace, evolution and creation, miracle and causation, revelation and psychological processes.

A similar line of criticism is started by the exalted views of human nature which prevail in modern thought as a reaction from the opposite extreme of depreciation characteristic of Calvinism. One of the most interesting results of the criticism of Calvinism by the Arminian controversialists was that it awakened the marvellously acute mind of Jonathan Edwards in defence of the Calvinistic position. In no generation had Calvinism an apologist with such matchless intellectual gifts. Yet the ultimate results of the controversy were disappointing to Calvinistic theologians. The New England theology since Edwards' day has revealed a persistent modification of the Calvinistic position and a gradual reduction of the area of its authority. More important still, the influential school of critics of Calvinism represented by Channing, Emerson, Bushnell and other teachers on the farther side of the Atlantic, and on this side by the names of Maurice, Erskine of Linlathen, McLeod Campbell and the leaders of the earlier and later Broad Church schools of English

Theology, was called into activity. The field of their criticism was chiefly anthropological. Their task was comparatively easy; for the weakness of Calvinism most readily exposed to the scientific appeal to facts was its doctrine of human nature. They had simply to set man in his greatness against the Calvinistic view of man in his baseness. Their weapons were light, but used with grace and skill. The unspeakable dignity of man, his place in evolutionary processes, his infinite possibilities, the belief that in every human being lay germs of unbounded progress—these and other similar expressions of generous optimism were the contents of the quiver emptied in the attack. Such utterances set in sympathy with glowing ideals of man as he might be, taught with literary charm and touched with aesthetic culture, have done more to discredit Calvinism with our own generation than the profound arguments of many philosophies. Accompanied by a chivalrous temper, an active philanthropy, an enthusiasm for humanity, a passion for freedom, they constitute for the average man an indictment of Calvinism which, in a hedonistic age, with a prejudice against Puritanism and a shrinking from the name and nature of discipline, cannot fail to secure a verdict. It is obvious that the effectiveness of criticism of this order lies in instinctive and intuitive objection—another illustration of the emphasis upon the human which lay at the root of more reasoned criticism.

Here it might not be out of place to refer to a criticism more seriously urged on behalf of the accepted principles of modern Ethics. It is maintained that the Calvinistic Ethics are based upon outward authority which vitiates their true ethical quality. Calvin deliberately subjected Ethics to Dogmatics. From the Protestant point of view this was fundamentally reactionary; it was scholastic in method and aim. The only ethics consistent with the essential Protestant principle must be based upon inward compulsion, not upon outward authority. External authority can only issue in casuistry. The ethics of

Ignatius Loyola, who appears to have been a fellow student of Calvin at Paris, as well as those of Aquinas, expound a closed system given in the teachings of the Church; the ethics of Calvinism expound a closed system given in a written word. Both ignore the ultimate appeal to the authority of human personality. For a true ethical development there is, therefore, no more room in logical Calvinism than in logical Romanism. Ethically, Calvinism and Jesuitism have a common foundation in that they depend upon external standards and sanctions. Although, therefore, Calvinism has produced types of sacrificial devotion to right conduct which have frequently touched a lofty heroism, yet, as a system, its influence in the philosophical reconstruction of modern Ethics has been reactionary.

The trend of the higher philosophy and of the humanitarian tendencies in laying stress on the dignity of man as a rational self-conscious spirit has criticized the tendency of Calvinism to remove God and man too far apart. On the other hand, the scientific doctrine of Evolution, in seeking the origin of man in lower forms, and regarding him in primitive equipment as but one degree removed in mental and moral possessions from the sub-human species, presents a serious criticism of the Calvinistic doctrine of man and its consequent view of the meaning of sin and redemption. The modern interpretation of the early narratives of Genesis and of the theological doctrines of the Fall, of inherited depravity and of the place of death in man's original constitution, stand in antagonism to the doctrinal statements on these topics which are of the essence of Calvinism. If man is not a fallen being, but in process of ascent, the idea of sin as something abnormal, perverted, voluntary in man's development stands condemned, and the necessity and significance of atonement are changed. But as Calvinism only shares, though perhaps in a greater degree, a criticism common to all evangelical theology in this particular, it cannot be urged as a specific cause of its decline. A similar remark will apply to the modern modification of the forensic idea of the atonement

and to the effort to interpret it in terms of love rather than of law.

There is, however, one phase of modern anthropological interest from which we venture to think Calvinism has found a distinct check. The growing authority of the science of Comparative Religion presses more hardly upon the peculiar principles of Calvinism than upon those of its opposing theological systems. The widened outlook of our age upon the world, its larger conceptions of the divine love, its closer and more sympathetic knowledge of primitive and pagan peoples, have furnished grounds for strong criticism of the Calvinistic views of depravity and reprobation which now seems irresistible. Seekers after God rise from the mists of distance in time and space to protest against the adequacy of the views of sin and grace, of atonement and destiny which have specially marked the Calvinistic teaching. We are disposed also to think that the implications of the modern foreign missionary ideal are a criticism of Calvinism. This movement embodies the humanitarian spirit. It is only where the conviction works that the atonement is universal and the salvation of the whole race possible, that the deep note of urgency is added to the obligation for the expansion of Christianity which creates missionary enthusiasm and sacrifice. Certainly the historical fact is obvious, that it was only in the era that definitely marked the beginning of the decline of Calvinistic influence in this country and America that the founding of the great modern missionary societies took place. But whether this starting-point most truly suggests the decline of the era of Rationalism, or the effect of the criticism of Calvinism, it would not be easy to determine.

The final suggestion we wish to make as to the causes of the decline of Calvinism has reference to the criticism from the eschatological standpoint of the modern mind. No epoch in the development and history of doctrine has been devoted to Eschatology. This appears to have been reserved as the characteristic theological task of our own

age. It has special interest for any survey of causes leading to the decadence of Calvinism. Because it is not the doctrine of Predestination, *per se*, in which Calvinism, as in a teleological network, has enclosed the realms of nature and providence, which excites the strongest repugnance. For Determinism in philosophy and Selection in biological science are still acceptable and popular equivalents for Election in the realm of grace. It is against the Calvinistic eschatology that the revolt is most widespread. Below the surface this is the root objection. It cannot be denied that to a multitude of minds this element in the system wears an aspect of cruelty. It is more than an anachronism; it is felt as an ethical injustice in the drama of human life and destiny. Dr. Orr admits it: 'Very awful were the liberties which the holiest of men permitted themselves in picturing the irreversible condition and terrible torments of the lost. There is hardly anything in literature more appalling, for example, than the sermon of Jonathan Edwards on this subject. So with Boston and other divines. All this of necessity provoked a reaction.'¹ Every source and stage of the criticism of Calvinism has protested against it. The stronger ethical sense of the nineteenth century has penetrated this protest with passion. The general enlargement of knowledge, closer and more reverent acquaintance with other religions and civilizations, sympathetic reflection on the state of the unevangelized millions, the complexity of the problem of heredity, the effect of psychological analysis on the signification of responsibility, the sharp unscientific divisions of moral character, and the painful dogmatism on the issues of judgement have stimulated a wise misgiving. The eternal love of God, its sovereignty in grace and its expression in Fatherhood, have issued in a large number of theories of a revised eschatology whose common centre of unity, amidst many and deep divergencies, is their intense criticism of the eschatology of the Calvinistic system.

¹ *Progress of Dogma*, p. 347.

It approaches presumption to suggest in a few lines what is left after the reaction and criticism of some three centuries have done their work on the marvellous creation of Calvin's genius. Much in his system was, of course, Oecumenical, much also was Reformational. These more catholic elements have either stood the test of criticism or simply shared its effects exhibited in changes made in other confessionals. It is the distinctive elements of Calvinism which have suffered. The system as a system is gone; the mastery of its completeness, 'fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth,' is broken. Perhaps the perfect articulation of its system has proved its undoing. Systems have fallen on evil days. Our age cannot make them; it suffices to criticize them. Systematization has yielded to specialization. *Divide et impera* is the master method. Creeds were the possessions of the Churches; they are now their heirlooms. To be more specific, criticism, in breaking down the system of Calvinism, has taken away chiefly the deductions of its rigid logic, which stood in obvious antagonism to the facts of human consciousness and man's interpretation of God in terms of his own personality. Absolutism is gone; the decrees are gone; the ethical anomalies and the false perspective of the relations of God and man are gone. These are claimed by the critics. But all is not gone. The glory of Calvinism remains. The Sovereignty of God lasts. No longer interpreted in terms of righteousness and glory, but in terms of love and grace, it remains to mark the emphasis a master mind placed upon its supremacy. For, delivered from the trammels of its formal logic, the master spirit of Calvinism is—*Deo soli gloria*—God first and God last.

FREDERIC PLATT.

THE PORT OF LONDON AND THE CONSERVANCY OF THE THAMES

An Act to Provide for the Improvement and Better Administration of the Port of London, and for Purposes Incidental thereto. December 21, 1908.

Reports of Committees on the Port of London, 1793-1802.
[*Reports of the House of Commons, Vol. XIV.*]

The Report of the Royal Commission on the Port of London, 1902.

'*Carest thou Not?*' By C. J. O. Sanders. (London : Robert Culley.)

THE Port of London Act, which is primarily based on the Report, issued in 1902, of a Royal Commission appointed by the late Government to inquire into the subject two years previously, may be regarded as one of the most important of the sixty-nine statutes added to the roll during 1908. Owing in a great measure to the initiative of Mr. Lloyd George, it has provided a final settlement for a question the complex character of which is evidenced by the facts, that, of the *six* different Bills relating to it submitted to Parliament during the last eight years, *three* were respectively introduced by the late Government, the Thames Conservators, and the London County Council, and the other three by the London and India Dock Company ;¹ and also that, within three months

¹ The first of these three Bills, taking power to tax barges in their docks and goods in these barges, was introduced in 1900 prior to the amalgamation of the London and the India Dock Companies, by a joint committee of the two; and the other two after their amalgamation, which took place in the same year, in 1904 and in 1907. The Bill of the late Government was introduced in 1903 after the report of the Commission, and those of the Thames Conservators and the London County Council both in 1905. See *Memorandum in reference to the Port of London Bill*, April 1, 1908.

before the passing of the Act, expression was given, in a series of able articles by 'An Expert' in the *Daily Telegraph*, to the dissatisfaction of a section of the riverside manufacturers and shortsea traders with some of its provisions. It has, moreover, effected this settlement by transferring to a public authority, constituted on the same principles as the Metropolitan Water Board and the Thames Conservancy, not only the regulation of the tidal portion of the waterway hitherto vested in the latter body, but also the property and control of the various docks hitherto managed by private enterprise, and it has thus, for the fourth time, made a fundamental change in the system of conservancy by which the Thames is governed.

As it was in no sense a party measure, the Act, however, despite its importance, did not produce the notice and discussion usually evoked in the press by legislation of a more controversial character; and, as the subject with which it deals is chiefly associated in the minds of landmen with the examination of luggage and the payment of customs dues, it may at first sight seem to be too technical and prosaic to be worth the attention of those who are not personally interested in it. When considered, however, in connexion with its various incidents and the mode in which it has arisen, a port—which, legally speaking, is 'a harbour for the safe riding of ships . . . where customs officers are established . . . and comprehends a city or borough called *caput portus*, with a market and accommodation for sailors'—has both a national and an historical interest proportionate to its antiquity, and this is notably the case with the Port of London. Since the days when Roman merchants joined with the natives in the worship of Lud, the British 'god of commerce,' it has been 'a harbour for the safe riding of ships,' and until the Conquest the chief magistrate of London, the *Portreeve*, derived his title from it. The development of its trade, which led to the creation of its Customs House and markets, has made it not only the chief port in the kingdom, but one of the most important in the world; and in

1899 the actual tonnage of its shipping was nearly double that of Hamburg, the biggest continental port, and more than double that of the principal ports in France, Holland, Italy, and Austria,¹ while no less than 33·8 of the total imports and 26·7 of the total exports of the United Kingdom were dispatched to or from its wharves and quays.² Its *caput portus*, the metropolis, has, as is pointed out in the Report of the Royal Commission of 1902, attained the position of the central city of the British Empire largely owing to the fact that the Port is traversed by the Thames—'a long and sheltered tidal river conveniently situated for trading with the various coasts of the country, with the Continent, and with other parts of the world,'³—which is itself equally connected with our national history.

That river, with the Ouse and the Trent, was one of the chief boundaries between the Danish and English kingdoms of Guthrum and of Alfred—in whose reign Cricklade, the first considerable town on the river, was founded, and it has often imposed a barrier between contending armies in our internal wars. Of the towns on its banks, Cricklade, Lechlade (which figures in Domesday), Wallingford (represented in Parliament till the Reform Bill), Reading, and Maidenhead were all centres of the cloth manufacture, which until the seventeenth century remained one of the most important of English industries. Prior to the dissolution of the monasteries, Dorchester—a Saxon episcopal see in the seventh century—Godstow, Abingdon, Streatley, Reading, Medmenham, Hurley, Bisham, Chertsey, West Sheen and Isleworth were all the seats of abbeys. Oxford, the oldest University town in England, became the Royalist capital during the Civil War; and there were palaces at Windsor—a Royal residence since the Conquest—and at Hampton Court; perhaps at Kingston, where several Saxon kings were crowned; at Richmond, then called Sheen; and at Kew,

¹ *Report Royal Commission on the Port of London, 1902*, pp. 18, 19.
Ibid., p. 20.

² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Whitehall, Westminster, and Greenwich. In the capital and its suburbs the shores of the Thames—which, as is shown by the records of the Tower and of London Bridge, formed the chief natural defence of the city—were studded with the houses of the great nobles and gentry, whose state barges joined with those of the sovereign and the 'tilt boats' and 'wherries' of less wealthy folk in many a stately water pageant during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and until the early part of the nineteenth it remained 'the silent highway of London.'

Apart from historical associations of this description, however, the Thames, like all the larger English rivers, had a practical value for our ancestors which it is hard for us in the present day to realize. It supplied them with water not only for domestic, but also for industrial purposes, until the invention of steam rendered its picturesque water mills useless. Its fisheries—five several fisheries in Middlesex, which have long since become public, are mentioned in Domesday Book—furnished what was, until the Reformation, one of the staple foods of the population. As late as 1819 over forty different varieties of river and sea fish, including salmon, trout, sturgeon and turbot, were caught in the tidal portion of the river, but within another thirty years more than half of these had been driven away by the gasworks and the steamboats, and the conservancy of fishery is now maintained solely for purposes of sport.¹ Its importance as regards navigation in 1746 is illustrated by a table in Griffiths' *Conservancy of the Thames*, published in that year,² which shows that passengers and goods were dispatched by boat from the London quays to various places in *twenty-seven* different English counties, of which four were the maritime ones of Northumberland, Cornwall, Cheshire, and Norfolk, and four the inland ones of

¹ See Cooke's *Topographical and Statistical Description of Middlesex* (1819), p. 39; and Hoffman's *British Angling Manual*, New Ed. (1848), p. 237; and cf. Griffiths' *Conservancy of the Thames*.

² pp. 264, 265.

Notts, Oxford, Leicester, and Cambridge. After the inauguration of the canal era—which had by 1810 connected it with seven other rivers, and with the Kennet and Avon Navigation, and the Wilts and Berks, Thames and Severn, Grand Junction, Grand Surrey, Limehouse and Thames and Medway canals—the Thames became one of the chief bases of our inland navigation system.¹ Railway competition and the abolition of horse haulage have, however, now reduced the barge traffic to insignificant dimensions² and converted the towing-paths into public promenades, and the navigation of the upper river is chiefly maintained for the pleasure traffic, which has correspondingly increased during the last forty years. On the other hand, though the Thames now no longer supplies us with water power, and the portion of it between Oxford and London Bridge has, as regards the conservancy both of fishery and of navigation, become largely a public recreation ground, its value as a source of water supply for domestic purposes has enormously increased, since it was first tested with respect to London under an agreement made by Peter Morrice with the Corporation for the supply of certain districts by means of a water-wheel erected under the central arch of London Bridge.³ The total amount authorized to be daily abstracted from the river for the joint supply of the Metropolitan Water Board—which draws 123,025,136 gallons for the use of the six and a half million inhabitants of London—the South-west Suburban, the West Surrey, and the Woking Water Companies, and the Corporations of Windsor and Oxford is 228,500,000 gallons, or rather over

¹ Cf. *Useful and Current Accounts of the Rivers West of London*, by Zachariah Allnutt (1810), pp. 3-4.

² *The Board of Trade Returns*, 1898 (the last issued !), give the traffic on the Thames as over 500,000 tons.

³ Morrice was a Dutchman in the service of Sir Christopher Hatton. The Water Works, afterwards acquired in 1808 by the East London Company, were erected at Shadwell and East Ham in 1669 and 1747. The Chelsea Company was incorporated in 1723, the Lambeth in 1785, the Grand Junction in 1798, and the Southwark and Vauxhall, the West Middlesex, and the Kent Companies in 1805, 1806, and 1809 respectively.

one-fourth of the average daily flow of 1,034,000,000 gallons at Teddington Weir in 1905-6.¹ As this demand upon the river must necessarily increase with the growth of population, and thus tend to diminish the amount available for purposes of navigation and fishery, it is evident, having regard to the necessity of providing an adequate supply for the Port of London, that the changed conditions of to-day have in no way diminished the importance of regulating and maintaining its flow and volume. It may therefore be of interest, after briefly tracing the gradual development of the Conservancy of the Thames, to examine the modifications effected in it by the new system introduced by the Port of London Act, 1908.

With the exception of some fourteen miles between Oxford and Bercott, which were not made navigable until 1624 under 21 Jas. I, c. 32, it appears from the preamble of that Act that the Thames must probably always have been navigable from Cricklade in Wilts to Oxford and from Bercott to the sea, and some incidental evidence on the point is furnished by the details given in Professor Thorold Rogers' *History of Agriculture and Prices* with respect to the cost of water carriage for wheat, oats and herrings between London and places in Oxfordshire, Surrey, Kent and Herts in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.² The inscription, 'God preserve the City of London, A.D. 1280,' upon the Mark Stone in the meadows near Staines seems to show that the Corporation must, during the thirteenth century, have been invested with the jurisdiction, which Lord Hale says was inherent in the Crown, of 'reforming and punishing nuisances' in all navigable rivers, 'whether fresh or salt,' with respect to the river up to Staines, and the conservancy of the fishery of this part of the Thames, together with that of the Medway, was also vested in it by Richard II in 1393. That these powers of the City were, however,

¹ *Report Metropolitan Water Board*, 1906, pp. 58, 68, 82, 84, and cf. *Reports*, 1907.

² Vol. I, p. 663.

inadequate seems evident from the first two Acts¹—both passed in 1423—in which the name of the Thames appears, which respectively empower justices to remove weirs and other fixed engines in Surrey, Kent, and Essex 'without the liberties of the City,' and prohibit the practice of fastening nets to weirs, poles, boats and anchors as being obstructive to navigation and injurious to fishery. Nearly two centuries later we find the Lord Mayor described in Letters Patent of James I, issued in 1605, as 'having time out of mind had and exercised the office of Baliff and Conservator of the waters of Thames' from Staines Bridge to 'a certain place called Kendall . . . otherwise Yentlett towards the sea . . . and in the Port of the City of London'; and Stow records a formal statement of the rights of the City to the conservancy as being made by the Common Sergeant to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen in July 1616, at a session for the conservancy of the river.² Though, however, this peculiar jurisdiction of the City seems to have been unquestioned, the point whether it vested in the Corporation the soil of the bed and banks was in subsequent reigns frequently disputed by the Crown until 1858, when, after a Chancery suit lasting twelve years, the ownership, after being formally vested in the Crown, was by Thames Conservancy Act of that year transferred to the Conservators.

The conservancy of the river above Staines may be said to have begun with the completion of the navigation of the Thames between Bercott and Oxford under the Act of 1624, above mentioned, which, like many others of its class in the seventeenth century, originated in the decay of highways and was passed to provide for 'the conveyance of Oxford freestone by water to London, and coals and other necessities to Oxford now carried at a dear rate by road only.' By placing London in direct water communication with several inland counties the Act

¹ 2 Hen. VI, cc. 9 and 15.

² Griffiths' *Conservancy of the Thames*, p. 107; Stow's *Survey* (Ed. 1729), Vols. I-IV, and p. 34.

produced a great increase in trade, which led to the passing of a series of others, by the two most important of which, in 1756 and 1771, the conservancy of the upper river was vested in commissioners empowered to prevent 'exactions and extortions and to purchase land for constructing works and towing-paths, and to make further regulations with respect to traffic.' As modified by the latter Act the Commission comprised not only the members of Parliament representing all the counties on the river, the incumbents of all the riparian parishes, the mayors and recorders of all the chief riparian towns on the Thames and Wey, and the chief dignitaries of Oxford and of the deaneries of Windsor, Westminster and St. Paul's, but also 'all persons possessed of a leasehold or freehold estate of £100 per annum within the counties of Wilts, Gloucester, Oxon, Berks, Bucks, Surrey, and Middlesex'!!! The bulk of this unwieldy body appears, however, to have been reduced by subsequent legislation, and, thanks largely to the skill of the two eminent engineers entrusted with the task—Mr. Jessop and Mr. Milne—twenty-four pound locks and other improvements had, by the close of the eighteenth century, been erected on the river between Lechlade and Staines, a distance of over a hundred miles, at a cost of £60,000, supplemented by the surplus of the tolls. In addition to this, various abuses in the conservancy were redressed with respect to the enforcement of private rights incident to mills and fishing weirs, and to the delays caused and the exorbitant tolls charged by the fishermen and millers who at first managed the locks.

The success of these improvements in the conservancy of the upper Thames led 'the Bargemasters and Navigators and other persons . . . interested in the improvement of the Thames Navigation' to petition the City of London on December 6, 1804, for their adoption for 'the river westward of London Bridge within the Liberties of the City of London.' Though the Corporation had about thirty years previously obtained statutory powers for dealing with it, the navigation of this portion of the river—

especially between Staines and Richmond—was still seriously defective, as the 'jetties' or 'weir hedges,' which had been erected in lieu of weirs across the river not only proved inadequate for their object, but also caused dangerous currents at high and a shortage of water at low water. They were therefore ready to agree to the request of their petitioners, and, on the recommendations of Mr. Zackary Allnutt—solicitor to the latter and superintendent of a portion of the upper river—they obtained further powers under an Act of 1810, which enabled them to expend some £20,000 on the erection of locks at Penton Hook, Laleham, Shepperton and Teddington, the last named of which, since twice rebuilt, was completed in 1811. This portion of the river, popularly termed 'above bridge,' was always treated by the City as entirely distinct from that 'below bridge,' which had from time immemorial constituted the Port of London, and the growth of trade at the close of the eighteenth century had led to the initiation of reforms in the conservancy of the latter about ten years before those just mentioned with respect to the former were carried out.

At this time the only wet dock in the Port of London was one upon a site now included in the Surrey Commercial Docks, and ships were loaded and delivered in the river at a score or so of 'legal quays' and about half that number of 'sufferance wharfs,' the use of which was authorized only by special permit. As in time these quays and wharfs—the bulk of which appear to have come into existence in Queen Elizabeth's reign and the remainder in that of Charles II—became insufficient for the purpose, goods had to be discharged into lighters, in which they often remained for weeks at a time awaiting delivery at the quays, and exposed to the depredations of gangs of river thieves.¹ During the century imports had risen from £4,875,538 in 1700 to £14,863,238 in 1794, and exports

¹ *Report Royal Commission Port of London*, p. 63. Cf. Griffiths' *Conservancy*, p. 266, for a list of wharfs and quays in 1746, and also Stow (ed. cit. sup.) Bk. V, p. 281.

from £5,387,767 in the former to £16,578,802 in the latter year; and the presentation by the West India Merchants to Parliament of a petition complaining of the inadequate accommodation in wharves and docks to meet the great increase of commerce,¹ led to the appointment of no less than four committees of the House of Commons between 1796 and 1800 for the consideration of the subject. Nearly a dozen different plans for improving the dock accommodation, besides two for rebuilding London Bridge, which was generally acknowledged to be a dangerous obstruction to the navigation, were submitted to these committees, one of the most original of which was that of Mr. Revelly, which proposed the creation of a new channel for the Thames from Limehouse to Blackwall, leaving the reach round the Isle of Dogs as a dry dock. Only two of these schemes, however, were recommended for adoption by the committee of 1799, one of which was the construction of a dock for West India ships, proposed by a Committee of Merchants; and the other—submitted by the City Corporation—the construction of a canal across the Isle of Dogs.² The result was the constitution of the West India and the London Dock Companies—the latter with a dock at Wapping—by Acts of 1799 and 1800; and three years later of the institution of bonded warehouses, in which goods could be stored previous to the payment of customs duties. In 1803 the East India Dock Company obtained an Act authorizing the construction of docks at Blackwall, and thirty-five years later it amalgamated with the West India Dock Company; while the St. Katharine's Dock Company, established in 1825, similarly amalgamated in 1864 with the London Dock Company, and pur-

¹ *Report of House of Commons Committee on Port of London*, 1796, pp. 267-271.

² Descriptions of these various schemes (with plans) will be found in the *Report House of Commons Committee on the Port*, 1796, pp. 272 et seq. The rebuilding of London Bridge is dealt with in the two final reports of the Select Committee of 1799, published in 1800 and 1801, p. 604. Cf. *Report Royal Commission*, 1902, p. 63.

chased the Victoria Dock constituted in 1850. This led to the construction, first, of the Albert Dock in 1875 by the London and St. Katharine Docks Company, and then in 1882 of the still more expensive Tilbury Dock by the rival East and West India Dock Company; and finally, after six years of keen competition between them for trade, mitigated somewhat by a working agreement in 1888, the two companies amalgamated in 1901 into the London and India Dock Company, whose undertaking has just been purchased by the new Port Authority. One of the other two Dock Companies whose existence has been similarly terminated by the new Act—the Surrey Commercial Dock Company—was originally founded in 1507 as the Commercial Dock Company and acquired its later title by amalgamating in 1864 with the Grand Surrey Docks and Canal Company, first established as a canal company in 1801. The other, the Millwall Docks Company, established on the Isle of Dogs, was incorporated in 1864.¹

The construction of the docks must from the first have tended considerably to diminish the demand for the services of the lightermen and watermen, whose Company, instituted in 1511, continued until the passing of the new Act to exercise jurisdiction, independent of the City, over all persons employed in the navigation of boats and barges in the Thames, and who in the 17th century could, as Stow tells us, have at any time supplied 20,000 men for the fleet, and even as late as 1809 and 1816 furnished numbers of seamen both for the Walcheren Expedition and that of Lord Exmouth. That Act, however, has not affected the jurisdiction of the Trinity House—an institution, which, originating in a guild and almshouses

¹ Cf. *Report Commission*, 1902, pp. 64-74, and App. D. p. 134. Other docks are the Limehouse, belonging to the Regent's Canal Co.; Brentford (G. W. Rly. Co.); Chelsea (W. London Extension Co.); Poplar (Mid. Rly. Co.); and Deptford (L. B. & S. C. Rly. Co.). The Port Authority has, apparently, power under section 4 of the Act to purchase these or any other 'undertakings' affording facilities for 'loading, unloading, or warehousing goods' in the Port of London.

for mariners founded by Sir Thomas Spert in 1511, received its first charter from Henry VIII in 1515, the year following the grant of that to the Watermen's Company, and whose original 'Trinity House' at Deptford was, like the original Watermen's Hall in Upper Thames Street, destroyed by the Great Fire, when nearly all the records of both perished. The duties of the Trinity House formerly comprised the control of the Government Navy Yard at Deptford, which was made a royal naval station in 1573, but they now principally consist in the management and superintendence of lighthouses, beacons and buoys in England and Wales and the Channel Islands, and the appointment and examination of pilots, the London district for the latter purpose including the Thames and Medway up to London and Rochester Bridges respectively, and the sea as far as Orfordness and Dungeness.¹

It has been shown that by the beginning of the nineteenth century a definite system of conservancy had been established both in the upper river, 'the river above bridge,' and the Port of London. Its efficiency on the upper river, however, began, after the introduction of the railway system, to be injured by the decline of traffic resulting from the rapid decay of that on the canals connected with the Thames. By 1850 the locks between Cricklade and Staines had become so dilapidated that their use involved both danger to vessels and failure of water power for the mills to which the weirs were attached, while 'old lock tolls' were demanded for locks long abandoned, and the growth of weeds, formerly kept down by the barge traffic, had covered the bed and surface of the river. The navigation of the lower river had suffered equally from the increase in shoals after the removal of old London Bridge, the non-removal of wrecks and obstructions, the mud and refuse thrown, especially in docks, into the river, and later by the sewage discharged into it from nearly all

¹ The full title of the Trinity House is still: 'The Guilde, Fraternitie or Brotherhood of the most glorious and undivided Trinity of St. Clement in the parish of Deptford, Strond in the county of Kent.'

the towns on its banks. All these abuses combined to show that the dual control of the City and the Upper River Commissioners was unsatisfactory, and, by Acts of 1858, 1864 and 1868, a Board of twenty-three conservators controlling the whole river was substituted in its place, on which the City and the Upper River Commissioners, together with the Privy Council, Admiralty, Board of Trade, Trinity House, and dock owners, wharfingers, owners of passenger steamers and of steam tugs and lighters, were all represented. The Conservators, who were described by the late Lord Cairns as 'guardians of the navigation and proprietors of the bed and soil of the Thames for that purpose,' not only took over all the duties discharged by their predecessors, including the conservancy of fishery vested in the City, but were also entrusted with the fresh ones of checking pollution in the river and its tributaries, and, if applied to by any of the six water companies then supplying London, of preventing the construction of works likely to interfere with the purity of their intakes.

It is primarily to the energy and excellent administration of the Board—which rebuilt nineteen of the twenty-six locks between Cricklade and Teddington and reformed all the abuses just referred to on the lower river by systematic inspection and prosecutions—that the high standard and efficiency of the conservancy of the Thames to-day is due. Its operations were, however, considerably hampered both by the inadequacy of its funds and also by the independent jurisdictions exercised over the lower river not only by the Medway Conservators, the Trustees of the Lea, the Commissioners of Sewers, and the Metropolitan Board of Works, but also by the Admiralty, Board of Trade, Trinity House, Watermen's Company, and the Dock Companies, all of whom, as already stated, were themselves represented on the Conservancy Board. On the upper river, again, the jurisdiction of the Conservators was similarly fettered by that of the Thames Valley Drainage Commissioners which was concurrent with it; and in 1879 the Thames Traffic Commission, after pointing out

the evils arising from this conflict of authorities, suggested that they should be met by a considerable extension of the powers and duties of the Conservancy Board. After fifteen years' consideration of the subject Parliament at length adopted this recommendation in the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, which, besides consolidating the law, reconstituted the Board and increased the number of the Conservators to thirty-eight, representing all the numerous bodies having interests on the river—the Trinity House, Board of Trade and Admiralty; the Common Council, London County Council, and Metropolitan Water Companies;¹ the Councils of all the counties traversed by the Thames and also of the boroughs of Oxford, Reading, and West Ham; the owners of registered ships, sailing barges, lighters and steam tugs; and the wharfingers and the dock owners. Before its curtailment by the Act of 1908 the jurisdiction of the Conservators extended over the Thames and Isis from Cricklade to a line between Yantlet Creek and the City Stone on Canvey Island, and for purposes of prevention of pollution included also its tributaries; and the seaward limit of the Port of London was a line between a point near the Tower on Hammel's Naze, Essex, and another about five miles from the North Foreland Lighthouse. Their duties were, broadly speaking, described in the preamble of the Act of 1894 as the preservation and improvement of the Thames 'for purposes of navigation for profit and pleasure, and as a source of water supply for the metropolis and the suburbs thereof,' and therefore included, *inter alia*, the erection and maintenance of banks, locks, tow-paths and other works; dredging and scouring and removing obstacles in the river, and the appointment of harbour masters for regulating the river traffic, the loading and unloading of vessels, and the placing and maintenance of beacons necessary for navigation. In addition to these, however, the Conservators were also entrusted with the regulation and preservation of fishery, the prevention both of injury to birds and plants, and of nuisances to

¹ The undertakings of the Water Companies were transferred to the Metropolitan Water Board in 1903.

riparian owners, the regulation of bathing, and the erection of piers and wharves.

This comprehensive system of conservancy, which has been successfully administered for almost exactly fifty years, is based on the principle that it is essential to the utilization of the river to its fullest extent for the various, and often conflicting, purposes of fishery, navigation and water supply, that the whole of the waterway should be controlled by a single authority; and, having regard to the importance of this principle, it is rather to be regretted that Parliament, with the view of improving the accommodation of the Port of London, should have now abandoned it. The Port of London Act, 1908, reverting to that of dual control, has again divided the river into two distinct portions, the upper of which, governed by a new Board of seventeen conservators, extends from Cricklade to Teddington; and the lower—the whole of which now constitutes the Port of London under the control of a newly established 'Port Authority'—comprises the tideway from Teddington to a line between the pilot mark at the entrance of Havengore Creek, Essex, and the Land's End at Warden Point in the Isle of Sheppey. While the new Conservators exercise all the functions of their predecessors as far as Teddington, those of the latter relating to the tideway are now exercised by the new Port Authority, which, it is important to note, is also charged with the administration of the docks formerly vested in the Dock Companies.

It was urged by the Royal Commission, in support of these sweeping changes, that the multiplicity of authorities in the Port—the Thames Conservancy, the Dock Companies, and the Watermen's Company—had caused many complaints of the injury to trade arising from their different jurisdictions. It was also stated that, while extension and improvement in the docks were absolutely necessary, the only company able to undertake them—the London and India Dock Company—could not, owing to the claims of their shareholders, attempt the work without further revenue powers of financial assistance. Lastly it was

pointed out that there is a general consensus of opinion amongst shipowners and traders that the river itself also urgently needs improvements, to the cost of which they would be willing to contribute if satisfied that their contributions will be rightly expended, and the reason for such improvements is clearly indicated in the Report.

Owing to the great natural advantages of the river—which has no bar—little was ever done to improve its natural condition until some dredging operations were undertaken by the late Conservators, which increased its depth to Gravesend to twenty-six feet, and to the Albert Docks to twenty-two feet, but left untouched the seven miles of the Leigh Middle Shoals near Shoeburyness, the removal of which had been recommended by the Thames Navigation Committee in 1894. It was not until after the Commission of 1902 had pointed out that ‘the revolution brought about by the rapid growth in the size and draught of ocean-going steamers and . . . the demand for rapid dispatch’ made the existing depths of waterway inadequate that the late Conservators were enabled, under an Act of 1905, to provide a channel between the Nore and Gravesend twenty-one miles long, thirty feet deep at low water of spring tides, and one thousand feet wide.¹ This increase in the size of ships of all nationalities during the last twenty-five years—the numbers of which, in the case of those of from 2,000 to 2,999 tons, rose from 943 in 1886 to 2,177 in 1901, and of those from 5,000 and above from 40 to 578²—is in point of fact the most important consideration in the future of the Port of London. The United States, Germany, Holland, France, and Russia are all endeavouring to challenge the maritime superiority of Great Britain, and in 1901 the first two, who are our closest rivals, respectively built six and twenty-four steam-ships of over 10,000 tons as against twenty-eight built by this country. It appears to be an accepted dictum that ‘the economical ship is the large ship,’ and Sir A. L. Jones,

¹ *Report Commission*, 1902, pp. 13, 14, App. A., p. 126.

² *Ibid.*, p. 28.

senior partner of the Elder Dempster and Co. line, informed the Commission that we 'may look with certainty to the future producing very much larger ships.' It is evident, therefore, that if the Port of London, which, as has been said, takes about one-fifth of the trade of the United Kingdom, and has a far greater transshipment and re-export trade than any of the continental ports, is allowed to fall behind Hamburg and Rotterdam in providing accommodation for these large modern ships, the result must be injurious not only to the Port itself, but to British commerce generally.¹

The new Authority has been invested with full powers for effecting the improvements necessary to enable the Port of London to maintain its present position. Amongst the powers and duties transferred to it from the late Conservators are the government of all vessels within the Port and the improvement and completion of the navigation of the river by means of dredging and removing obstructions and wrecks, &c., besides those of the appointment of harbour masters for the regulation of traffic in the river, the licensing of docks, piers and embankments, and the placing and maintenance of mooring chains and landing stages, &c., &c.² It will now also exercise all the powers and duties formerly vested in the Watermen's Company, with respect to the registration and licensing of craft and boats, and the licensing, as well as the government, regulation and control, of lightermen and watermen³—a class

¹ *Report Commission*, 1902, pp. 28, 29.

Number of steamships afloat in 1901 (excluding warships) belonging to the following countries, from and over 7,000 tons. (*Report*, p. 28.)

	No. of ss. from 7,000 to 9,999 tons	No. of ss. over 10,000 tons
British	80	28
American (United States)	1	6
Dutch	1	4
French	5	2
German	18	24
Russian	2	<i>nil</i>

² *Report Royal Commission*, 1902, p. 34.

³ Port of London Act, 1908, sect. 11.

whose exemption from dues, and whose statutory right to enter and leave the docks without any payment in respect of the goods they carry off, which were reasonable enough a century ago, have long constituted a standing grievance with all the London Dock Companies.¹ Lastly, its acquisition of the undertakings of the London and India, Surrey Commercial, and Millwall Dock Companies, while transferring to the Port Authority the income formerly derived by the companies from tonnage dues upon shipping entering the docks, dock dues upon goods landed upon or loaded from them, and from warehousing, will enable that body to effect improvements in the docks calculated to increase the value of others which are being simultaneously carried out in the waterway of the Thames—such as the construction and equipment of new docks, quays, wharves and railways, or the methods of imposing, levying and collecting dues, rates and tolls.²

In view of the general approval with which it has been received, it would be out of place now to inquire whether the object of the Act might not have been equally well effected by the transfer of the docks only to a public trust and the consolidation of all other jurisdictions in the Port in the late Conservators, who would thus have continued to retain the sole management of the waterway of the Thames. The scheme embodied in the Act is of necessity an experiment. It has, however, been thoroughly considered, and its prospects of success are enhanced by the representative character of the Port Authority, seventeen of the eighteen *elected* members of which are elected by payers of dues, wharfingers and owners of river craft, and one by wharfingers only; while of the ten appointed members, the Admiralty and the Trinity House each appoint one, the Board of Trade two, the London County Council two from within and two from without its own body, and the Corporation two, one of whom must be a member of it. Provision is made for the representation of labour by the enactment that one of the

¹ *Report Royal Commission*, 1902, p. 80.

² Port of London Act, 1908, sects. 2 and 6.

members appointed by the Board of Trade and one of those appointed by the London Council are to be respectively selected after consultation with 'such organizations of labour' as appear to be 'best qualified to advise' upon the matter. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman, who are appointed by the Port Authority, may, but need not, be members of it; and, in order to ensure the aid of expert knowledge it is provided that for the first three years two at least of the members shall be persons of experience in dock management.¹

The new governing body of the Port, therefore, appears well qualified to maintain the prestige of British commerce, and we hope that it will in doing so materially improve the prospects of the class for whose spiritual needs the Seamen's Mission in Poplar has, as shown by Mr. Sanders, laboured to such good purpose, in the face of difficulties for over half a century. The Port Authority, on which, as has been just pointed out, labour will be represented, is directed, after examining the existing 'conditions of engagement of workmen employed in dock, riverside, and warehouse labour,' to take such steps, 'either by themselves or in co-operation with others,' as appear 'best calculated to diminish the evils of casual employment and to promote the more convenient and regular employment of such workmen.' For this purpose it is empowered to establish or maintain, and assist in maintaining or establishing, offices, waiting-rooms, and employment registers,² and it is permissible to hope that, by means of these provisions, and the powers of conciliation with respect to complaints by dock and warehouse employés,³ the Port of London may one day cease to justify the description given of it over twenty years ago⁴ by Miss Beatrice Potter as 'the scapegoat of competitive industry.'

URQUHART A. FORBES.

¹ Port of London Act, 1908, sect. 1.

² Ibid., sect. 28.

³ Ibid., sect. 27.

⁴ In the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, September 1887; and also in first series of Booth's *Life and Labour of the People in London*, Vol I, chap. ii, p. 12.

‘A GREAT ROMANTIC’—GEORGE MEREDITH

The Works of George Meredith. (Constable & Co.
Eighteen vols. 2s. 6d. each.)

‘**T**HE cedars fall around us’ was the first thought that came with the news that George Meredith had passed away at his cottage on Box Hill on May 18, so soon after the death of his lifelong friend, Swinburne. Mr. Thomas Hardy, who was twelve years younger, and published his first important novel, *Under the Greenwood Tree*, a year after the appearance of *The Adventures of Harry Richmond*, still remains with us, the last survivor of the great Victorian writers. There is a certain similarity in the fortunes of the two men. Each has had his band of devoted admirers, and each had to fight for many years against a dead weight of indifference on the part of the great public. But while Hardy is a pessimist by temperament and conviction, George Meredith was wholeheartedly an optimist. It was largely his optimism that endeared him to a disheartened generation. But he was chiefly what R. L. Stevenson once called Scott—‘a great Romantic.’

We all recognize romanticism when we meet with it, but we find it difficult to define. To the French critic Brunetière it meant the assertion of the individual—the *moi*, against the classic tradition, which corresponds in literature to the accepted conventions of social life. Others would define it as a keen sense of the wonder and mystery of existence. It involves a dislike for the obvious and the stereotyped, a relish for the unexpected, a disposition to break new ground and to forsake old paths. On all these grounds George Meredith might be claimed as a representative of the romantic spirit in literature.

The Romantic Movement both in England and abroad at the beginning of the nineteenth century was characterized by two things. It stood, broadly speaking, for individualism and for the freedom of the individual, as opposed to outward constraint and coercion, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Byron, Shelley, Hugo, Swinburne, Browning were all Radicals if not Revolutionaries. And if it is objected that Scott, the chief of the Romantics, was a high Tory, one need only look at his favourite types. Are they not all more or less in revolt—gipsies, bandits, pirates, outlaws? His heart is with Rob Roy, though his sober judgement may be with the magistrate who locked him up in the Tolbooth; and in these matters we classify men by their instincts and not by their reasonings.

George Meredith is one of the champions of individual freedom, and in this respect he continues the Romantic Movement. He was a lifelong Liberal, an eager supporter of the cause of Italian independence, a chivalrous asserter of the claims of women to political power and economic independence. He was no mere iconoclast. If he had not Scott's historic passion—his thrilled reverence for the past; if he would not have wept, as Scott did, at the sight of the national regalia, he had a real value for the solid Conservative forces of English society. He respected, even while he often felt it his duty to combat, the old aristocratic tradition and all that it stood for. He recognized the force of the social bond—the fact that we are members one of another. But at the same time his heart is always with the individual in his warfare against the herd; whether it is Evan Harrington, fighting for the girl he loves against the massed forces of social prejudice; or Beauchamp, championing political reform against the men of his own class and the foes of his own household; or Vittoria, on the boards of La Scala, flinging down the challenge of an oppressed nation to brute force, as represented by the Austrian officers in the boxes, or Diana, writing for bread and independence in her little London house. It is this that makes him such an inspiration to youth. For the

world would never move at all if the young were not over-persuaded of the faults of the old order. It takes youth—inexperienced, one-sided, passionate youth—to give the impetus that is needed to overcome the immense inertia of society. Middle-aged experience comes in with 'if' and 'but' and '*non quieta movere*.' But for those who were young in the seventies and eighties Meredith's books had the song that set them marching.

And it is more than a mere coincidence that the poets of Liberty were also the poets of Nature. The second great characteristic of the Romantic Movement was that passionate, that almost religious love of nature, which appeared in the poetry of Scott and Wordsworth as a new thing in English literature. The love of Nature in Meredith reveals itself not chiefly in 'purple patches' of description, though here and there he can paint such a picture as this, of a sunrise seen from Monte Motterone.

Bells of herds down the hidden run of the sweet grasses and a continuous leaping of its rivulets, give the Motterone a voice of youth and homeliness amid that stern company of Titan-heads for whom the hawk and the vulture cry. The storm has beaten at them till they have got the aspect of the storm. . . . They were the look of the revolted sons of Time, fast chained before scornful heaven in an iron peace. Day at last brings vigorous fire; arrows of light pierce the mist wreaths, the dancing draperies, the floor of vapour; and the mountain of piled pasturages is seen with its foot on the shore of Lago Maggiore. Down an extreme gulf the full sunlight, as if darting on a jewel in the deeps, seizes the blue-green lake with its isles. The villages along the darkly wooded borders of the lake show white as clustered swans. . . . Monte Boscere is unveiled; the semicircle of the Piedmontese and the Swiss peaks covering Lake Orta, behind, on along the Ticinese and the Grisons, leftward toward and beyond the Lugano hills, stand bare in black and grey and rust-red and purple. You behold a burnished realm of mountain and plain beneath the royal sun of Italy. In the foreground it shines hard as the lines of an irradiated Cellini shield. Farther away over the middle

ranges that are soft and clear it melts, confusing the waters with hot rays and the forests with darkness, to where wavering in and out of view like flying wings, and shadowed like wings of archangels with rose and with orange and with violet, silver-white Alps are seen. . . . They lean as in a great flight forward upon Lombardy.¹

This love of nature appears rather in a sensitive consciousness of the background which it makes to the human spectacle, and the interaction of human life with the aspects of earth and skies. The woods of Surrey and the music of falling water are woven into the magic of the love-duet between Emilia and Wilfred. Lord Romfrey looks at the long swelling lines of the Downs, on the slopes of which he wooed and won his bride, and unconsciously invokes them as accomplices in his scheme of wedding Beauchamp and Cecilia. The silent heath over which Evan Harrington walks to his father's funeral preaches to him of the greatness and the littleness of man. The streamlets are merry playfellows and the Alpine summits austere counsellors. Dacier, when he meets Diana coming from her early walk, evidently reflects the thought of the author, when he concludes that only one who was clean and fair of soul could dare to affront the morning glory with so blithe and unclouded a face.

Meredith had the romantic manner. His style, so tortured and obscure when he was disentangling a difficult sequence of thoughts, has in its unencumbered movement an arresting eloquence; it is singularly sincere and vivid, noticeably free from *clichés* and cut-and-dried phrases. Like Shakespeare's, it is often spoilt by a tiresome euphuism; but at its best, when the swift thrust and parry of the dialogue rings like the clash of steel, one thinks of Shakespeare too. Angelo's defiance of Weisspriess in the pass may stand with Benedict's challenge to Claudio.

He could never photograph the colloquial tone of modern life with the skill attained by many writers of less

¹ *Vittoria.*

than a tithe of his powers. We know from Trollope's novels how ladies in country houses conversed in the sixties. It certainly was not like this: 'Lady, you have deemed me capable of the meanest of our vices.' Or again: 'We are accustomed to peruse our Willoughby, and we know him by a shadow.'¹ But the point is that Meredith in his dialogue rises instinctively to the tone of romance, thus achieving naturally and inevitably the effect that the Wardour Street band of 'historical novelists' strain for with their 'Methinks,' and 'If you list,' and 'Marry, good sir.' His dialogue may not always hit the tone of modern social life, but it is always dramatically right. Each individual comes in with his appropriate accent and gesture. Indeed, he *lives* his characters so completely that his dialogue is sometimes difficult to follow; because his people think more than they say, and one has to supply the *sous-entendus* as one does in real life, a task at which the lazy reader who expects the author to do all the work for him is apt to rebel.

After all, Meredith is too original to be included in any category. He possessed the supreme gift of the novelist, the shaping imagination. His characters were living enough to take their own way with him. They are living enough, some of them, to remain with us as companions, equally real with Peggotty, or Colonel Newcome, or the Baron of Bradwardine. He could create not merely living beings, but a whole social *milieu* with its appropriate atmosphere and background. We know the High Street of Bevisham as if we had gone canvassing there with Beauchamp; and the village of Patterne as if we had lived at Sir Willoughby's gates. But this great native force of imagination was directed by the brain of a student and a philosopher. 'Fundamental brainwork' (to use a favourite phrase of his), a thoughtful study of social forces, a profound appreciation of the tragic interplay of circumstance and character, give his novels their abiding interest.

¹ *The Egoist*.

He wrote with difficulty, for the ideas with which his brain laboured were not such as find facile expression. Like Browning, he had to endure the false accusation of wilful obscurity. But it must be admitted that, like Browning also, he sometimes wasted effort on elaborating a trifling ingenuity, and that the thought in his difficult passages is not always worth digging for.

Like most innovators he had to create his own public. Perhaps his difficulty in establishing a contact with English taste was due partly to the fact that he had a foreign education. Born in Hampshire, that country of heath and forest which he has described with a special predilection, he was sent to be educated in Germany, where he remained till he was fifteen. Against his own wish he was put to the law, which he gave up for journalism and literature. His first book was published when he was twenty-three, but it was not till 1859 that he brought out his first important novel—*The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*.

For thirty years Meredith wandered in the wilderness of popular disfavour, making a living by journalistic work, and acting for many years as reader to the publishing firm of Messrs. Chapman and Hall. It seems incredible that while such books were coming out as *Evan Harrington* (1861), *Sandra Belloni* (1864), *Rhoda Fleming* (1865), *Vittoria* (1867), *Harry Richmond* (1871), and *Beauchamp's Career* (1876), the author should have remained almost unknown to the general public. With *The Egoist* he finally conquered the critics, but it was not till the appearance of *Diana of the Crossways* in 1886 that he could be said to have attained general recognition. Before that date scattered enthusiasts in the provinces could get his novels, in the old three-volume form, from the top shelves of circulating libraries, where they were seldom disturbed; but since 1886 there has been a steady welcome for both popular and library editions.

It is a great testimony to the courage and wholesomeness of Meredith's nature that, during an experience which has broken many a heart and soured many a spirit, he

'never turned his back, but marched breast forward,' never whined about the public neglect of genius, and never compromised his principles or spoiled his work for the sake of popularity. We need in these days such examples of the proper dignity of a man of letters.

He had a love for epigram, for the kind of statement that is pointed and metaphorical; and he sometimes strained for an epigram that was not worth making. His hatred of the obvious betrayed him into affectation. These faults became increasingly evident in his later books, and sent his true lovers back to those great romances of the mid-Victorian period on which his fame is securely founded.

That charming little fantasy, *The Shaving of Shagpat*, illustrates the lighter side of his genius. It sparkles with the fantastic gaiety that finds expression in the drawing-room comedy of *The Egoist* with its delightfully whimsical preface.

The heartrending tragedy of *Richard Feverel*, containing some of the most pure and passionate love-passages ever written, is an attack on the tyranny of systems.

Here, at the threshold of his career, Meredith strikes the note that vibrates all through his later works. He wages perpetual war with the sentimentalists who will not face facts. They may be literary people—realists or romanticists with a theory in favour of 'rose-pink' or 'dirty drab.' They may be doctrinaires in politics or ideologues in education, such as Sir Austin Feverel, who sacrifices his only son as a demonstration of his pet theories, and thinks he can get rid of the facts of life by declining to see them, ostrich fashion.

The tragedy of the book is the catastrophe of two beautiful young lives, ruined by despotic conceit and self-will. When fate has served the baronet better than he deserves, and provided his son with a mate who really answers the requirements of his system, he must assert himself by their forced separation. The fall of Richard

and the death of Lucy are the results of this wanton experiment.

It is superfluous to quote what everybody knows. The scene in which Richard meets Lucy for the first time, and the tragic passage in which he bids farewell to her before going to fight a duel with the man who has attempted to seduce her in his absence, are unsurpassed in our literature.

The point about Sir Austin Feverel is not that he is a bad man—far from it. He is a high-minded person who can solace an elegant retirement with such aphorisms as this :

Expediency is man's wisdom; doing right is God's. . . .

There is for the mind but one grasp of happiness; from that uppermost pinnacle of wisdom whence we see that this world is well designed.

But he lives too much to himself and his aphorisms in the society of feminine adorers such as Lady Blandish. The wholesome outer air is never allowed to blow on his theories. Meredith's trust in the justness of the instincts of women is shown by the fact that Lady Blandish sees through him at last. His conduct to Lucy shatters even her robust faith. Sir Austin Feverel was the first member of the family of *poseurs*, of which Sir Willoughby Patterne is the crowning example; but he is more to be pitied than most, because his insincerity is unconscious, and the results of it are shown in crushing misery to himself.

The courage, thoughtfulness and tragic power of *Richard Feverel* were no recommendation to it in an age when literature was dominated by the false sentiment that he despised. The *Athenæum* for July 9, 1859, remarked : 'The book is very clever, but it is not true to real life or human nature. We hope the author will use his great abilities to produce something pleasanter next time.' It seems to have been in a spirit of deliberate antagonism to the affectations of the time that he introduced Mrs. Berry, the woman of frank speech and primitive emotions. Even so, in *Sandra Belloni* Mrs. Chump, the vulgar Irish

widow, acts as a foil to the superfine ladies of the Pole family—Pole, Polar, and North Pole, as they were called by their intimates to denote the degree of chilliness which each could express by a bow.

In *Evan Harrington* Meredith took, intentionally or not, the advice of the *Athenæum* critic. The love-story of the gallant young tailor and the far-descended Rose Jocelyn is emphatically a 'pleasant book,' in spite of the rather tiresome farce of Mr. Jack Raikes and the Cogglesby brothers. But the making of the novel is the Countess de Saldar, perhaps the most delightful humbug in fiction after Falstaff. Her *verve* and resource and high spirits remind one of that arch-rogue.

Side by side with the Countess de Saldar as a social adventurer, we must place that other picture, one of the most sustained and finished things that Meredith ever did, of the 'hopping, skipping social meteor' who is the true hero of *Harry Richmond*. Those who have seen Du Maurier's illustrations for the book, which first appeared serially in the *Cornhill*, will remember the likeness of Harry Richmond's father to the First Gentleman of Europe. Roy Richmond is, or believes himself to be, the son of George IV by a morganatic marriage. The effect of this belief on a clever, amiable man of weak brain and huge vanity, endued with a handsome presence, great social talents, and restless energy, is convincingly set forth, as well as the impression that he makes on those who cross his path. Children and women worship him and cling to him with unreasoning devotion; the world of fashion delights in him, so long as he can continue to amuse it; honest, narrow, stolid souls like the Squire of Riversley loathe him; high, serious natures like the Princess Ottilia regard him with a pity touched with scorn. There is a poetic fitness in his end—the fire at the old Grange, kindled by his crazy vanity, and his death in the flames, into which he had rushed to save his benefactress. The author's insight is shown in revealing what elements of attractiveness and nobility subsist in a character which might seem

all froth and imposture, and in keeping our sympathy for him to the last.

Harry Richmond was a baffling and perplexing book to its first readers. It is one of those in which we feel that the characters have taken matters into their own hands; Harry Richmond himself is far from being the ordinary novelist's puppet, acting on the definite plan laid down by his creator and working up to a proper *dénouement*. The author's tyrannical imagination presented him just so and not otherwise—the kind of youth who would inevitably be turned out by such an experience acting on such an heredity, pulled one way by the county gentleman tradition, and then violently whirled in the other direction, in the 'glittering wake' of his father, the adventurer. He would naturally make more than one false start, misread his own heart, and fall below his own best instincts, and only gradually find himself and his true path in life. But such a blundering, tentative, uncertain hero was unattractive to the great mass of novel readers in the seventies—and continues to be unattractive to-day.

The evolution of Janet Ilchester, in whom Harry Richmond learns to recognize his true mate, is instructive as showing what Meredith valued in woman. He was supremely contemptuous of the sham refinement which insisted that a woman should be ashamed to have a healthy colour or a healthy appetite. He insisted, with an emphasis unnecessary in our hockey-playing generation, on the fact that his heroines enjoy their meals. Janet's is a strong, simple, affectionate nature; 'mentally a trifle beneath' her lover; 'morally above.' As a child she is selfish and greedy. Her strength of character shows itself at first in self-assertion; but her nature deepens and sweetens in the practice of natural duty and affection, till she becomes capable of rising to the heights of self-sacrifice. Her great quality is courage, and out of that strength comes forth sweetness.

There are points of contact between Janet and the Italian heroine, Sandra Belloni. The little Italian *can-*

tratrice is adopted by the three daughters of a wealthy London merchant, and proves herself the good genius of the family. The affectations of the Pole young ladies are rather small game for Meredith's satire; but Sandra is adorably fresh and natural, and whenever she appears the story lives and moves, though it is weighted with some of the most trying instances of his misplaced ingenuity.

It was the function of the Muse of Comedy, so Meredith conceived, to observe the histrionic tricks of little creatures like the Poles. Comedy is 'a game played to cast reflections upon social life, and it deals with human nature in the drawing-rooms of civilized men and women.' He sees how, when human beings have outgrown the stage of fighting with one another for bones, they proceed to try and impress one another by acting the parts in which they conceive themselves to shine. The Comic Spirit looks on at the play, feasting on the delicious incongruity between the actor himself and the thing he poses as being.

It was an original, almost an audacious idea, to take as the type of the sentimental *poseur* a fine young English gentleman, the representative of a historic house, a person who ought to be the very embodiment of the solid simplicity we like to imagine as truly John Bullish. But the audacity of the idea is equalled by the remorseless penetration of its execution. From the moment when Sir Willoughby Patterne turns from his door the shabby cousin of whom he had boasted when he was at a safe distance, to that when he is reduced to begging on his knees for the hand of his slighted sweetheart, in order to save him from hopeless discomfiture in the eyes of his little world—the world of his dread and his unconscious worship—we are kept in ceaseless suspense, watching the shifts and doubles of the *Egoist*, who desires 'to clothe himself at everybody's expense,'—to make everything and everybody minister to the gratification of his vanity,—and 'is of that desire compelled to strip himself stark naked,'

—to part with one precious thing after another to save the appearances that are to him most precious of all.

There are interesting reminiscences of Meredith's contemporaries in some of his novels. Vernon Whitford in *The Egoist*, the lean, long-walking scholar, with his look of sunken brilliance, his passion for the Alps, his stern, simple uprightness and shamefaced generosity, has certain traits of Leslie Stephen. In *Sandra Belloni*, Tracy Runningbrook the poet, with his green eyes and wild red hair, his simple eagerness and enthusiasm, is unmistakably Swinburne as his friends knew and loved him. And in *Beauchamp's Career* he has embalmed the memory of another friend, the Radical sailor, Admiral Maxse.

Beauchamp's Career is interesting on several grounds. It is one of the best of our political novels; the Bevisham election scenes are full of humour and spirit. It contains two of his most striking feminine characters: the typical Englishwoman, conservative and prejudiced, but resolute, tender and high-minded, in Rosamund Culling, and the exquisite Renée, with her French grace and wit, her blend of timidity and recklessness. Neville Beauchamp is at the opposite pole from Sir Willoughby Patterne; he is the embodiment of simple unselfishness. Gallant fighter and ardent lover as he is, his passion for the common weal carries all before it; and perhaps it is no unfitting climax to his career that his brave life should have ended in the effort to save a poor man's child. His uncle, Earl Romfrey, represents the feudal and aristocratic tradition which Meredith respected even while maintaining that it had lasted its time and done its work; Lord Romfrey's assault on the Radical philanthropist Dr. Shrapnel, and his subsequent apology, show that ancient feudal spirit at its worst and best.

Vittoria owes much to his experiences as correspondent to the *Morning Post* during the Austro-Italian campaign of 1866. Sandra Belloni reappears as the heroine of this romance, but she is rather a disappointment. The real heroine is Italy struggling to be free, and the hero is the

man who inspired that struggle—Mazzini. In spite of its inequality, *Vittoria* is a prime favourite with some readers. Such episodes as the opera scene in La Scala, the duel in the pass, the Five Days of Milan, are told with a fire and picturesqueness and romantic passion that enthral one. The book is sown with winged phrases that live in the memory and spur one to action, such as this: 'Everything is worth what it costs if only as a schooling in energy, resolution, and self-denial.'

In nothing is Meredith more original than in his studies of women. His impatience for the 'veiled virginal doll' of the conventional Victorian novelist, his respect for the individuality and independence of women, justified itself in a series of feminine portraits that are worthy of comparison with the heroines of Shakespeare. It is only with such creations as Juliet, Beatrice, and Desdemona that we can parallel Lucy Feverel, or Clara Middleton, or Diana Warwick. *Rhoda Fleming* was, in its way, as gallant a defiance of convention as Richardson's *Clarissa*, and Meredith's attitude towards women had some affinity with Richardson's. The book which shows this best is *Diana of the Crossways*.

In this, the last of his great novels, he illustrates the dangers of life in 'society' for a lonely, inexperienced, and beautiful girl. 'Men may have passed Seraglio Point; they have not yet doubled Cape Turk.' It shows the pitfalls in her way, the struggle for a foothold on the upward path after tragic failure and mistake. Redworth, 'the man who can be a friend to women,' receives the meed of his steadfast chivalrous trust and patience. And as a challenge to cheap sneers against the friendships of women, the author gives us the example of a noble and perfect friendship in Diana and Lady Dunstan.

Although we are told that the story of Diana is to be read as fiction, it was, of course, suggested by Mrs. Norton, and her famous friendships with Lord Melbourne and Sidney Herbert. Our better knowledge has acquitted Sheridan's daughter of the treachery which Meredith

attributes to his heroine—the betrayal of a Cabinet secret to the editor of the *Times*. Without slurring the baseness of the action, he makes us understand how a woman of generous nature could be capable of it. Diana is a human soul in peril and pain; and while we read of her fortunes, we find ourselves the spectators of a spiritual tragedy. We ask ourselves, 'Will the spirit emerge victorious?' and that is Meredith's triumph.

Space forbids more than the barest mention of his poems, which demand a study to themselves. Some critics place them above his novels; and without going so far as this, we would commend to the worthy reader these poignant utterances of a soul always passionately sincere.

People are now engaged in the usual futile speculation as to whether his books will live. Whether they will be read a hundred years hence or not, who can tell? What surely cannot perish is the inspiration he has given to the sluggish, and the courage to the faint-hearted. He stood all his life for truth, for fortitude, and for comradeship. Though outside the orthodox folds, he believed intensely the creed of his hero Mazzini:

Our life is but a little holding, lent
To do a mighty labour; we are one
With heaven and the stars when it is spent
To serve God's aim; else die we with the sun.

And now that he in his turn has

entered the black boat
Upon the wide grey sea

we seem to hear the echo of 'the voice remote' that speaks of hope and courage still.

DORA M. JONES.

Notes and Discussions

THE HISTORIC CHRIST

IN the April number of this REVIEW a brief account was given of a series of able apologetic lectures by Pastor Gerhard Hilbert, together with a fuller appreciation of his suggestive treatment of 'The Easter Faith.' His method of re-stating, in the light of modern criticism, the grounds of belief in the resurrection of Jesus Christ has commended itself to some readers, who have expressed a desire for further information concerning his attitude towards other fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

The fourth lecture, on 'The Person of Jesus Christ,' is admirable alike for its comprehensiveness and for its lucidity. Hilbert lays his foundations on the rock, as becomes a wise master-builder. He takes nothing for granted, not even the historicity of Jesus Christ. He is familiar with Kalthoff's attempt to show that Jesus is 'the personification of an idea, the transcendental principle of the Church.' The argument might have been strengthened by a reference to Jensen's wild theory, which does great violence to the Gospel narratives, and vainly strives to find resemblances to their portrait of Jesus in Babylonian myths. But Hilbert is content, after a reminder of the witness of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Pliny, to show that 'the biblical sources, judged from a purely historical point of view, are very trustworthy.' It is unnecessary to repeat his forceful reasoning. His first rampart will bear the shock of this attack, for St. Paul's witness to Jesus, borne within thirty years of our Lord's death, is quite incompatible with the supposition that it might have been refuted by living persons who had nothing to do but to say, 'This Jesus never lived.' Even Haeckel finds Kalthoff's denials too much for him. Hilbert is amply justified in saying that the historicity of Jesus is not seriously questioned by any scientific historian, but only by a few dogmatic materialists who fabricate 'history' in their studies and present us with a view of the world which is irrational for the simple reason that history demands not personified ideas, but creative personalities.

Passing to the consideration of critical theories which deny

the historicity of certain features in the Gospel portrait of Jesus, Hilbert begins with Von Hartmann's objection to what he calls 'the abnormal development of the self-consciousness of Jesus.' This objection, like many others of which it is typical, is shown to rest on the pre-supposition that everything in the Gospels which implies that Jesus was not 'a mere man' is to be ascribed to the creative imagination of the early Church which surrounded the figure of Jesus with a halo of divinity. The result of Frenssen's attempt to paint the portrait of Jesus, without the halo, is well described as the presentation of 'a weak and vacillating character, lacking all initiative.' To the obvious question, How came such a man to His position in history? Frenssen replies, He owes it to Paul, who invested Him with 'the dazzling, royal robe of the divine Messiah.' Hence, according to Frenssen, the task of modern theology is to remove the decoration which Pauline speculation has added to the historic figure of the meek and lowly Jesus.

In arresting and convincing language Hilbert proceeds to show that modern theology is unequal to its self-imposed task. 'The modern portrait of Christ has no real existence; there exist only various portraits of Christ drawn by modern critics.' In proof of this statement, reference is made to the difference in the results arrived at by Wrede and J. Weiss—two scholars who work on essentially the same modern methods. The contrast to this diversity is furnished by the fundamental unity of the Gospels in their estimate of Jesus. To Wrede belongs the merit of having destroyed the legend based upon the assumption of a contradiction between 'the historic Jesus' of the Synoptists and 'the dogmatic Christ' of the fourth Gospel. From the Synoptic Gospels scientific criticism cannot remove the evidences of 'the abnormal self-consciousness' of Jesus, veiled though it may often be. Schweitzer is quoted with approval, especially on account of his protest against the tendency 'to depreciate the personality of Jesus' and to explain Him by 'human psychology.'

Hilbert claims to have demonstrated the impossibility of removing the supernatural from the character of Jesus, as He is portrayed in the 'sources,' without destroying the portrait itself. He proceeds to illustrate this general principle by examining the evidence for the Messianic claims of Jesus. He agrees with Schweitzer that 'the whole history of Jesus and of early Christianity becomes an absolute riddle, if Jesus

was not conscious of His Messiahship. For what other reason was He crucified than that He confessed Himself to be the Messiah?' A fresh and interesting *résumé* of the evangelists' witness to Jesus leads up to the conclusion that 'the deepest kernel of His personality was not derived from His *milieu*.' Brought up in the same environment, His contemporaries are utterly unlike Him. Jesus was a Jew, but there was nothing Jewish in Him. To perceive this, we have only, as Kähler says, to place Him between two genuine types of the Jewish ideal—John the Baptist, and Saul the Pharisee. It is also pointed out that Jesus appears not only as Lord of nature, but as Lord of history. Bismarck was conscious of his inability to control his destiny, but Jesus reads, in the depths of His soul, the end from the beginning. It is not history, but fiction, that represents Him as dreaming of triumph. 'He directs His life to its foreseen end. . . . He is not a link in history; He is the Lord of history.' Between this conception of Jesus as Lord and His life of lowly service, there is no disharmony. His power is used in the service of love; therefore His love is never weakness. Nietzsche condemns compassion as 'unnerving and enervating,' but the compassion of Jesus was 'the compassion of power.'

The thought of Jesus as Lord of Himself, and therefore free for service, leads up to a clear setting forth of His sinlessness. Hilbert's appeal is to the 'sources,' and his contention is that a psychological impossibility is involved in the supposition that He who detected sin in its most hidden recesses was deceived about Himself. His sinlessness was, however, no mere negative virtue; as He is revealed in the Gospels Jesus is 'perfect in purity and truth, perfect in love and compassion.' No wonder that the question, 'Who is He?' forced itself upon His contemporaries; His disciples were conscious of the mystery that veiled His personality, although at times gleams of His glory shone forth in His gracious promises as well as in His lofty claims. 'The dying Buddha is said to have requested his disciples to forget him, and to remember only his teachings. Nietzsche represents Zarathustra as saying, "I bid you lose me and find yourselves." Only Jesus has ventured to ascribe to His own person eternal significance for all men—and this according to the testimony of all the Gospels.'

Freshness is imparted to the familiar argument that the invention of the character of Jesus by the fishermen of Galilee is inconceivable. Reference is made to the failure of the

attempt merely to repaint His portrait, even when the artists were men so poetically gifted as Klopstock and Frenssen. 'The Jesus of Klopstock's *Messiah* is a sublime figure, but it lacks life. It is a mere shadow, without flesh and blood.' On the other hand, Frenssen's realistic Jesus has actuality and life, but it is 'devoid of all dignity.' Kähler's conclusion is inevitable: 'Jesus Himself, in His incomparable and powerful personality, had so clearly and so incisively fixed in the mind and memory of His disciples the main features of His portrait that it could neither be erased nor erroneously sketched.'

In the latter part of his lecture Hilbert gives further reasons for his ever-strengthening conviction that the supernatural traits in the portrait of Jesus cannot be removed without destroying it. Some modern theologians acknowledge the sinlessness of Jesus, but deny His divinity. His uninterrupted communion with God is said to account for His continuous victory over evil, albeit He was only a man. No explanation is given, by those who argue thus, of the fact that neither before Him nor after Him has any man achieved the same triumph. Moreover, the problem still remains unsolved, How did this man preserve unbroken fellowship with God? The true solution is that 'communion with God and sinlessness are interchangeable conceptions; communion with God expresses positively what sinlessness affirms negatively.' To those who grant that Jesus alone of all the sons of men was without sin, and always obedient to His Father's will, Hilbert says in substance, This is also my own belief, but the fact remains inexplicable, unless it be true, as I verily believe, that 'Jesus is the only-begotten Son, whilst we are only adopted children. God was in Christ; He is God manifest in the flesh.'

As to the verdict of history, Hilbert maintains unhesitatingly that it vindicates the truthfulness of the claims of Jesus. He asks: Is it not true that He is becoming increasingly both the Judge of men and their Saviour? For the individual, however, the only completely satisfying answer to the question, 'Who is Jesus?' is found in his own experience. 'In the deepest abyss of our nature Jesus humbles us and puts us to shame; at the same time there issues from Him a stream of love and purity which lifts us above ourselves. He helps us in our sorest need—in our conflict with sin and with ourselves. He sets the prisoners free and transforms slaves into conquerors.'

J. G. TASKER.

POETIC AGNOSTICISM: MEREDITH AND SWINBURNE

To appraise the permanent position in the literary Walhalla of two such eminent 'Victorians' as Swinburne and Meredith immediately after they have passed away, is manifestly impossible. It is difficult enough to see them as they really are. This Note is not concerned with the claims of these two men of brilliant genius to high honour amongst their contemporaries or posterity—one of them possessing as keen and rapid an intellect and as vivid imaginative powers as any writer of the century, the other known as one of the most consummate masters of metre to be found in the whole of English literature.

The only question before us for the moment is the attitude of these poets to the highest questions of life. Their treatment of themes within their own range is so luminous and splendid that it jars upon the sensitive reader to be continually reminded of the boundary-wall of limitation beyond which neither of them was able to pass. It is not intended to suggest that every poet must necessarily be religious. A critic who expects to find in a bard an exponent of theological doctrine understands neither poetry nor theology aright. Further, it is quite clear that an artist in words, or on canvas, may choose a myriad subjects in which the great questions of life are not implied or suggested, and such a one may the more completely rest and refresh the weary soul because he leaves these on one side, content to charm and console, 'the idle singer of an empty day.' But when a poet is a thinker, when his themes impinge upon the Infinite and the Eternal, when he is recognized as a teacher of some kind of philosophy of human life, then more may fairly be expected of him. From such a one we look for an imaginative rendering of his deepest faith concerning the Whence, the Whither, and the Why of existence, and if he fails us there we turn away disappointed.

It is quite understood that Swinburne and Meredith were men of their era. Neither was one of those supremely great souls who transcend the ages. And they represent not the whole nineteenth century, which ranges from Wordsworth to Browning, but one fraction of it during which religious faith in this country was at a low ebb. Matthew Arnold was the child of this generation and the *vates sacer* of a dark mood of

the soul, in which only the 'melancholy, long, withdrawing roar' of the Sea of Faith could be heard, retreating to the breath of the bleak night wind. At the Grande Chartreuse he saw the 'last of the people who believe':

Silent, while years engrave the brow ;
Silent—the best are silent now.

But Arnold was not silent, he sang the dirge of faith. Plainly he lamented that the new world was 'powerless to be born.' Clough lamented also, even more bitterly. Some were content to be literally silent; others felt the thrilling pulsations of new life, and poured out their souls in prose or verse, but concerning the highest and deepest matters they had no message to give. Meredith and Swinburne were among these. The harp of each was richly vibrant and resonant, as its chords were swept by a master-hand, but some of the strings are dumb. On the greatest themes they say, expressly or implicitly, We do not know, we cannot tell.

These two essentially poetic artists have here been classed together, because they passed away from earth together and because they have so much in common. But in their relation to religion, as it is generally understood, the attitude of the two men was essentially different. Meredith's face was towards the light. Not only was his ethical teaching of a lofty and inspiring kind, but it might be said that it held a real religion in solution. Without echoing the current phrase that Swinburne was a Pagan at heart, there can be little doubt that in his earlier years he turned his back upon the East and all his life through was persuaded that no light could come from that quarter. Distinctively Christian doctrine may be left out of consideration. A thinker who is unable to believe in a living God and personal immortality, and who holds that there is no adequate ground for such faith on the part of any, is agnostic for our present purpose. But he may tremble on the verge of faith in God and eternal life, and in his teaching prepare the way for both, or he may close the door of his mind on such subjects altogether. Meredith is of the former class, Swinburne of the latter. There is a whole diameter of sky between the two stanzas that follow :

Our life is but a little holding, lent
To do a mighty labour ; we are one
With heaven and the stars, if it be spent
To serve God's aim : else die we with the sun,

and

From too much love of living,
From hope and fear set free,
We thank with brief thanksgiving
Whatever gods may be
That no life lives for ever;
That dead men rise up never;
That even the weariest river
Winds somewhere to the sea.

It would not be right to understand in the first extract that Meredith meant by the term 'God' precisely what the Theist means, nor in the second to quote lines from 'The Garden of Proserpine' as if they expressed the whole of the poet's philosophy of life. The former passage is Vittoria's rendering of Mazzini's message, and the latter is professedly a Pagan picture. But as there is no space in a Note to justify the statement by quotations, the writer must simply express his belief that the two passages not unfairly represent the attitude of these two men of genius towards the themes of God and immortality.

Provided, that is, Meredith's Deity be viewed as a Beatified Spirit of the Earth, not as a Personal Ruler of the universe. It is the Earth-Mother whom he worships; his verses are, as he called some of them, 'poems of the joy of earth.' His God is dimly seen as a shadowy impersonation of the good elements in Nature, not ruling and over-ruling, but Himself darkly struggling into existence through the evolution of humanity, coming to full consciousness in and through the painful education and the noblest efforts of toiling and suffering men and women. And, whilst some passages from Meredith's writings and utterances of his may be held to point to the prospect of personal, rather than mere corporate immortality, it is probable that his hope never reached a confident expectation, and private letters published since his death confirm this view. He wondered and guessed, like the rest of mankind who possess no well-grounded faith. His 'religion,' which was a noble one as far as it went, had promise of the life that now is, not of that which is to come. The 'goal of goals' is in this world. As Mr. G. M. Trevelyan says of him, 'There is no kingdom of God promised, before which there will be no satisfaction, and after which no ground for complaint. Far otherwise. . . . Each is to help himself, and also to clear a foot of pathway for

his companions and for those who are to follow. Surely this is not only common sense, but true religion.'

We doubt if it is either. Common sense does not take us so far, true religion takes us infinitely further. Meredith's fine optimism carries us beyond the one and drops us pitifully far short of the other. Surely it is well, in doing all honour to men of high literary genius, to recognize their limitations and not to allow the glamour of inspiring ethical teaching on the one hand or of fascinating musical strains that charm the ear and linger in the memory on the other, to dazzle or disturb the eyesight of the soul. If no higher spiritual knowledge is available than poetic agnosticism can furnish, how is man to find his way through the wilderness? Swinburne's gospel that death is peace, and Meredith's trumpet-note summoning to courage and joy, even in the worst of ills, provide poor consolation at best for the weary wayfarer. The twentieth century will not be satisfied with the dreary no-faith of the middle of the nineteenth. Tennyson and Browning furnish in different ways an antidote to the prevalent 'sleeping sickness' of the spirit. And if evangelical teachers will but enter fully into the true spirit of the gospel of Christ and render it in terms suited to the new age, the doubts and denials of a past generation will be forgotten like the languors of a sickly dream.

W. T. DAVISON.

A FRENCH LIBRARY OF SCIENTIFIC APOLOGETICS

THE need for a series of cheap manuals, written by first-class scientists, to exhibit the errors of materialism has been felt for a long time. Messrs. Bloud & Co. (4 Rue Madame, Paris; Hachette and Co., London) are now publishing such a series under the title of *Science et Religion*. The works are in paper covers, and printed in good clear type, the price ranging from one shilling to one shilling and sixpence.

In *La Providence Créatrice*, M. Lapparent, a talented geologist, proves that the earth could only have reached its present condition by the guiding Providence working ceaselessly during long ages. He regards the coal-measures in their

origin and position as proof of such design. In *Les Silex Taillés et l'Ancienneté de l'Homme*, M. Lapparent shows that many discoveries of so-called primaeval man are false and untrustworthy, while the claim of the oldest stone weapons, the 'Eoliths,' to be considered of human workmanship has been broken down. The attempt also to calculate the antiquity of man from the rate of movement of the ancient glaciers in France is valueless. M. Ortolan, in *Vie et Matière*, holds that there is no comparison whatever between a crystal and a living organism, and that between the organic and the inorganic there exists an impassable chasm. In two volumes the Abbé Leroy maintains that theistic evolution is in harmony with the teachings of Christianity, though this cannot be said of the materialistic theories of Haeckel and his followers. The attack upon these crude suppositions is commenced by M. Courbet in three volumes entitled *La Faillite du Matérialisme*. The first describes the rise of the materialistic theory, and the opposition which the highest scientific authorities have given to it. The other volumes are devoted to Force, Energy, Gravitation, and the various physical problems raised by atomicity, electricity, and the phenomena connected with the ether. The origin and working of all these, as well as the ultimate beginning of force, is shown to be bound up with the manifestation of an Almighty Will. M. Contestin, in *Le Matérialisme et la Nature de l'Homme*, examines the statements of the materialists, and shows that man is too complicated a being to be accounted for by merely the interaction of physical forces.

The two works of the series which will attract the greatest attention are probably those by M. Jacques Laminne, which deal specially with Haeckel's theories. The first is called *L'Univers d'après Haeckel*, and the second *L'Homme d'après Haeckel*. The former combats Haeckel's theories as to the origin and development of the organic and inorganic world, and shows how utterly opposed they are to the discoveries of modern science. In the latter the origin of man is examined, and geology as well as comparative anatomy are laid under contribution to prove the falsity of the materialistic theory. The different lines of descent by which the development of man has proceeded from ape-like ancestors are discussed, and it is shown that the moral and intellectual nature of man testifies unanswerably to his spiritual origin. The Marquis de Nadaillac's

Unité de l'Espèce Humaine is a strong argument to prove the unity of the human species. He finds his evidence in the weapons, primitive utensils, potteries, burials with their bones often coloured red, and in the mysterious religious signs and emblems, which are found amidst the earliest traces of man. The identity of human conceptions manifests the identity of man's genius, and consequently demonstrates man's common origin. In our opinion the best work of the series is *L'Homme et le Singe*, also by the Marquis de Nadaillac. Despite the marvellous advances of science, ether, gravitation, and electricity present insoluble problems. The differences between men and apes are set forth, such as man's erect position, spinal curve, the character of his hands and feet, and weight of his brain. It is not the mere weight of the brain, but *the character of the work which the brain does* that demonstrates man's unique origin. The triumphs of music, painting, sculpture, and mechanics show that his thoughts are different from those of the apes, because his nature is different from theirs. There is no evidence to prove that evolution occurs in actual times. Spontaneous generation has been given up, and the sterility of hybrids prevents the blending of species for their formation. Nothing favourable to evolution can be deduced from the facts of embryology; we never see new species spring from those we know, and we never observe a species on the way of formation. As in the present so it has been in the past. The bones and mummies of animals from the tombs of ancient Egypt and Chaldea precisely resemble living animals, and the drawings of the still earlier cave-men prove the same identity. So do the shells deposited by the River Niagara more than 30,000 years ago. The earliest remains of man also exactly resemble our own bones and skulls. The famous Neanderthal skull contains a brain as large as some of those of the modern Hindus, and the skulls of Engis, Bruniquel, and Raymonden are as highly developed as those of civilized races. Fossil man was as truly man as is the present European. Nor in going back to the far-distant tertiary ages do we find any traces of beings intermediate between man and apes. The diminutive flints of Thenay, Otta, and Puy Courney are too small and rude to be of human workmanship, and the *Pithecanthropus* of Java, if the remains all belonged to the *same* individual (which cannot be proved), must have been a real man, and must have resembled the ancient Brazilians or modern Australians. Go

back as far as we will, we always find *real men*. Such low races as the Fuegians, Veddahs, Bushmen, and Australians are as truly men as we are. They possess great capacity for improvement, many of them have been taught all the elements of civilization and education, and the languages of the Australians and Fuegians prove by their high character that they were formerly more cultured and civilized than they are now. Their degradation is owing to their present unfavourable surroundings. The talent of the Eskimo is well known, and the rude and brutal Tinné of Canada have, in favourable circumstances, become the clever and semi-civilized Navajos. There are other barriers between man and apes, such as his reason, conscience, power of progress, and mastery over nature. As to whether evolution has prevailed in the past amongst the lower animals, geology gives a doubtful answer. Some classes have progressed, and some pedigrees have been made out. On the other hand, many plants and animals have continued unchanged, and some divisions of animals have actually retrograded. Many orders appeared suddenly and died out suddenly. All this is incompatible with evolution.

D. GATH WHITLEY.

THE ANGLICAN CLAIM TO CONTINUITY

No claim is more frequently or more earnestly made for the Church of England than the claim of continuity. 'The Church of England of to-day is the old Church, continuous, catholic, sufficient, incomparable,' as one bishop expressed it at the Pan-Anglican Conference. 'In all things essential,' another speaker said, 'the Church of England is the same before and after the Reformation.' But the claim will not bear investigation.

Two Churches, holding the same doctrines and both possessed of valid orders, existing not only side by side and contemporaneously, but also in succession, on the same ground, and owning and using in succession the same properties and edifices, may be two totally distinct organizations. The present Greek and Armenian Churches may be cited as two cases in point. In doctrine and in orders there is not a pin to choose

between them. Yet if any two bodies of men were ever separate and distinct from one another, they are the Greek and Armenian Churches. And what is possible of two contemporaneous Churches is *a fortiori* possible of two existing in different centuries. Even, therefore, could we thrust out of reckoning the charge of 'abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God and most damnable to man,' which the Church of England makes against the whole of pre-Reformation Christendom, England included, 'for the space of eight hundred years and more,' or could we regard as of no account the paragraph on Transubstantiation in Art. XXVIII; and could we, respecting other points of doctrine, assert with truth the absolute identity of what was held of old and what is held now, even this, together with valid orders, would not make the present Anglican Church identical with the pre-Reformation Church, nor a continuation of it. The doctrine of the two might be identical, though in fact it is not; the succession of bishops may be unbroken; the Communion service may be nothing more nor less than the old Sarum mass (though nobody thought it so in the sixteenth century); we may be the legalized heirs of the men who built our old cathedrals and parish churches; but nevertheless, the present Church of England may not be the Church so called in Magna Charta; the Church of Parker and Davidson may only be a continuation of the Church of Augustine and Warham, as Joseph Wilmot was a 'continuation' of Henry Dunbar in Miss Braddon's novel.

A Church is not a mob. It is a society, or company of men, organized and united for some purpose by some arbitrary and external bond of union. A man may be a vegetarian in principle and practice, yet not belong to the Piccadilly Vegetarian Society. One may also belong to that Society without being a vegetarian either in practice or in principle. So a man may be a Catholic or a Protestant in principle, without belonging to either Catholic or Protestant Church. But a man is not, properly speaking, a Catholic or a Protestant, with a big P or C, unless he is such in principle, and belongs to *the* Church, or to *a* Church, which professes Catholic or Protestant principles, and is true to its profession. Given the men and the principles, then, how do they form a Church? Twelve vegetarians by their vegetarian principles and practices alone do not form a vegetarian society. So twelve million Protestants or Catholics do not, by their Protestant or Catholic professions

only, form a Protestant or a Catholic Church. There is needed besides, an organization, a government, and a personal centre of unity to which the whole body may hang. And each of these three must be, from the nature of the case, in any one society, numerically one. Two societies or Churches may exist, contemporaneously or successively, with organizations, governments, and centres of unity, exactly alike. But because they are alike and not identical, the societies are two, not one. The prime test, of course, is the centre of unity. But a secondary test is the personnel of the government and its officers. Between these and the members there is a relationship of rule and subordination in matters for which the society exists. That relationship may be strained without being broken. But if it is strained to the breaking point, the member with the broken relationship ceases to be a member of the society. And whether the breakage is the act of the chairman, president, or whatever the head may be called, or of the member, it is clear that the member, not the head, goes out; for the head, so long as he is head, carries the society with him. If he did not, he would cease to be head. And if the outgoing member with a number of followers sets up another head, he *ipso facto* sets up another society; and this, as repudiating the old head and setting up a new one which the old society does not recognize, is in no real sense a continuation, but a rival, of the old society.

Now, rightly or wrongly, for a thousand years before the Reformation the centre of religious unity for every individual Englishman, for every bishop of every English diocese, for the *Ecclesia Anglicana* as a whole, was not the King of England but the Pope of Rome. Whether our ancestors thought him infallible in teaching, absolute in authority, and endowed with universal and plenary jurisdiction, or how far their views of his position and office fell short of those expressed by the Vatican Council, is all beside the question. One thing is certain, they accounted him Vicar of Christ in a very unique sense, and the visible head of the one and only Church of Christ they knew on earth. This fact is demonstrated by the legislation of two or three centuries hostile to various papal claims of a non-purely religious kind, as well as by countless declarations, still extant, of kings, lawyers, clerics and laymen during the thousand years. Kings, clergy, and laity complained at times, as well they might, of the greed and rapacity of the Popes and

their minions. But their very complaints, and sometimes angry defiance, are proofs that they recognized the authority so atrociously misused.

In other words, the pre-Reformation Church of England was not a self-contained Church. It recognized the authority of a centre of union outside its own borders. King John might fume as he liked, and with some reason; but with all his fuming, a 'foreign priest did tithe and toll in his dominions.' The English Church was one of many national Churches which acknowledged, as the others do to this day, in spiritual matters, one common centre of unity, the Bishop of Rome. On the contrary, our present Church of England is self-contained. It holds to no centre of unity outside itself on earth. It is out of communion with, and has actually 'forsaken,' or been forsaken by, 'the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany,' and 'suchlike' (Canon XXX). It does not form part of any organization greater than itself, including those ancient Churches; and if it claims to be one of three great 'branches'—Anglican, Greek and Roman—of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, the other two 'branches' absolutely repudiate the connexion.

There are two documents which, read together, pulverize the 'high-church' theory of continuity. The one is the *Decretum Unionis Graecorum* of the Council of Florence (A.D. 1439-1445), and the other is the Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. c. 1). Greeks and Latins at the Council of Florence defined 'that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and that the said Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter the Chief of the Apostles, and is the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians: and that to him in Blessed Peter was bestowed by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of shepherding, ruling, and governing the universal Church.' Now, the Council of Florence was dealing in this decree with purely religious and not with temporal or political matters. And in purely religious matters all members of the Church of England were individually and collectively shepherded, ruled, and governed by the Pope up to the time of Henry VIII. The Council expressed for the Greeks the principles which the Church of England had acted on during the whole of its history. The records of the country have been ransacked to make out a case for the contrary, but in vain.

At length the time came, however, when England, as a whole, ceased to be shepherded, ruled, and governed in spiritual matters by the Pope. Whether it went out, or whether it was driven out, of the larger communion which still held the Pope for its head, is not pertinent to our present inquiry. Whichever way it was, another head or 'supreme governor' was imposed upon the 'Church of England,' and consequently by every rule of logic this 'Church of England' which consented to be shepherded, ruled, and governed by the new 'supreme governor' or 'governess,' formed a new society, which was not a continuation, but a rival, to the old. We may pass by the doings and undoings of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary, and come then to the Act of Elizabeth, by which the present Church of England stands. This act was called 'An Act to restore to the Crown the Ancient Jurisdiction over the Estate Ecclesiastical and Spiritual,' &c. It is very questionable whether the word 'restore' and the word 'ancient' are not used in this title to convey a *suggestio falsi*. The jurisdiction conferred by this Act of Queen Elizabeth had never been claimed for any monarch of England before Henry VIII, and was, therefore, scarcely 'ancient' in the usual meaning of the word. However, 'All usurped and foreign power, and authority spiritual and temporal' was to be 'clearly extinguished' within this realm: 'no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate, Spiritual or Temporal' (in short, the Pope) was to 'use, enjoy, or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, &c., &c., spiritual or temporal,' . . . but the same were to be 'clearly abolished.' It was also 'established and enacted' 'that such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Power or Authority hath heretofore been, or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the Ecclesiastical State or Persons, and for Reformation, Order, and Correction of the same, and of all manner of Errors, Heresies, Schisms, Abuses, Offences, Contempts and Enormities, shall for ever by Authority of this Parliament be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm.' Power is given to the Queen and her heirs to 'assign, name, and authorize persons to exercise, use, occupy and execute under [her] Highness, &c., all manner of Jurisdictions, Privileges, and Pre-eminences, In any wise touching any Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, within these realms.' And further, 'That all and every Archbishop,

Bishop,' and certain other officials, were to take an oath to this 'tenor and effect,' and to 'utterly renounce and forsake all foreign Jurisdictions, Powers,' &c., &c. Thus the Act and the oath contradict and repudiate the decree of the Council of Florence. They attribute to the Crown of this realm, by authority of Parliament, what the Council attributed to the Pope, by alleged authority of Jesus Christ, namely the office of shepherding, ruling, and governing the Church, i. e. for reformation, order and correction of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, and the rest. In other words, they inaugurated a new society or Church, the members of which could not be members of the old, because the 'supreme governor' of the new was a rival to the supreme governor of the old. It is well known that Elizabeth herself freely admitted the fact.

Now, this plain consideration simply puts out of court the elaborate arguments of several bishops in the publications of the Church Historical Society, and, amongst others, of the Rev. F. W. Puller in *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*. If St. Cyprian and St. Meletius were, as Mr. Puller opines, out of communion with the See of Rome, and if they were right in their opposition to papal interference, on the ground that communion with Rome was one thing and communion with the Catholic Church quite another, then the ancient British, Scottish and English pre-Reformation Churches were hopelessly in the wrong. Writing of King Oswy, St. Bede says : 'Oswy, though educated by the Scots, perfectly understood that the Roman was the Catholic and Apostolic Church' (*Eccl. Hist.* iii. 29). And what Oswy knew, or thought he knew, the whole pre-Reformation Church believed. The precise amount of obedience our forefathers rendered to the Pope, the exact prerogatives they attributed to him, we need not pause to define. But of their spiritual allegiance to him, as testified by the toilsome journeys made by archbishop after archbishop to Rome in order to receive the pallium from his hands, and as testified by their payments in hard cash, both in honourable and in dishonourable cases, the whole of our ecclesiastical history, with the insignificant exception of the Lollard episode, speaks with one unanimous voice. The Church of this island was as 'Roman' as the Churches of what Mr. Puller delights to call the 'suburbicarian' provinces. And contrariwise, the present Church of England is anti-Roman. It may be 'Catholic,' it may be 'Protestant'; it is not itself quite certain which

it is; but it has no doubt about its being anti-Roman. The one sole dogma professed with absolute unanimity by every school of thought in the present Church of England is, that 'The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.' 'No jurisdiction:' not even that which Mr. Puller allows that he had in the 'suburbicarian' Churches in the time of St. Cyprian.

Then why not frankly abandon this continuity theory? Those who maintain it throw away the strongest defence which can be made for the Church of England from a spiritual point of view. What they offer is at best a defence against hostile politicians of the Church's right to the use or usufruct of certain lands and buildings. To an inquirer who cares nothing for these, but is seeking the means of living both a public and a private, a corporate as well as a personal, religious life, and is comparing the Church with either Romanism or Dissent, the continuity theory is a hollow mockery. What we have to allow, and what we have to justify, to such an inquirer is the fact of discontinuity. The old Church—not all its doctrine, nor all its religious practices, but the Church itself, as an organized and papally governed society—had become intolerable and impossible, religiously and politically; and Elizabeth's Church was the very best substitute which the sixteenth century could produce. The English Reformation, then, was not a mere washing of the face, but the substitution of a new and better looking face for an old and ugly one. And if this substitution is an incontrovertible fact of history, and if the substitution can be defended and justified up to the hilt, what honest purpose can be served by calling it in question?

A. B. CRANE.

Recent Literature

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL

The Sayings of Jesus. No. II of 'New Testament Studies.' By Prof. Adolf Harnack, of Berlin University. (Williams & Norgate. Crown Theological Library. 6s.)

THIS second instalment in English of Prof. Harnack's 'Studies' comes to us, like the first and the third, from the pen of the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson. Of the translator's work we need only say that it reads like an original, and will represent the famous author's researches to a large and appreciative public in this country. There are many of us who love nearly everything about Germany except her language, which never becomes, like French, a pleasure to read; and there are great numbers more who can only read Harnack in English, to whom it would be little less than disastrous to be unable to learn from the most influential theologian now living. Our gratitude to Mr. Wilkinson is only tempered by the carelessness of the proof-reading: the Greek in particular shows blunders which no work of scholarship should admit.

To deal with so important a book as this of Harnack's in a brief review is of course quite impossible: we can do little more than indicate its subject. The general relations of our first three Gospels are in these days happily no more a question of serious difference between scholars of any parts. That St. Mark is one fundamental source of our First and Third Gospels is universally admitted; nor is there much less certainty as to their other main source, a collection of the sayings of Jesus, with a minimum of narrative, which had been translated into Greek before it reached the canonical evangelists. This lost document, now generally known by the convenient symbol Q, forms the subject of the present study. Harnack endeavours to reconstruct its text by minute criticism of its derivatives in Matthew and Luke: he discusses its order and

contents, its date and historical trustworthiness. His conclusion that St. Luke is constantly making stylistic alterations, and that (except for certain points of importance in which the first evangelist has treated the text freely) we are generally to find the original form in Matthew, is, we venture to think, pressed much too far. Many a time it seems that a much better case might be made out for the reverse conclusion. We cannot discuss the matter here. That Matthew and Luke are completely independent in their use of Q is a welcome observation (p. 172). Christian apologetic has much to gain from the established results of synoptic criticism; nor is it the least important fact of our new knowledge that we can confidently assign what is common to these two Gospels to a document of the highest antiquity, which can be trusted to give us a fresh and accurate account of the words of the supreme Teacher. Many will read with great satisfaction the severe criticisms which Harnack passes on brilliant men of imagination, who have brought discredit on biblical criticism by their lawless subjectivity. Dr. Harnack starts from presuppositions widely differing in momentous matters from our own; and his testimony is the more valuable when he insists on the value of our evidence that Jesus called Himself 'the Son,' and actually used words which in their Matthaean form (xi. 27) involve a Christology that 'approached very nearly to that of the Johanne writings in one of the most important points' (p. 303). But we need make no more selections. That Dr. Harnack has with any certainty reconstructed the very words of the lost Q we may seriously doubt. But his contribution to this great task is one which no inferior scholar could have produced at all; and its suggestiveness and acumen will make the study of the book most profitable to all who seek to get nearer to the original words of Him who spake as no other man.

The Old Testament in Greek. Larger Edition, with Critical Apparatus. Edited by Alan E. Brooke, B.D., and Norman McLean, M.A. Vol. I. part ii. (Exodus and Leviticus). (Cambridge University Press, 1909. 12s. 6d. net.)

It is some three years since the publication of the first part of the monumental Cambridge Septuagint, on which Messrs. Brooke and McLean have patiently laboured through the best part of a score of years; and we have now a second instalment,

which brings the work down to the end of Leviticus—less than a tenth of the whole Septuagint. It would be difficult to conceive a task of biblical scholarship that claims more unstinted gratitude from the student world. Men of great learning and acumen have given a large part of their lives to the task of collating MSS. of the Greek Old Testament, and they record the results of their toil in volumes which put before us all the known evidence from which anything can be expected. It is purely preliminary labour: the interesting work of constructing a resultant text is denied them, though whenever the editor comes—if ever, we might almost say!—he will depend entirely on their materials. How much longer these industrious and self-effacing scholars will be content to work on thus for posterity we cannot tell: to the ordinary student the compiling of these crowded pages suggests a kind of penal servitude from which the Cambridge editors have fairly earned their release—if they can get some one to relieve them! Meanwhile, they have produced a book of guileless workmanship, which few but themselves can criticize; and it is unlikely enough that any student of the Septuagint for many generations to come will dispense with their help or ask for any other of the kind. The new part differs from its predecessor only in the addition of a few more authorities to the apparatus, and in the convenient innovation of printing New Testament quotations in full at the beginning of the notes on the verse or verses from which they are derived.

Studies in Mystical Religion. By Prof. Rufus M. Jones. (Macmillan & Co. 12s. net.)

The Mystical Elements of Religion. By Baron Friedrich von Hügel. Two vols. (J. M. Dent & Co. 21s. net.)

The two works which we have placed at the head of this review are strangely dissimilar. One is by a professor in an American college of Friends, Haverford College. The other is by a learned cosmopolitan German, well known in Cambridge and London as one of the ablest supporters of reasonable Modernism in the Roman Church. The one is as lucid in its style as the other is obscure. Their methods also are unlike. The Baron groups his discussion round the life and times of a Mystic but little known to Protestants, however

scholarly, Saint Catherine of Genoa. The Professor sweeps down the ages from the Greek philosophers to the rise of the Quakers in the seventeenth century, noting in its historical order the different manifestations of the Mystic spirit, but strangely ignoring St. Bernard and the Mystics of the school of St. Victor, and scarcely doing justice to the mediaeval prophetesses. Both works are signs of the times. As a result of the attacks of Higher Criticism on the one hand, and of materialism on the other upon the current orthodoxy, we see a return in many directions to Mysticism, as we shall also see a return, unless we are much mistaken, within the next few years, to Dogmatism. Both the Mysticism and the Dogmatism are the different result of one and the same movement of thought. The lessened value of the authority of a book leads some to find the sources of authority in an inner experience or illumination, and drives others to the dogmas of an authoritative Church. Now of these two tendencies the Quaker and the Romanist are the most perfect types. In our judgement their 'hour' lies in the near future; though probably in the case of the Quakers it will not be the organization which will reap the numerical gains of this deeper current of thought. To the true Mystic, organization, or the interests of the organization, can never loom large.

But to return to our volumes. For several years we have been honoured by knowing Baron von Hügel. Only those who have met him in the social circle and heard his wonderful deliverances on every topic of religion and ethics can have any idea of the fascination of his vast learning, breadth of sympathy, and subtle sparkling criticism. To listen to the Baron is to listen to one who has explored the depths of thought. But for those who have never had the privilege of knowing Baron von Hügel, we fear that his great work will be somewhat disappointing. It is evident from the style that the Baron thinks in German, or in an English which too often assumes a German form. Hence a certain heaviness and obscurity which will deter all but the serious student. Here is no book that one can read with his feet on the fender, or under the summer suns; rather is it a hard mental strain. But for those who will persevere to the end there is much gold. In Catherine of Genoa herself the reader will not probably be so much interested as in the critical study of the mystical elements of religion, to which the second volume is devoted, and to

which, in fact, the picture of St. Catherine's life and teaching in the first volume is but an introduction. Suffice that this second volume cannot be ignored by any student of Mysticism, for in it we have the acute criticisms of a singularly acute mind upon most of the phases of mystical religion and their modern explanations. But we must warn our readers that the Baron never tempers the wind to the shorn lamb.

But this is precisely the charm of Prof. Rufus Jones. His work is both deep and clear. Dr. Jones, it is true, has an advantage over the Baron. Dr. Jones has only to maintain the faith of which he is one of the most illustrious exponents; but Baron von Hügel, as a cultured Romanist, is constantly thrown upon the defensive, and defence, however successful, is never as persuasive as 'singleness' of vision. In Dr. Jones's *Studies in Mystical Religion* we have the most important general work on mysticism since Dr. Inge's Bampton Lecture. But the work is by no means complete. In another volume Dr. Jones intends to deal with the rise of the Friends. But his historical survey of the mystical elements in religion from the first century to the sixteenth will probably attract a larger circle of readers, if only because of its width of outlook. The section in it on the Friends of God is of special value.

The Inner Light. By Arnold R. Whately, M.A., D.D.
(Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 6s.)

As the title suggests, the essay leans towards Mysticism, but of the philosophic, and not the ecstatic, order. The conclusions are all that can be desired, an omnipotent God and a real human soul, neither abstract monism nor rank pluralism, free will, immortality, revelation. That is what many wish to justify. How is it to be established?

Dr. Whately claims that the knowledge of God is immediate, but he will not start from the abstract idea, but from the concrete, and, therefore, posits provisionally: 'The Christian Idea of God and the Universe,' 'not as a good idea but as an experience.' Still further, since such an experience is *ex hypothesi* a final view of reality, it includes all others, and, therefore, stands unless disproved; although elsewhere he states that if this idea can be brought into relation with the rest of experience and thought . . . it is then justified as valid.' The common fault of the intuitionists is that they deal with their primary intuition after the manner of a Chinese

nest-box, and either draw out or put back into it an amazing number of other boxes. Of course an intuition is merely asserted. It carries only individual conviction, and is capable neither of proof nor disproof, but to include within, or obtain from, an intuitive experience the developed product of Christian thought, is an attempt not likely to receive sympathetic consideration. Whilst many will be inclined to grant that it is characteristic of the religious consciousness that it claims an immediate experience of a relation to another than, and higher than, self, few will care to posit even provisionally what Dr. Whately does, and on account of rebutting criticism which, from the brevity of the essay, dismisses rather than disproves other views, to allow it to stand.

The argument runs smoothly, but it glides over the jolts. Dr. Whately does not disarm his difficulties. He prevents them from clashing by tying them up out of reach of one another. For example, he recognizes in the religious consciousness 'a twofold revelation of God.' On the one hand the individual knows his unity with God, and God's distinctness from the world; on the other, God's unity with the world and distinctness from Himself. Thus the antinomies of human freedom and divine providence, God in the world and in the soul, God for the world and for the soul, instead of conflicting are placed on 'parallel lines of ultimate reciprocity,' not contradictory but correlative. This is convenient, but not very convincing. Parallel lines never meet; antinomies are not solved by driving a wedge between them to split them apart, and we cannot accept as a solution what looks like despair of ever finding one.

In the criticism of philosophy, disagreement with conclusions does not debar pleasure and profit from their study, and both may be gained from Dr. Whately's essay. Its ability is evident, its spirit is excellent, and it abounds in clear and clean thought. Without endorsing the whole argument, the results, nevertheless, are those of a sound instinct, and although by a different process, it will not be upon different lines that they will ever be satisfactorily attained.

The Ethics of the Christian Life. By Dr. Theodor von Haering. Translated by James S. Hill, B.D., Rector of Stowey. (Williams & Norgate. 10s. 6d.)

Dr. von Haering succeeded to the chair of Ritschl at Göttingen in 1889, but after six years' service returned to Tübingen,

where he occupies the chair of Dogmatics and Ethics. This is the first of his books to be translated into English; and though the translation is sometimes rather awkward, the matter is substantial, wide in its range, and full of reference to current topics. The method adopted is to prepare the way by an examination of the fundamental concepts of ethics, and to show how in other systems of thought than the Christian those concepts are emptied of their value. Christian ethics is then presented as a coherent system, due attention being given to the forms it assumes respectively in Roman and in Evangelical circles. The supreme good is set forth as the establishment of the kingdom of God, which is viewed as a moral condition, not to be identified with, though eventually taking upon itself the form of, an external and organized community. Hence the practical law of duty becomes that of love to God and our neighbour after the example of Christ, who is viewed as being in one and the same person 'the historic Christ and the glorified Saviour,' and who 'not only points out the goal, the way, and the source of power, but is Himself all these things.' The new life is then treated, only briefly in the case of the individual, and with an artificial and unconvincing classification of the virtues, which in consistency ought to be arranged according to the results of a psychological study of the postulated Standard. On Christian life in society the author expands, filling nearly a third of a long, but not too long, book with such details or perplexities of duty as are occupying at present the minds of many men.

The treatise is adequate in scope, and a fair and on the whole successful attempt to exhibit Christ as the centre of all ethical relations. In dogmatics the writer is much nearer the Methodist view than he thinks or knows. His translator points in a note to a defect in one curious generalization. Similar notes might have been added with advantage to the allegation that Methodism undervalues infant baptism, and to the travesty which represents assurance as faith in one's own conversion instead of in the cross of Christ. A discipline in Methodist teaching would help the author to avoid the further confusion of describing repentance in one place as a change of mind and in another as a change of will, and of equating it with conversion, which in turn is equated with sanctification.

In the final chapter the author introduces an unusual variety of themes. From marriage and the family he passes to in-

dustry and art, to the State and the Church, each item in its subdivisions including matters of pressing interest. There are good pages on the ethical aspects of various political and economic theories, on the relation of Christianity to colonization and its schemes, to aesthetics, to recreation and sport. An unsatisfactory distinction between church and sect is based upon the relation of each to an established institution in a country. Much better is the ethical illumination cast upon the problems of a separated ministry, of a recognized form of service, of synodal authority and administration. The light may not all come directly from the gracious Example, who is the end and inspiration of Christian morality; but the effect upon the reader will be to help him to a defensible conclusion.

Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels. By Dom John Chapman, O.S.B. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1908. 16s. net.)

The Vulgate as approved by the Council of Trent and the Vulgate (New Testament) as issued by Jerome about 383 A.D. are not quite the same thing. The former interests few outside the Roman communion, but the latter deserves the careful attention of all who care for textual criticism. It is true that it is but a revision of an Old-Latin text, and that the Old-Latin texts, being Western in character, are viewed either with interest or with suspicion or with both, but seldom as the preservers of the right reading against other authorities. But, in order to effect his revision, Jerome employed a Greek manuscript like the Greek Sinaiticus in character, and at least as old. In his opinion that was the best type of Greek manuscript in existence, and his opinion was that of the greatest biblical scholar of Latin race, to whom all types of text were accessible. It confirms our respect for him that this should also be the view of modern scholars.

Bishop Wordsworth and Prof. White have, on the basis of accurate collations of about forty old manuscripts, recovered for us what is practically the text of the Gospels and Acts as Jerome himself issued it. The variants between the text thus recovered and the official Sixto-Clementine Vulgate have been made accessible to all by Dr. Nestle in his cheap, yet accurate, edition of the latter. Dom Chapman, of Erdington Abbey, Birmingham, whose studies have previously lain more in the

direction of the Greek text and the Old-Latin authorities, has in this luxurious work endeavoured to recreate the history of the transmission of some of our best manuscripts of the Vulgate. He takes us to South Italy, South France, Northumbria and Canterbury, following the clues given him by notes contained in these manuscripts, and with wonderful learning and ingenuity attains his results. He has not himself examined manuscripts, but starting from the assumption that Wordsworth and White have actually recovered Jerome's text, he endeavours to explain how the manuscripts especially followed by them come to contain as good a text as they do. It seems a pity that he did not examine one or two very old MSS. of Italian provenance, with the view of testing the correctness of Wordsworth and White's conclusions. We must not be too quick to regard the question as closed. Perhaps Dom Chapman's *confrères*, to whom the Pope has delegated the revision of the official Vulgate, may attain to a text even better than the Oxford Vulgate.

But though this part of the book may be regarded as not leading with certainty to all the desired conclusions, there cannot be two opinions as to the value of the rest. Even there the non-consultation of manuscripts has hindered perfection, but the chapters on 'The Irish Text of the Vulgate Gospels,' 'The Vulgate Text of St. Gregory the Great,' 'The Four Prologues: their Text and their Meaning,' &c., are of the highest value. Dom Chapman has proved satisfactorily that the prologues found in MSS. of the Vulgate are the work of the heretic Priscillian. He has studied their language, translated them and written their history with unexampled fullness. We wish that he had given us studies of the Gospel quotations in some other Italian writers than Gregory, such as Leo the Great. It is most desirable that a full account should be taken of the form of quotations in post-Vulgate, especially Italian, writers, but of them we must first have critical editions, otherwise the work will be practically wasted. The fluctuations in the use of Old-Latin and Vulgate in writers down to the ninth century is a great subject, which may yet be treated with the fullness and exactness desirable. Meantime, we must thank Dom Chapman for the example he has set. Not only students of the Vulgate, but all who care for the history of the use of the Scriptures in our own country should read and re-read this interesting work.

Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible. By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D. (Frowde. 3s. net.)

These lectures were delivered in connexion with the Trust founded in 1907 in memory of Mr. Leopold Schweich of Paris. £10,000 was handed over to the British Academy for 'the furtherance of research in the archaeology, art, history, languages and literature of ancient civilization with reference to biblical study.' Dr. Driver was fitly chosen as the first lecturer. His subject appeals to all Bible students, and is treated in a way that will interest the general reader quite as much as the expert. The free use of illustrations also adds greatly to the value of the book.

The Christian Doctrine of God. By W. N. Clarke, D.D. (T. & T. Clark. 10s. 6d.)

Dr. W. N. Clarke needs no introduction to theological students on this side of the Atlantic. His handbook is widely circulated amongst them, and deservedly popular; and they will welcome this elaborate and careful, if too diffuse and in some minor points ill-judged, treatise. The author's aim is confined strictly to the presentation of the conception of God that is characteristic of the Christian religion. In Jesus Christ he finds the light of that knowledge, and he hesitates nowhere in the assurance that such light is true and satisfying, worthy of all acceptation. His method is to avoid any reference to the past, as well as the expression of any anticipation of future developments, and to set forth in detail what he thinks to be the prevalent view of God within Christendom, without any citation of particular opinions or discussion of divergent views. Controversy is eschewed altogether. And the result is a very valuable book which, notwithstanding its length, should be used by the student as an introduction to further study or as a convenient summary.

In respect to arrangement Dr. Clarke adopts an order which he considers to be that of religion rather than of philosophy or of science. The apologetic section closes the inquiry, that to which the evidences point being examined before any valuation is made of the evidences themselves. Hence, after enumerating the sources from which the present Christian knowledge of God is derived, our author divides his book into four parts. The

moral attributes of God are discussed in the first, with a wise insistency upon His unity in character. The second is concerned with His relations to men, the third with the so-called natural attributes. The fourth turns to evidences and objections. Incidentally, such positions as those of the pantheist and the agnostic are assailed; but Dr. Clarke carries out his intention with some severity not to be diverted from constructive work by any prolonged offensive action. He builds up a massive and lordly structure, although it pleases him to place the foundations last; and the structure is left in its completeness for comparison by observers with any rival view. That theism both holds the field at present and is gaining ground as the necessary postulate of a working theory of life or duty, is almost beyond question; and there are increasing signs of the spread of the belief that of theistic faiths the Christian is the best type.

At several points in the author's discussion of a wide range of topics the reader will be tempted to ask questions. There is a fine section on immanence, in which its difference from omnipresence is traced; but one wants to know how also it is related to the two varieties of indwelling, of which one alone can be said to be normal to man. The economical Trinity is asserted, though resolved into a kind of functional modalism; and the Christian view requires something more to be said, unless some of the conceivable relations of God are to be left out of consideration. The old arguments for the Divine existence are classed as venerable and retiring; yet the author does little more than recast and group them, and has in reality no new argument to bring forward. The discussion of the existence of pain and evil is helpful, but might have been carried further into the depths of God's purpose and of man's moral condition. The method also, though deliberately chosen, has its disadvantages, and is not without defects. The Christian view is based upon New Testament teaching, regarded as authoritative, far more intrinsically than would be inferred from the paucity of scriptural quotations. Not only is there no bibliography, but the honour of specific reference is conferred upon Paley alone. Yet the book is full of interest, is fresh and modern, a timely tribute to the importance of theology and to the central place in religious thought of Jesus Christ as the Revealer of God.

Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought. The Place of the Old Testament Documents in the Life of To-day.

By Dr. W. G. Jordan, Professor of Hebrew, &c., Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. (T. & T. Clark. 7s. 6d. net.)

Amid all the volumes on religion which ceaselessly pour forth from the modern press, it would be difficult indeed to name one more valuable and timely than this. It combines at once the supreme estimate of the value of truth which distinguishes the scholar, with sympathy for non-critical readers, and its expression in a manner of writing which is as fascinating as lucid. The stand taken is as brave, in face of the still existing fears and hates of some sections of modern Christianity, as it is reverent and cautious when confronting the critical tendencies of certain extremists. 'It is no use,' affirms the author, 'attempting to minimize the difference between the traditional view and the critical treatment of the Old Testament. The difference is immense: they involve different conceptions of the relation of God to the world, different views as to the course of Israel's history, the process of revelation, and the nature of inspiration.' This, beyond all intelligent controversy, is the situation which has to be faced by the evangelical Churches to-day, and no amount of zeal in mission work, or emphasis upon Christian experience, will avail to mask it. Only two things need or can be here added. First, that mere superficial railing at the Higher Criticism comes directly within the scope of Gamaliel's warning in Acts v. 39, because, as Dr. Jordan says, 'By modern thought we mean not any wild speculation or temporary fads, but the great, ever-broadening current of human knowledge which comes to us from God through the toil of faithful men.' To fight against that is as irreligious as it is irrational. Secondly, it is equally foolish, because 'Changes thus made at the demand of intellectual honesty turn out to be in the interest of the highest faith.' In days gone by the Bible has been much read and little studied. To-day the reverse is the case. The Bible is more studied and less read than ever before. It does not require much acumen to perceive what must be the issue of this tendency. Unless some such guidance as the Eunuch sought from Philip is forthcoming, the Old Testament will become a sealed book to the modern man. Happily such helps are now appearing from

many writers equally devout and scholarly. Amongst them all no work merits higher recommendation to the reader of average intelligence and sincerity than this issue of Dr. Jordan.

The Pauline Epistles. By the Rev. R. Scott, M.A., D.D.
(T. & T. Clark. 6s. net.)

Dr. Scott's volume on the Pauline Epistles gives evidence of careful and laborious work. He has raised a number of questions which are of perennial interest, and he is likely to accomplish at least as much as this—he will set us to verify our conclusions with reference to the many questions which gather round the one name 'Paul.' Mr. Scott's own conclusions are, to say the least, subversive. If he is correct, what we have looked upon as 'data' in these writings are far from deserving such a name, and the findings of great and revered scholars will have to be relegated to the category of exploded theories. Dr. Scott allows as Paul's own work only the following: 1 Cor. (except xv. 20–34), 2 Cor. (except vi. 14, vii. 1, and xiii. 11–34), Romans i.–xi. and xvi., Galatians and Ephesians. All the rest, together with other New Testament writings not usually held to be 'Pauline,' such as Hebrews, 1 Peter, Matthew, and Mark, he holds to be 'Pauline' only in this—that they belong to a school to which that name may be given as expressive of 'Pauline' doctrine, but 'only in a second degree.' Thus a second group, consisting of Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 Thess. iv.–v., 2 Thess. i.–ii., Romans xii. xiii. xv., 1 Cor. xv. 20–34, 2 Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1, the Gospel of Matthew in its final editing, and perhaps slight elements in Acts, are all ascribed to Silas. 1 Thess. i.–iii., 2 Thess. iii., Colossians, Philemon, Romans xiv., and the final editorship of Mark's Gospel are by Timothy, while the Pastorals, together with Romans xvi. 25–27, are by Luke.

We confess that the arguments put forward to sustain these, and other startling hypotheses, seem somewhat slight. The well-known theory of four groups of Epistles, indicating stages of development in the thought of the apostle, is dismissed as being 'at variance with the probabilities of natural evolution; and if it were not unreal, it would compromise the authority of the man who was the victim of changes so marked.' It is impossible in a brief notice to enter into any controversy with the author, but, as indicative of the kind of 'argument' frequent in these pages, we may notice that Galatians is said to belong to the period of the Captivity, because the words, 'I

bear branded in my body the marks,' &c. (vi. 17), 'seem most natural if the weight of the chain was in the apostle's mind,' and 'the tenderness of the closing verses are most intelligible if we suppose that he was now a prisoner.' So, also, the salutations in Romans xvi. 'are now generally supposed to have been addressed to Ephesus. Such a multitude of salutations could not have been dispatched to an unknown place.' We may not multiply such examples of 'criticism.' To us it seems a pity that so much scholarship and unquestioned diligence should have gone so far astray. As we have said above, the volume has its value in driving the New Testament student to verify conclusions which are often too easily accepted. That is always an advantage. But we do not consider that this work will persuade many to alter them.

The Ideal of the Material Life. By S. E. Keeble. (Culley. 2s. 6d. net.)

This volume of sermons is what might be expected from the founder of the Union for Social Service. They all deal with aspects of social well-being; and they unite the sympathy of the Christian disciple with the knowledge and training of the economist. The result is what is for the most part a very fine setting of the doctrine of social responsibility, as applied to all classes and conditions of men. We hear so much to-day from a certain class of preacher to the effect that 'the rich in the lump are bad,' and that the only people worth considering are the poor; and therefore it is a relief to hear the many-sided responsibilities of social existence insisted upon without playing off class against class. The earlier chapters are a fine apologia for commercial life; and one would be glad to think of their being read by the constituency most needing them—the young men and women in our great business houses, who are so tempted to sordid and low views of their calling. The book is extremely fair, and the judgements on the whole are well balanced. The writer's passionate sympathy with the victims of social injustice does not make him bitter or violent—unless it be against the 'idle who feast' in face of 'the industrious who starve'; and few of us would dissent from his indictment on this issue. We are surprised to find him taking quite such a strong position of antipathy to Roman law as a malignant influence upon social well-being in England; and one cannot help feeling that much might be said upon the other side.

Century Bible Handbooks. *Christian Ethics*. By R. Mackintosh, M.A., D.D. *Old Testament History*. By W. H. Bennett, D.D. Jack. 6d. net.)

That a complete system of ethics should be compressed into a handbook of less than 200 small pages would seem to be impossible. By dint of severe reticence and brevity Dr. Mackintosh has accomplished the task. Brevity does not in this case mean vagueness; the teaching is definite and clear enough. The two historical and constructive sections, containing twelve chapters, are models of concise statement. The difficulty may be understood from the fact that the two chapters on Christian Duties and Virtues have to define Duty and Love, Duty and Virtue, Duty and Vocation, Division of Duties; Courage, Temperance, Wisdom = personal virtues; Justice = social virtue; Humility, Patience, Thankfulness, Joy, Fidelity = religious virtues. The Keswick theology comes in for some criticism, socialism for still more. Some deliverances are open to question; thus, 'Infant baptism, however seemly in itself, ought not to be called a sacrament.' The many references to ethical writers and theories increase the value of the work. On p. 40 'man' is a misprint for 'mass.'

Written on the basis of the critical theory, Dr. Bennett's volume ably summarizes the history from Moses to Nehemiah. The time before Moses is treated as pre-historic and uncertain. Personal and tribal history are mixed up. 'Many scholars hold that Abraham, at any rate, was a person and not merely a tribe.' About the later history greater certainty is expressed. The great prophets and kings are sympathetically sketched, although some of the judgements are off the line. Of Ahab it is said that 'the popular exponents of Christianity have exaggerated the discreditable features of his character and career, and made him out to be a monster of iniquity.'

Man: First and Last, Cave-Dweller and Christian. By George St. Clair. (F. Griffiths. 9s. net.)

The author, well and favourably known by his works on mythology, died before the revision of the work was completed. A graceful obituary note by the son says, 'The angel of death took him softly by the hand as he lay sleeping, with the proofs beside him on the bed.' There is little appearance of incompleteness in the work itself. Everything gives evidence of care in the collecting and shaping of material. The object of the

work is to essay another reconciliation of science and faith in their story of the genesis of man, or, in other words, to establish consistency between Scripture and science on the theory of the slow evolution of man. The author first discusses the Scripture account of man's creation, dwelling on the difficulties of the literal interpretation; then gives a very full account of the stages in the scientific evolution of man, and finally attempts a reconstruction of the religious doctrine on the subject. The second part is the most instructive. Here the author's scientific knowledge finds the fullest scope. The other parts, if not complete, are a contribution to a solution or alleviation of the difficulty. In all sections the spirit is excellent and the style lucid and graceful. On p. 45 *redemptorum* is a misspelling, and the *Ophites* are called a 'Christian' sect.

Light on the Advent. Illustrated. By T. Nayler. (Stock. 5s. net.)

The full title states the purport of the work. The writer holds a third Advent still future, but limits the second one in the way stated. Whether he succeeds in 'showing' this is a question to which the answer is doubtful. He seeks to prove his case by showing that the precedent signs were fulfilled, among others that of the Son of Man. But the alleged fulfilment is exceedingly vague. The illustrations of the city and temple and the particulars of the siege are the most definite parts of the work.

Man and the Bible: A Review of the Place of the Bible in Human History. By J. Allanson Picton, M.A. (Williams & Norgate, 1909. 6s. net.)

To say that this 'review' is written from the standpoint of a fervent disciple of Spinoza is to say that its attitude is utterly hostile. The purpose, relentlessly pursued, is to belittle the influence of the Bible in every field. The work consists of two parts. First, an estimate is given in six chapters of the position of the Bible in as many periods from the nineteenth century to the first. The former period, the golden age of bibliolatry, is the 'apotheosis' of the Bible as embodied in the work of the Bible Society. As we go back, the Bible is seen to be less and less a power—a most vulnerable position. Then three chapters discuss the effect of the Bible on religion, morals

and social progress, the verdict being more favourable in the first instance than in the other two. In truth, the judgements of the writer are in hopeless contradiction to one another. One half annihilates the other half. It would be easy to quote tributes of admiration to every part of Scripture which few believers could excel. Again, the language of criticism and depreciation is violent in the extreme. We do not care either to quote or discuss it. In one place we are assured that in comparison with the measureless duration of man's existence on earth 'the extent of the influence of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures has been almost infinitesimal.' On the other hand, the last sentence of the book is a paean of praise. Paul is alternately justified and condemned. On the author's position the Bible is a hopeless enigma, like his own 'review.' The work is written with undoubted ability, which makes us regret its spirit and purpose all the more. It angers and pleases in turn.

The Preacher. By Arthur S. Hoyt. (Macmillan & Co. 6s. net.)

It is by no means an easy thing to write a good book upon preaching. The whole ground, as one would think, has been so often covered, and the greatest masters of the art have brought their rare genius to its exposition. When Dale and Beecher, Stalker and Brooks, have spoken, there is not left very much which is essential to say. But Dr. Hoyt has contrived to make a suggestive contribution to a well-worn theme. His book is divided into three nearly equal parts, in which he discusses the personality of the preacher, his message, and his method. He wisely insists upon the importance of the preacher's personality, and has many good things to say of its enrichment, and its intellectual and spiritual culture. His chapters upon the authority and the aim and the contents of the message are distinctly helpful, and his consideration of the different types of preaching is suggestive. The volume is a distinct contribution to homiletical literature, it is enriched with many quotations from many sources, and is everywhere informed with a spirit which is worthy of the great theme of which it treats. Young preachers will find in it guidance, and older preachers will catch a new vision and feel a new and compelling influence.

Israel's Hope of Immortality. By Rev. C. F. Burney, D.Litt. (Clarendon Press. 2s. net.)

The four lectures here reprinted were originally delivered at Durham, and have appeared in the *Interpreter*. They contain a scholarly account of Old Testament teaching on a future life, as that is understood in the light of modern biblical criticism. The conclusions reached may disappoint some readers, who have been accustomed to find a clear revelation of immortality in such passages as Job xix. 25. But a more careful inquiry into the facts enables us to understand the progressive character of divine revelation on this important subject, and in some degree to understand the reasons for the very gradual dawn of a hope in the future life amongst the Jews. Dr. Burney's work is done in a careful, interesting, and suggestive way, and will form a useful introduction to wider study of the subject.

We welcome the appearance of a second edition of *Authority and the Light Within*, by Edward Grubb, M.A. (Jas. Clarke, 2s. net). Mr. Grubb represents what is known as 'Quaker' teaching, on its more thoughtful and scholarly sides. He solves the problem of authority in religion by finding the test of truth, not in an infallible Church, nor in an infallible Book, but in divinely guided reason or spiritual intuition. The teaching of the Society of Friends on the light within needs, he thinks, to be partly corrected, partly strengthened, in the light of modern knowledge. In a carefully reasoned argument, marked by great moderation and good sense, he pleads for a 'religion of the Spirit,' as opposed to religions of authority, which, in his view, have had their day.

With a considerable part of Mr. Grubb's views we agree. But in our opinion he does not lay sufficient stress on the authority of Christ as revealed in the New Testament. He speaks of it as differing 'not in nature, but only in degree,' from other spiritual authorities, and provides no safeguard against modern attempts to undermine the finality of the Christian religion. The 'light within' is most important for interpreting revelation; it does not possess ultimate authority.

The Bible in Modern Light. Being Part III of *The People's Religious Difficulties.* By Dr. Frank Ballard. (Robert Culley. 6d. net.)

This booklet contains nearly 200 answers given by Dr.

Ballard to questions relating to inspiration, inerrancy, Old Testament difficulties, &c. The answers may be described in the author's own words as 'rational, frank, and fair.' They reveal an earnest endeavour to understand the position of the honest inquirer, whom Dr. Ballard is well able to distinguish from the captious critic.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. An Exposition. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. (Macmillan & Co. 2s. 6d. net.)

The Dean of Westminster has republished the first part of his Commentary on this Epistle in a way that makes it accessible to all Bible readers. The price of the original work was twelve shillings; this is only half-a-crown. It represents more than ten years' labour, and is a noble unfolding of the Epistle 'which is the crown of St. Paul's writings.'

Man's Origin, Destiny, and Duty. By Hugh MacColl. (Williams & Norgate. 4s. 6d. net.)

Mr. MacColl attempts to show that the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion may be established independently of any appeal to miracles. Such doctrines he considers to be three only—the immortality of the soul, and the existence of a world of superhuman beings with One Supreme, whose will is the standard of duty. It is rather an emasculation of the Christian religion, but good as far as it goes; and in the different essays the writer makes many wise and helpful suggestions. Weak points are an elaboration of a quantitative conception of infinity, with a variety of somewhat irrelevant though interesting hypotheses. The tenth chapter contains an effective onslaught on Haeckel's style of argumentation; and two supplementary papers are respectively a defence of teleology and an examination of the nature and durability of the soul.

The Living Word. By the Rev. Elwood Worcester, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton. 6s. net.)

Dr. Worcester is well known as the founder of the Emmanuel Church Movement, but in this book he is not concerned with the spiritual healing of nervous disorders. Adopting the point of view of modern philosophic thought, he attempts to establish faith in God, with assurance as to His

relation to the soul and an adequate solution of some of the supreme problems as to immortality and the existence of evil. He founds chiefly upon Fechner and Rückert, whose wisdom was mainly Eastern in its sources; yet he has worked over the questions himself, and his book is a symptom of the spreading revolt against scientific materialism in the name of the soul. The argument is strong and simple, the language is direct and clear, and the audience in view consists of the two classes of the scientifically educated, who want for rational faith a basis of facts, and of the great company of untrained minds needing to know what can be said in behalf of a religious interpretation of the world.

The Making of Moral Manhood. By the Rev. John E. Wakerley. (Culley. 2s. 6d.)

The title of this book is attractive, and if all Brotherhood addresses are like those which the President of the Federation has given to his own men's meeting, the work will bear great fruit for England. Mr. Wakerley is familiar with the struggles and temptations of working men, he has a gospel which meets all their needs, and he knows how to win it a hearing and a right of way into the conscience and heart. There is no dull or obscure sentence here. The illustrations are effective, and the whole book is living and manly.

Studies in the Teaching of Religion, by W. Scott Palmer (Longmans, 1s. net), is an attempt to show how God may be made known to men, and how they may be helped to live the life of divine-human beings. The treatment is singularly suggestive, and we hope it will be widely read. When Christians learn 'to know and teach the self-bestowing God,' when they show their 'beliefs in His continued incarnation, His universal redemption, and the habitual inspiration of His Spirit,' the world will be eager to share their treasure.

Things New and Old, by Professor Knight (F. Griffiths, 5s. net). These Sunday addresses are full of thought and spiritual insight. That on the Power of Prayer is very beautiful; that on the Communion Service is a real help towards the charity which should reign in the hearts of all communicants. The book is full of choice and devout thinking.

Is Death the End? or Conscious Personality after Death, by a well-known writer (F. Griffiths, 3s. net). Some remark-

able personal experiences are given in this book. The writer is a strong believer in spiritualism, and is not even afraid to express his faith in Mrs. Piper, and in some stories which we feel quite unable to accept. Still, it is a very interesting study.

Bible Study. By F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock. (Elliot Stock. 2s.)

This handbook of suggestions for the study of the Bible will have great value to those whose minds have been disturbed by recent critical inquiries and suggestions, and will really tend to the settlement of thought. It covers a great deal of the field of inquiry, states the problems which scholars are attempting to solve, shows the trend of thought, indicates the position to which the writer himself has come, and urges arguments which everywhere deserve serious attention.

Messrs. Longmans publish a cheap edition of Canon C. H. Robinson's *Studies in Christian Worship* (6d. net, cloth 1s. net). Its keynote is that 'every act of worship forges a link in the chain which unites the worshipper at once to God and to his fellow men.' The neglect of praise in books of devotion is well brought out. We wish all who are tempted to neglect public worship would read these stimulating studies.

Do We Believe? by Bishop Barry (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), is a set of four lectures delivered in St. George's, Windsor. The argument for faith is very powerful, and Bishop Barry works it out in a most impressive and helpful manner.

The Acts of the Apostles, by E. M. Knox (Macmillan & Co., 3s. 6d.). Miss Knox has already given teachers two helpful sets of Bible lessons on Genesis and Exodus. The present volume covers a field still richer. Fifty lessons are mapped out, and the wealth of suggestion in Miss Knox's paragraphs will surprise those who use them.

The Witness of the Wilderness, by G. Robinson Lees (Longmans, 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Lees' account of the Bedawin and their life in the desert is the best we have seen. He has consulted Doughty's *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, and produced a really good book which teachers and preachers will find helpful in their work. Many illustrations add much to its value.

The Church of Christ. Its True Definition (R. Scott, 2s. 6d. net). These nine addresses were delivered at the Sixty-first Conference of the Evangelical Alliance. They are a call to

revert to a spiritual ministry and to rely on the Bible in spiritual work. Dean Wace contributes a catholic-spirited preface. Dr. Orr deals with the pressing question of 'The Church and the Holy Scripture.' He thinks that the Church will not make much progress while the under-valuation of Scripture lasts. The Rev. Dinsdale T. Young's subject is 'The Church's Duty in Home Evangelization,' and he has much to say which it is wise for preachers to remember.

The Mystery of Seven, by E. M. Smith (Stock, 2s. 6d.), is a study of 'silent analogies' pointed at by the 'catch-word' seven in the Bible. The writer thinks that a treasure cave is opened by such investigations.

We have not seen a more tasteful set of booklets than *The Book of Psalms*, *The Book of Proverbs*, *From Day to Day* (Culley. 1s.) They would slip into a waistcoat pocket or a lady's hand-bag, and carry a welcome message to sick-rooms. They are gems which are bound to be popular.

The God of the Bible (Stock, 2s. 6d. net) is a lady's attempt to relieve troubled minds by making the nature of God shine forth. It is well done and helpful.

Miracle and Infidelity (Stock, 1s. 6d. net) is an old doctor's thoughts about the Bible. The fulfilment of prophecy in Christ has convinced him of the truth of miracles, and he has reached, at the close of sixty years of professional life, a happy rest in the old faith. The writer's strong, simple, childlike faith will be refreshing to a host of readers.

Robert Blatchford's New Religion (Culley, 1d.) is a sermon preached at the Lyceum Theatre by the Rev. J. E. Rattenbury. Humanism borrows its good things from the gospel, but has no light for death-beds and crushing sorrows. It is a telling argument, and it is put in a style that will arrest attention.

The Credentials of the Gospel (Culley, 2s. 6d. net) is a cheap edition of Dr. Beet's Fernley Lecture with a new preface, in which reference is made to the later work of Professor Haeckel and to other books bearing on the subject. The evidence from within is supported by that drawn from the material world. Christianity is compared with other religions, and the historical argument is developed in a masterly chapter. The whole book will strengthen faith by showing the firm and broad foundation on which the Christian hope rests.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL

The History of Freedom, and other Essays. Historical Essays and Studies. Lectures on Modern History.
By Lord Acton. Edited by John Neville Figgis, M.A.,
and Reginald Vere Lawrence, M.A. (Macmillan.)

Lord Acton and his Circle. By Abbot Gasquet. (George Allen.)

IN the issue of this REVIEW for October 1906, reference was made to the remarkable character of certain articles written for various reviews by Lord Acton, and catalogued by Dr. Shaw in his 'Bibliography.' When that article was written it seemed only too likely that the valuable researches and the still more valuable judgements of this greatest of English historians would remain buried in back numbers of publications owned by those who had no consuming desire to give further publicity to utterances so inconveniently frank and so ruthlessly outspoken. Since then, however, two most capable Cambridge historical scholars have published three volumes of the lectures and essays of their great professor: and, moreover, they have enriched one of the volumes, the first on the above list, with an introduction, full of both affection and insight, which does much to make Acton's personality live before us and to explain the enormous influence he exercised on a large circle of friends and disciples. Abbot Gasquet's contribution consists largely of Acton's letters to Robert Simpson, with whom he was intimately associated in the production of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign Review*. It is partly due to this fact that the impression of Acton derived from Gasquet's pages is lacking in individuality and definiteness to any one who has read the original matter collected by the Rev. J. Neville Figgis and Mr. R. V. Lawrence. The conversation heard only at one end of a telephone is never satisfactory; and the same is true of correspondence. Further, it is probably not unjust to the Abbot to suggest that many of Acton's most characteristic

writings would be so very distasteful, on account of their free handling of things ecclesiastical, that he would not desire to give prominence to that side of his work. So we have in *Lord Acton and his Circle* the liberal but loyal Catholic, working with enthusiasm for the elevation of the standard of culture, learning, and faith among his co-religionists. It is to the other volumes that we turn to find the unsparing critic of all ecclesiastical fraud and wrong-doing, the very incarnation of candour and truth. And the two aspects are complementary, not incompatible.

The first of these volumes contains his two Bridgnorth Lectures on the History of Freedom, delivered before the Literary Society of the town which once he represented in the House of Commons, and which was near his seat at Aldenham. It is well known that Acton had projected a colossal and comprehensive History of Liberty, but had hung back, after collecting an enormous amount of material, because he could not feel assured that the last word had been spoken on the French Revolution. These two lectures may be taken as a general view of the subject which bulked so largely in his thoughts and which he hoped to set forth in detail. The Cambridge editors have, with great perception, grouped together in this volume a number of essays and articles bearing upon the conception of Freedom, from many sides. They have, so to speak, given us another '*Ring and the Book*,' the *Book* being the Bridgnorth Lectures, the *Ring*, articles on such subjects as Democracy in Europe, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Protestant Theory of Persecution—wrongly assigned by Gasquet to Simpson—Machiavelli's Prince, Döllinger's Work on the Temporal Power, Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. H. C. Lea's *History of the Inquisition*, Bryce's *American Commonwealth*, and the Vatican Council. The second volume named does not deal with so many topics of general interest, and they are more miscellaneous; but it contains his monumental article in the *Quarterly* on 'Wolsey and the Divorce of Henry VIII'; a review of the *Life of George Eliot*, for whose work he had a deep admiration, as is shown in his *Letters to Mary Gladstone*; and, last but far from least, his letters to Creighton which are so self-revealing as to his attitude to history and so uncompromising in their moral judgement, and which conclude with a two-page postscript of maxims headed 'Advice to Persons About to Write History—Don't!' The third volume contains

the Inaugural Lecture on *The Study of History*, and the Lectures given as Professor 1899-1901. A profoundly learned, ruthlessly candid, unflinchingly just historian—and a Catholic withal—dealing with such subjects as Luther, Calvin, the Huguenots, the Puritan Revolution, &c., cannot but be illuminating; and for once one feels in touch with a teacher who is not swayed by prejudice and partisanship.

It is here that the value of Acton as a teacher counts for so much. No affection for the Church of his fathers—and 'communion with Rome' was to him 'dearer than life'—restrained him from pouring out scathing criticism upon those who, in the name and for the sake of religion, had been guilty of dishonesty and tyranny. 'In judging men and things Ethics go before Dogma, Politics, or Nationality. The Ethics of History cannot be denominational.' Hence he metes out unstinted blame both to the Pope who condoned the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and to the persecuting Puritans of New England—of the historian who tried to whitewash the Pope in that matter, Acton caustically writes: 'Such things will cease to be written when men perceive that truth is the only merit that gives dignity and worth to history.'

It was this temper which he carried into his academic and literary work. In the prospectus of the *Home and Foreign Review* he announced its policy in the following words: 'It will abstain from direct theological discussion as far as external circumstances will allow; and in dealing with those mixed questions into which theology indirectly enters, its aim will be to combine devotion to the Church with discrimination and candour in the treatment of its opponents, to reconcile freedom of inquiry with implicit faith, and to discountenance what is untenable and unreal without forgetting the tenderness due to the weak, or the reverence rightly claimed for what is sacred.' Sooner or later a disposition such as this was bound to find itself in conflict with the Roman authorities. Cardinal Wiseman complained that the *Home and Foreign Review* 'grazed over the very edges of the most perilous abysses of error,' and 'habitually preferred uncatholic to catholic instincts, tendencies, and motives,' and the accusation was accurate from the point of view of the Roman *curia*. Wiseman's successors would have been disposed to assert the prerogatives of the hierarchy and try to win *éclat* for the Church by the excommunication of a scholar of Acton's standing; but, fortunately for themselves,

prudence kept them back from a course in which they would have made themselves the laughing-stock of Europe; and his diocesan, sent down to investigate, thought it prudent to give him a certificate of orthodoxy.

But there is no doubt that his attitude towards the Papacy underwent a very radical change, though—and this is one of the puzzles of the situation—his devotion to the Roman conception of religion was unimpaired thereby. There is a very marked difference between the spirit which breathes through his review of Döllinger's *Church and the Churches* and that which is manifested in the *Letters of Quirinus*, written from Rome during the Vatican Council, and in the article on the Council reprinted in the first of these volumes. Probably the struggle with Wiseman, which ended in the cessation of the *Home and Foreign Review*, began the disillusionment, which would be intensified by the Syllabus of the same year (1864), and the process would be consummated by the humiliating experiences of Papal chicanery and duplicity in regard to the Council. Döllinger's *Papacy Fables of the Middle Ages* mark the change in the position of the great German historian, and when Acton says of his friend and master that 'the ecclesiastical history of his youth went to pieces against the new criticism of 1863 and the revelation of the unknown which began on a very large scale in 1864,' he is saying what might be very truly transferred to himself. But Acton 'went to pieces' more than his master in respect of his attitude to the ecclesiastical wrongs of the past, and his later years were clouded by the discovery that Döllinger, from whom he thought he had learned his reading of history, 'was not willing to go so far in rejecting every kind of mitigating plea and with mediaeval certainty consigning the persecutors to perdition.' The very cleavage, however, is indicative of the heat of his passion against those who overrode the moral law in the supposed interests of religion.

In short, these volumes may be earnestly commended to those who would fain develop an historic sense permeated with moral values. Acton is never easy reading because of his allusiveness, but he cannot fail to be an inspiration to all who are willing to sit at his feet. They will learn from him to 'judge not according to the orthodox standard of a system religious, philosophical, political; but according as things promote or fail to promote the delicacy, integrity, and authority of

Conscience.' Under his guidance historical study will be no barren task, no weary piling up of information: it will be, rather, a preacher of patience, a champion of tolerance, and an avenger of innocent blood.

Notes and Documents relating to Westminster Abbey.

No. 1. *The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey.* By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Dean of Westminster, and Montague Rhodes James, Litt.D., Provost of King's College, Cambridge. No. 2. *The History of Westminster Abbey.* By John Flete. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. (Cambridge University Press. 5s. net each.)

These are the first volumes of a series which it is hoped to issue bearing on the history of Westminster Abbey. The dissolution of the monasteries and a fire in 1694 dispersed or destroyed the manuscripts, but a good deal of evidence as to these collections has been preserved, and this has been gathered together with loving zeal by the Dean, who has had the benefit of the unrivalled experience of the Provost of King's. In the twelfth century the books at Westminster were under the care of the precentor, to whom eight shillings a year was given for their repair. The books seem to have been kept as at Durham in 'almeries of wainscot' in the north wall of the cloister against the wall of the church. Stephen Langton left seven chests of books to the Abbey in 1376, and of these a list has been preserved. In 1492 there is an entry: 'Payments for the newe repairyng of the Seyny bookes,' that is books used by monks who had been bled and 'were allowed to sit during certain of the choir services in front of the altar of St. Benedict, using a book called the *Liber Minutorum*.' Many other interesting details are given by the Dean in his account of the Chapter Library. The Provost's special knowledge has enabled him to draw up a list of the books lost or extant which were in the library at the time of the dissolution. He also describes the manuscripts given to the library by Dean Williams in 1623, which perished in the fire of 1694, and those now in the library. Dean Robinson gives a full account of the Westminster Chartularies.

John Flete, a monk at Westminster from 1420 to 1465, was the only mediaeval writer who prepared a history of the Abbey.

The Dean says that though 'he displays no graces of style and not the most rudimentary sense of humour' he 'has devoted vast pains to his task, has copied actual documents in attestation of his statements, and refrains from guessing where he can find no evidence.' Flete's work has never before been printed, and Dean Robinson has set himself to provide a trustworthy Latin text. He has not attempted to supply notes, but his Introduction contains much information as to the four main sections of Flete's history which will greatly assist students. He has also been able to make some valuable corrections as to the dates of the abbots. The Dean and Chapter have done a public service by the issue of volumes which will do not a little to lighten the labours of future historians. It will deepen our debt if it is found possible to add to the series.

Six Oxford Thinkers. By Algernon Cecil, M.A.
(Murray. 7s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Cecil has attempted here to trace a chain of ideas which exercised a profound influence upon the nineteenth century. He regards the ideas of the past as infinitely more interesting than its battlefields and of infinitely greater consequence to ourselves. His object has been 'to depict, and in some degree to discuss, the progress of Oxford thought in the nineteenth century by the light of the careers and characters of certain powerful Oxford intellects.' Gibbon comes first as a link between the philosophic attitude of the eighteenth century and the historic attitude of the nineteenth. In dealing with the origins of Christianity 'he suffered the greatest disgrace that can befall a historian. He observed and recorded facts, the significance of which entirely escaped him.' He adopts, apparently without a shadow of regret, the baser explanation of the facts. Newman showed that faith, hope, and charity were a better explanation of the success of Christianity than Gibbon's five reasons, whilst Church insisted that Christianity was a more wonderful thing if it was not true than if it were. The study of Newman, the central figure of Mr. Cecil's six thinkers, is full of that romantic interest which always surrounds him. Church is 'the most beautiful mind of the nineteenth century.' Mr. Cecil asks in closing his estimate: 'Who can measure the value of such a life as this, until the

long issue of events is disclosed, and the deep under-currents are revealed, and the things of time are seen in the light of eternity?' Froude's mastery of style and the great unrest that was in him to the end are well described; and Pater is regarded as one who followed the form and colour rather than the reality of things. The beauties of Christianity were more to him than the Christian religion. The last essay on 'Lord Morley of Blackburn' applies to our living statesman the words he himself used of Burke, that he 'has the sacred gift of inspiring men to use a grave diligence in caring for high things and in making their lives at once rich and austere.' All the studies are rich in charm and all set the reader thinking.

Nineteenth-Century Teachers, and other Essays. By Julia Wedgwood. (Hodder & Stoughton. 10s. 6d. net.)

Everything that Miss Wedgwood writes is marked by force and insight, and these studies of the great thinkers of our time are a national portrait gallery where we stand in the presence of Coleridge, Maurice, Kingsley, Stanley, R. H. Hutton, George Eliot, John Ruskin and those whom we do not willingly let die. The studies range over the last thirty years, and are taken chiefly from the *Contemporary* and the *Spectator*. They form a mirror by which we follow the changes of contemporary thought. The biography has a strong infusion both of philosophy and theology. Miss Wedgwood thinks Dr. Arnold the first Broad Churchman and Dean Stanley the last. Everything in this volume reveals that discriminating touch which makes Miss Wedgwood's work so suggestive and instructive to thoughtful readers.

Mansfield College Essays. (Hodder & Stoughton. 12s. net.)

These Essays, written by those who have studied or taught at Mansfield College during the twenty-two years that have passed since Dr. Fairbairn became its Principal, were presented to him last November on his seventieth birthday. They fittingly and worthily represent that broad and generous conception of theology and religion for which Dr. Fairbairn has always stood. Each of the writers has dealt with some subject which was at the time engaging his special attention, and the bibliography of the doctor's own writings stands at the close of the volume, an impressive record of a life of high

thinking distilled into works that have enlightened and inspired a host of earnest seekers after truth. The Essays are not too learned for thoughtful readers even though they may have no expert knowledge of the subjects discussed. Mr. Silvester Horne's plea that Calvin's memory should be relieved from 'some of the unwarrantable accusations with which the prejudice of centuries has marred his fame,' is one of the most readable contributions. Mr. Selbie's high-toned study of 'The Religious Principle of Congregationalism' is worthy of Dr. Fairbairn's successor. Profs. Bartlet, Peake, and Gray, Mr. Macfadyen and Principal Garvie deal with great themes in an illuminating style. The Essays show how the torch of truth is being handed on by Mansfield men, and we do not wonder. As Mr. Edward Shillito well puts it in the dedicatory sonnet—

For it were shame
That we who call thee master, and have trod
With thee awhile, should leave the task undone
Which thou from youth hast loved, with soul aflame
To trace for man the footprints of his God.

George Selwyn and the Wits. By S. Parnell Kerr. With sixteen illustrations. (Methuen & Co. 12s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Kerr is compelled to admit that the quality of George Selwyn's wit was poor. It lacked the 'fundamental brain-work' without which great wit was impossible. Selwyn was no scholar, though Eton gave him some knowledge of the classics. Nor was he a reader: 'I have been years without looking in a book, and God knows in my long life how few I have read.' He had one favourite. When Rollin's *Ancient History* was put into his hands he read it 'three times over by choice.' But whatever Selwyn's limitations his personal charm won him friends like Lord Holland, the Duke of Queensberry, Horace Walpole, and the Earl of Carlisle. His affection for 'Mie Mie,' the little Italian child whom he almost regarded as a daughter, is a very tender page in the life of this wit and worldling. She afterwards became Marchioness of Hertford, but did not prove an altogether reputable person. It was Selwyn who introduced Horace Walpole to Madame du Deffand, who became one of Walpole's closest friends and correspondents. This volume is a picture gallery in which the fashionable life of the eighteenth century spreads out before the reader, with its gaming, its frivolity, its hoops, powders, and patches. We

follow Selwyn into the House of Commons and travel with him over Europe. Mr. Kerr does not forget that it was also the century of John Wesley, who 'bestrides it like a Colossus.' 'It is in Wesley's journal that you will find the only complete account of the England which was his.' Nobody can deny 'the excellence and strength' of Wesley's style. The portraits in Mr. Kerr's volume introduce us to Selwyn and his family, and add much to the interest of a book that is crowded with pleasant things.

George Borrow: The Man and His Work. By R. A. J. Walling. (Cassell & Co. 6s. net.)

This book owes much to Dr. Knapp's standard *Life*, but it adds some valuable material as to Borrow's Cornish origin and the memorable visit which he paid to the county in 1853. Mr. Watts-Dunton has helped the writer with expert advice and suggestion, and allowed him to draw freely on his recollections of his friend. The result is an interesting study of one of the unique figures of English literature. Borrow's father was a captain in the West Norfolk Regiment, and the wanderings of the family from town to town implanted in his younger son that restlessness and love of adventure which never left him. His early life was a failure till Francis Cunningham and Joseph John Gurney secured him a post under the Bible Society. This brought him congenial opportunity of travel and adventure, and provided material for his famous *Bible in Spain*, of which thirty-five thousand copies were sold in twelve months. *Lavengro*, on which he lavished his utmost art and labour, was a failure. Mr. Murray did not sell a thousand copies in the first year. *The Romany Rye* was even more distasteful to the public, though these are now recognized as Borrow's masterpieces. His marriage to Mrs. Clarke was one of his best pieces of fortune. No one more needed a gracious woman's ministries. He was often a prey to terrible fits of depression, and his outbursts of rage and spleen wrecked some of his best friendships; but this book makes it clear that, despite his angularities and awkwardness, Borrow had a warm and generous heart.

Shelley. By Francis Thompson. (Burns & Oates. 2s. 6d. net.)

We have found this little volume a gold mine. The essay was prepared in 1889 for the *Dublin Review* on the suggestion

of Cardinal Vaughan, but the editor of that day returned it, and it was found among the poet's papers after his death. Mr. Meynell offered it again to the same Review, which, for the first time in its life of seventy-two years, gained, through this paper, the honour of a second edition. Mr. George Wyndham regards the essay as the most important contribution to pure letters written in English during the last twenty years. He brackets it with Myers's *Virgil* as the two best English essays on poetry of our day. Thompson is not blind to the evil side of Shelley's life. 'We see clearly that he committed grave sins, and one cruel crime; but we remember also that he was an atheist from his boyhood; we reflect how gross must have been the moral neglect in the training of a child who could be an atheist from his boyhood.' Both as poet and man Shelley was essentially a child, and his childlike irrationality had much to do with his restless discontent. His poetry shows the 'child's faculty of make-believe. The universe is his box of toys. He dances in and out of the gates of heaven; its floor is littered with his broken fancies. He runs wild over the fields of ether. He chases the rolling world. He gets between the feet of the horses of the sun.' Shelley's *Adonais* is described as the most perfect among his long poems, though its lack of Christian hope prevents its being described as ideally perfect. The fact that he was an 'ethical anarch' mars other passages, though Mr. Thompson knows of but three to the purity of which exception can be taken. The study is not merely a piece of prose-poetry, but it is full of Christian discernment as well as critical insight.

William Bramwell, Revivalist. By the Rev. C. W. Andrews, B.A., B.D. (Culley. 1s. net.)

William Bramwell is one of the saints of Methodism, and this little volume tells the story of his life and work both with sympathy and discernment. 'He was indisputably holy, a man of most extraordinary power in prayer, always fervent, perfectly guarded in speech, and utterly free from a partisan spirit.' He spent most of his ministry in Yorkshire, where he was immensely popular, and lived in an atmosphere of continual revival. Norfolk Street, Sheffield, was so crowded that 'hundreds could not enter.' There is not much evangelism of the Bramwell type left. A 'painful solemnity' marked his services. He preached 'as if death were at his elbow.' To us,

Mr. Andrews says, his preaching 'would be grossly realistic,' but he was mighty in faith and prayer. Sometimes when he pleaded for the dying he appeared to pray death off the scene altogether. He had also a kind of second sight. He prevented a girl from sailing to Jamaica in a vessel that was afterwards wrecked, and unmasked one hypocrite after another as though he had been an Old Testament prophet. The whole study will be a stimulus to preachers. The chapter on Entire Sanctification is specially valuable.

The Story of the Jewish People. By Jack M. Myers. (Kegan, Paul & Co. 1s. 6d. net.)

This is the first volume of a bright little history of the Jews since Bible times. It is intended for use in school and home, and, despite obvious limitations at a crucial point, will fill a very useful place in an efficient style. One naturally turns to the chapter on 'Jesus of Nazareth,' which takes up little more than two pages. He is represented as the son of Joseph and Mary, who developed gentleness of character and eloquence of speech, and was crucified after a mock trial on a trumped-up charge. 'Although Jesus Himself had directed all His efforts to promoting Judaism within the Jewish community in Palestine, His followers founded the new religion we now call Christianity, and endeavoured to spread its doctrines among the Romans and other pagan nations.' That is a Jew's reading of the gospels. It is a world below the truth, but it is deeply interesting to a Christian reader.

Coillard of the Zambesi, by C. W. Mackintosh (Unwin, 6s.). This cheap issue of a great missionary book will be much appreciated. Its illustrations are of special interest, and the story of the noble Frenchman and his not less noble Scotch wife is told in a way that stirs the imagination and warms the heart.

Mr. F. Griffiths's *Essays for the Times* (6d. net) have made their reputation, and the five latest Essays well sustain it. The second part of Mr. Beet's *Roman See in the First Centuries* is a learned and well-written study of Rome under the early Christian Empire. It is a boon to have such a compact survey of a fascinating period of Church history. *The Science of Religion* is one of the best discussions of the subject we have met. Peladan's *True Place of the Holy Sepulchre* is a powerful argument that 'the dome of the rock is no other than the Anastasis of Constantine, and contains the true Holy Sepulchre hewn out of the living rock.'

The Wander Years. By H. Yoxall, M.P. (Smith, Elder & Co. 6s. net.)

We have shared some of these 'journeys into life, letters and art' as they appeared in *Cornhill*, and it is good to take them again in a more leisurely fashion. Mr. Yoxall's tags may bewilder some readers, but that is only at the starting-point, and no one can fail to gather a rich harvest as he follows his guide through that wonderland of old France of which this wanderer has made himself king, or comes across all kinds of chinaware, for which Mr. Yoxall has an eagle eye in all his wanderings. Pages such as that about the church of the Jesuit College at Chaumont and the chronicle of the fortunes of Yolande de Flandre bring the past back as at the waving of an enchanter's wand. But much as the past attracts him, 'De Rebus Publicis' shows how closely Mr. Yoxall is mixed up with the present. It is his whimsical revenge on the House of Commons, where 'you tire, you sicken, and you break away to some calm garden, or to bathe your mind in a book.'

With the Afghans. By Claud Field, M.A. (Marshall Brothers. 3s. 6d. net.)

We are surprised at the cheapness of this handsome and well-illustrated volume on the history, language, customs and character of the Afghans. Their traditions, which Dr. Bellew is inclined to accept, describe them as 'Bani Israel' descended from Aghana, said to be the commander-in-chief of King Solomon. The Afghans from an early date have been zealous adherents of Islam. Unnatural vice prevails to a terrible extent, and murders are often occasioned by it. The explosive nature of the Pathan also frequently gives rise to tragedies. Their religion is on the whole fairly described as a bastard Judaism. A mission has been established for fifty years at Peshawar, and in 1892 Mr. Field began his work in the city. Dilawar Khan is one of the heroes of Colonel Younghusband's *Story of the Guides*, and Mr. Field's account of his conversion is of singular interest. The valuable chapters on 'Afghan Poets' and 'Afghan Fables' will make special appeal to scholars.

The City of Jerusalem. By Colonel C. R. Conder, LL.D., R.E. (Murray. 12s. net.)

Colonel Conder here presents in convenient form the results reached by research and exploration as to the history and

buildings of Jerusalem. He first saw the city in the summer of 1872, when the population was only a third of what it is to-day. 'The railway station was not thought of, and only a few villas outside the gate existed, while the suburbs to north and south had not grown up, and Olivet was not covered with modern buildings.' He spent three winters in exploration, and discovered the buttresses of the Temple rampart still standing. Ancient towns were constantly rebuilt on the sites of their ruined predecessors. There are 'at least six successive cities to be studied at Jerusalem, lying one above another where the depth of the débris is greatest.' The identification of Bible sites is thus made incredibly difficult. Colonel Conder does not disregard the traditions which embody the sincere beliefs of various generations, but tests them by the explorations of our own time. Jebusite Jerusalem was a royal city, a sacred place and a strong fortress. Of this citadel, taken by David, Colonel Conder gives a clear description. In successive chapters he reconstructs the city of the Hebrew kings, of Ezra and Nehemiah, and of the Greek age. Then we reach the Jerusalem of Herod and the gospel sites. Colonel Conder is persuaded that the knoll north of the Damascus Gate, which is now used as a Moslem graveyard, is the actual site of Calvary. He made this suggestion in 1878, and it was subsequently adopted by Laurence Oliphant and General Gordon. He cannot, however, endorse Gordon's opinion that the 'Garden Tomb' was the true place of the Holy Sepulchre. There is good reason to suppose that it is not older than the twelfth century. The book is one of singular interest.

Among the Holy Places: A Pilgrimage Through Palestine. By Rev. James Kean, M.A. (F. Unwin. 5s.) Full of detail and graphic in description, this work is deservedly popular, and it is not surprising it has reached a sixth edition. The author has the happy art of making you feel that you are travelling with him over those 'holy fields' which every one cannot see, and yet every one seeks to know something of. You visit Jerusalem, starting at the Jaffa Gate; you gaze on Hebron, with its many memories; Bethlehem is visited; you loiter by the Lake of Galilee and draw near to Damascus, and all the while you experience a sense of realism as scene after scene comes before the mental vision. The pictures, of which there are many, lend still further interest to this valuable book, which is well produced and well printed.

GENERAL

Hampshire. Painted by Wilfrid Ball, R.E. Described by Rev. Telford Varley, M.A., B.Sc. (A. & C. Black. 20s. net.)

MR. BALL has really done justice to the charms of Hampshire. The pictures of many little-known villages, old bridges, old mills, and quiet bits of river scenery are very effective, and the colour printing here given is a fine art. Mr. Telford Varley writes as one who is performing a filial duty. He feels the antiquity, the historic association, the harmony of form and rich glow of colour which make the Home-shire so attractive, and he has managed to distil all these into his book. When we reach Winchester, the story of city, cathedral, and college is brightly traced, and Mr. Ball has chosen his subjects with an artist's eye to effect. The Weirs, the Deanery, King's Gate, Brewhouse and Cloisters of Winchester College, the Ambulatory Tower at St. Cross, Cheyney Cross and other illustrations are a joy to see. The New Forest, and Gilbert White's country, furnish Mr. Varley with delightful material. Hampshire owes much to its seaboard. Her waters have witnessed more scenes of historic import and naval pageantry than any others around our island, and few places in the world show the same movement and diversity of craft as we find in Portsmouth Harbour, Southampton Water, and the Solent. Inland the chalk downs, broad woodland patches, moorlands, rivers, and the spacious New Forest all add to the beauties of a county which is one of the glories of England. We can pay no higher tribute to this fine book than to say that both painter and penman have made it worthy of its subject. •

The Faith and Works of Christian Science. By the writer of *Confessio Medici*. (Macmillan & Co. 3s. 6d. net.)

No one was better fitted to show the perils which Christian Science brings in its train than a London hospital doctor like the author of *Confessio Medici*. It is time action was taken. There are sixty-four registered healers in London, ten in Manchester, nine in Brighton. Their names, addresses and tele-

phone numbers are published every month in the *Christian Science Journal* for 'absent treatment.' The articles of this strange faith are set forth clearly in this volume, and the contrast is brought out between them and true philosophy. A sketch of Mrs. Eddy's career follows. It was from Quimby, the mental healer of Portland, Maine, that she 'learned, appropriated, reproduced, the principles, ideas, even some of the phrases, of Christian Science.' She went to him in 1862 'a frail shadow of a woman,' and left him cured of her nervous trouble and started on her career as a propagandist. Christian Science publishes her successes, and hides her failures. Two hundred cases are cited from the *Christian Science Sentinel*. All testimonials are accepted by these 'healers,' even the most fantastical and illiterate. She embellishes what she publishes, and evades investigation. Her claim to cure organic diseases breaks down under the most elementary rules of criticism. If Christian Science came down like a fog on some great hospital, the horrors would baffle description.

The Finsbury Library (R. Culley, 1s. net), of which the first six volumes lie before us, is one of the most attractive set of books on the market. The type is beautifully bold and clear, and the heavily gilt back is very attractive. The famous autobiographies of *Early Methodist Preachers* are now out of print, but two volumes under the attractive title *Wesley's Veterans* have been edited by Mr. Telford with a preface, which quotes tributes to these wonderful narratives from Dr. Parker, Bishop Gore, Prof. Caldecott, and others. Some useful notes and references to the original sources have been supplied, and there are a few additions which help to make this, so far as it goes, the most complete edition ever published. As the Library goes on it will be possible to include not only the thirty-four Lives gathered together by Thomas Jackson, but many others of great interest. These two volumes are an inspiring study of homely lives glorified by divine grace and by noble service for others. The abridged edition of *John Wesley's Journal* is in smaller type, though it is very clear. Every family in England ought to get this little book and study it from cover to cover. It is one of the classics of our evangelical history. *Four Thousand Miles Across Siberia*, by Charles Wenyon, M.D., is the fifth edition of a wonderful record of travel on the great post-road, sixteen years ago before sledge and tarantass

gave place to the luxurious railroad. It is a book that we are reluctant to lay down. *Through Two Campaigns* is by Arthur Male, who was chaplain to Lord Roberts's troops in the great Afghan campaign, which included the famous march to Kandahar, and in the Egyptian campaign, which ended at Tel-el-Kebir. Mr. Male died at Portsmouth in 1902, but this narrative will keep his memory green as one of the best and bravest of military chaplains. *The Great Chinese Awakening*, by A. R. Kelley, is the most complete and illuminating little book that we have seen on China and its people, the government, modes of life, and religious beliefs. A history of missions in China is followed by a description of the missionary at work and the way in which friends of missions may help in winning China for Christ. The book is as interesting as it is valuable. We know nothing like it, and hope that it may have an immense circulation.

The Silvae of Statius. Translated by D. A. Slater. (Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. net.)

It is to be feared that the poetry of Statius, like so much of the literature of the Silver Age, is 'caviare to the general,' and is not closely studied even by the Classical Honours man. Nevertheless, Mr. Slater, his latest translator and eulogist, makes out a strong case in favour of a deeper interest in the poet. In spite of his frigidity and artificiality, his verse, especially in descriptive passages, is not without charm and distinction. Pope (who has much in common with him) considered him second only to Virgil, while Dante and other mediaeval poets gave a place of honour to him, possibly owing to his supposed connexion with Christianity. Dante makes him speak of having been brought to Christ by Virgil's Messianic Eclogue. Then there is the well-known legend of St. Paul weeping at Virgil's tomb, and 'it is open to us to indulge the fancy that the Apostle and the Poet may even have met' there.

The *Silvae* are impromptus, thrown off without any fixed plan on a variety of themes, frequently inspired by interesting incidents in the Emperor's career and other events of public interest; but probably Statius is at his best when he forgets Domitian and writes birthday and other pleasant poems to his friends, like that in which he returns unthankful thanks for a Christmas box in the shape of a book—'out of some poor devil of a bookseller's pack!'

Mr. Slater's translation is clear and spirited as well as faithful. He has the advantage of following the new Oxford text, which gives, as in the description of Vopiscus's villa at Tivoli, the lines :

*quæ forma beatiss
ante manus artemque locis!*

in place of the impossible *arte manus concessa locis* of the older texts. We may quote the translation of a few lines in this passage: 'How fair before even handicraft touched them the beauty of these happy haunts! Nowhere has Nature shown so opulent a fancy. Over the swift stream the deep woods brood: each leaf is mirrored in the shifting picture; the reflection travels unchanged down the long river reaches.' The book is an interesting addition to the useful series of classical translations now being issued by the Clarendon Press.

Early Christian Hymns. By Daniel Joseph Donahoe. (Werner Laurie. 6s. net.)

This volume contains translations of the best hymns of the Latin Church, from the time of St. Hilary down to Thomas à Kempis and Urban VIII. A brief biography is given of each author, and a note is made where the hymn is drawn from the Roman Breviary so that those who wish may compare Mr. Donahoe's work with the original. He was led to undertake his task one Sunday afternoon in April 1904, when reading the 'Veni Sancte Spiritus.' The words and music shaped themselves with effort into an English form which seemed to give an adequate representation of the original both in thought and feeling. The six-line verse is preserved and the beauty of the original is well brought out, though we miss the thrice-repeated *Veni* in the latter half of the first verse. The translations from Prudentius are excellent, and the rendering of the 'Dies Irae' catches the sombre magnificence of the Latin, though 'Me who caused Thy crucial way' is not altogether satisfactory. The version of 'Gloria, Laus, et Honor,' the Palm-Sunday hymn, is happy, and so are the fragments from à Kempis. 'Jesu, dulcis Memoria' is beautifully rendered. The translations were deservedly welcomed when they first appeared in print, and now that they have been collected into this volume every lover of Latin hymns will count it one of his treasures.

Mr. J. G. Robertson's learned monograph, *Milton's Fame on the Continent* (H. Frowde, 1s. net), was read to the British

Academy last December. Milton was the first English poet who won fame for our literature in Europe. Voltaire's *Essay upon Epick Poetry* was a bold and effective plea for the Puritan poet, though he afterwards became afraid that admiration for him might endanger the good taste of Europe. The paper is one of special interest and value.

An Englishman's Castle. By M. Loane. (Arnold. 6s.)

Miss Laone's store of incidents seems inexhaustible, and they all light up her subject. She has no illusions. She has seen things with her own eyes and knows how hard is the fight with prejudice and selfishness, not merely among the poor, but among those who are in comfortable circumstances. The chapter which gives a title to the volume shows that the poor 'demand a price for admission to their homes.' She, as a trained nurse, was admitted with empty hands, but her friends had a different reception. 'They must pay their footing, must "bring their welcome with them"; and the worst part of it was that there was no fixed scale of charges.' Yet even a nurse was not welcomed in every house. The whole book is illuminating, and shows the constant need for strong sense and the wisdom that comes of experience if the poor are to be helped in a way that will permanently benefit them.

High Licence. Frederick W. Tompson. (Macmillan. 74 pp.)

'A critical examination of the Licence Duties prevailing in the United Kingdom and in the United States.' Mr. Tompson replies to Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell's volume, *The Taxation of the Liquor Trade*. Mr. Tompson lays stress on certain data which he claims that Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell neglected in their survey. Admitting that licence duties are much higher in the States than here, he contends that the direct taxes levied on liquor are considerably higher in Britain than America. Consequently, adds Mr. Tompson, if British licence duties are to be increased the retail prices of beer and spirits must be advanced. We fancy this alternative will not greatly distress temperance reformers!

The Taxation of the Liquor Trade. By Joseph Rowntree and Arthur Sherwell, M.P. Vol. I. Second edition. Revised and enlarged. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.)

The second edition of this exceedingly able book will be

welcomed by all who are interested in liquor legislation. The object of the writers is to show that there is an open field for increasing the revenue of the country by putting heavier taxes upon the liquor traffic. They clearly show that other nations tax the traffic much more severely than we do, and that without injustice the Government of this country may look in this direction for a large augmentation of revenue. In their opinion this would not only be a financial gain to the country, but this increased taxation would be an effective check to the mischiefs wrought by the traffic. From our point of view, however, it is a dangerous thing to build the finances of a nation upon the vices of the people. Whatever temporary check to the traffic may be effected by increased taxation, the history of our Indo-Chinese opium traffic demonstrates how difficult it is to get rid of an iniquity when it has been made a source of revenue. We are all familiar also with the way in which the representatives of the trade in this country are accustomed to appeal to their contribution to the revenue as a proof of their patriotism, and how opponents of drastic temperance legislation inquire what will happen if we destroy so lucrative a source of revenue. The more the revenue is made to depend upon the liquor traffic the firmer roothold will it have on the body politic. Increase of taxation is not in the ultimate interests of temperance reform but the very opposite. Messrs. Macmillan's sixpenny reprint of part of this work is a great boon.

The Children Act Explained, by Henry Carter (Culley, 1d.), is so lucid and so well arranged that it will be of the greatest service to all who wish to protect helpless children against cruelty, carelessness, and temptation. The Act is a noble one, and this pamphlet will show how its great possibilities for good may be realized most effectively.

Foreign Missions. By Alfred Beer. (Culley. 2s, 6d.)

Many will be grateful for this book. It is a survey of the whole field of missions which clearly sets forth what has been already done to win the world for Christ. The writer rejoices in the success of every labourer in this great harvest field, but he rightly feels that there might be a glorious extension of the work if all the home churches were filled with that power of the Spirit which makes real Christians. The surrender of body, soul, and fortune would set forces at work which would cause a more rapid spread of the kingdom of Christ than has ever

been known. 'There is nothing now in the world to hinder the work, nothing that was not hindering it in the Apostles' days.' We welcome such a book as a happy sign of the times. It is as readable as it is earnest.

London's Lure. An Anthology in Prose and Verse. By Helen and Lewis Melville. (Bell. 3s. 6d. net.)

This Anthology, the fruit of several years' reading, brings together passages that combine descriptive power and literary merit. It is happily arranged in seventeen sections. 'Town and Country,' 'Dawn' and 'Night' come first, then groups of extracts about 'Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens,' 'Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral,' 'The River and the Riverside,' 'Rain, Smoke, and Fog,' 'Impressions,' 'Some Literary Men in London.' Many favourite selections are included, though not a few of the most pleasing are comparatively little known. The closing pages, 'L'Envoi,' trace Macaulay's traveller from New Zealand who is to 'take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's' to Horace Walpole, who brings 'some curious travellers from Lima.' The dainty end papers with London designs, and the neat binding, make this book as alluring outside as it is within.

The White Sister, by Marion Crawford (Macmillan & Co., 6s.). This story adds to our regret that Mr. Crawford's work is done. The scene is in Rome, and the novelist's mastery of his material has never been more manifest. The Donna Angela, who in a few days loses father and fortune and lover, wins our hearts at once, and when she takes refuge in a famous sisterhood and becomes the most capable and reliable nurse upon its staff we feel how much her troubles have done to ripen a noble character. Then her lover returns, after five years' captivity in Africa, and the question is whether both lives are to be blighted by the vows Sister Giovanna has taken. Some exciting scenes between herself and the captain end badly for his hopes, but he proves himself a hero when the gunpowder magazine is blown up and Monsignor Saracinesca procures the White Sister a dispensation from her vows. Captain Severi thus wins the bride of whom he is worthy. The story is full of strong situations, which grow more absorbing till the final scene is reached.

St. Jude's. By Ian Maclaren. (R.T.S. 1s. net.) Dr. Watson was a noble pastor, and these stories form revelations of his own inner self which all his friends will prize. It is a very neat reprint.

The Rev. S. N. Sedgwick, M.A., recently published a singularly attractive *Young People's Nature Study Book*. He has now issued the chapter on birds and their eggs and nests as *The Young People's Bird's-Nest Chart* (Culley, 1s. net), with ruled pages for notes, coloured plates of eggs, other plates and a descriptive list of the nests of ninety-one birds. It is a nature pocket-book for which all lovers of birds will be increasingly grateful. We know nothing like it.

Twelve Thousand Words often Mispronounced, by W. H. P. Phyfe (Putnam's Sons, 5s. net). This is the handiest book of its kind that we know. The fact that it is in its eighty-fourth thousand shows how it has been appreciated. Mr. Phyfe has revised his work with great care and added two thousand words. We advise every one to keep it constantly in use.

The Madras Manual of Geography. With ninety-two maps, and eighty-five diagrams and illustrations. By George Patterson. (Christian Literature Society for India. 2s.)

This is a workmanlike manual admirably clear, well illustrated, and full of matter. The half-crown edition in cloth, with seven folding coloured maps, is everything that teachers and scholars could wish for. The full treatment of India makes it specially suitable for use in Indian Universities and for students of that great country.

The S.P.C.K. issue a valuable booklet on *Socialism and Christianity* (3d.) by Archdeacon Cunningham, a powerful discussion of *Betting and Gambling* (2d.) by Dr. Neligan, and *Our National Flag* (1d.), with notes and coloured illustrations.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England, 1909 (S.P.C.K., 3s.), is of special interest. An excellent Summary is given of the proceedings of the Lambeth Conference and a brief account of the Pan-Anglican Congress. The statistics from each diocese grow more instructive every year.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

The *Dublin Review* (April-June) opens with an article on *Lollardy and the Reformation*, and closes with a characteristically eloquent eulogium by Cardinal Gibbons on the relation of Christianity to the general welfare of the world. Between these two apologetic papers the most noteworthy contributions are the fine appreciation of Miss Edgeworth as the chief exemplar of *Moral Fiction a Hundred Years Ago*, by the editor, Mr. Wilfrid Ward, and a scathing paper on *The Mantle of Voltaire*, by Mr. F. Y. Eccles. This latter is founded on M. Anatole France's *L'Ile des Pingouins*, in which, it appears, 'the annals of the Penguin Islands are carried into the future and end with the hideous vision of an irremediable plutocracy, periodically devoured in flames, and rising inexorable from its ashes.' From the first, says Mr. Eccles, M. France has always been a mocker, like Voltaire, and has set himself to serve the enemies of Christianity. In this latest book there is, of course, an attack upon the Christian religion, but his chief aim has been 'ostensibly to poison the sources of national pride and to undermine the fabric of national glory by what is not even a caricature of his country's history.'

The *Quarterly Review* celebrates its centenary in its April issue. In addition to the centenary article, containing portraits of its famous editors and some of its more important contributors, and giving the history of the Review from the beginning until recent times, the number is enriched by eighteen other papers of great interest and value, including three notable contributions to the Darwin centenary, tracing the effect of the doctrine of evolution on the thought of the century in relation to the Church, to ethics, and to philosophy; a masterly account of *Modernism* by Professor Inge; *The Essentials of Great Poetry*, by the Poet Laureate; an article on *Tennyson*, by M. Emile Faguet, the most popular and distinguished of contemporary French critics, whose centenary contribution furnishes a welcome antidote to the harsh and hasty judgement of the late Professor Taine; the whole making a volume of 480 pages that will be treasured up by lovers of good literature and admirers of the ever-welcome 'buff' Review.

Perhaps the two most generally interesting papers in the *Edinburgh* (April-June) are the one adversely criticizing Pragmatism and the other advocating Co-Partnership as an alternative and antidote to Socialism. These are singularly timely and effective articles.

In the *Fortnightly* for May, Mr. Justin McCarthy reviews the *Carlyle Love-Letters*, chiefly from a literary point of view. English literature, he thinks, has never before been enriched with a collection of love-letters so peculiarly fascinating. He does not place the lovers on the same intellectual level. 'Carlyle overestimated to the last the intellectual capacity, or, at all events, the creative intellectual capacity of Jane Welsh. He evidently believed that she only needed literary training and encouragement to become one of the great women of the world. She was indeed possessed of remarkable talents, of vivacious and sparkling humour, and a peculiar faculty of creating sudden surprises in those who heard her talk or read her letters. But Carlyle's wife left no work of genius to the world.'

The remarkable and almost startling paper by Father Tyrrell in the May *Contemporary* will greatly please the Quakers, who have pleaded and contended from the first for such an unpaid ministry as that for which in *The Dearth of Clergy* he also eloquently pleads. He distinguishes between the ministry of the Word and the ministry of the Sacraments. For the latter 'no intellectual training is needed'; and for the former, except in matters of scholarship, and for purposes of apology and controversy, nothing more than an ordinary education is required, and much advantage would accrue from the employment of the laity as preachers and as workers in the Church. 'The preaching of simple and practical Christianity is easily within the capacity of simple and practical men. Not to speak of the Galilean fishermen, we may consider the lay-preachers of the Wesleyan Methodists.' He would not exclude laymen even from the confessional: 'The counsel and guidance of a good and wise man who knows the world and human nature would be far more helpful than that of a seminary-bred priest who knows neither except from the lurid pages of Dens or Gurry.' Revolutionary doctrine this: no wonder it has fluttered many a dove-cote, outside more perhaps than inside Father Tyrrell's Church. 'If financial pressure forces the Churches to such an expedient' as that which he has been advocating, it may, he says, be 'the beginning of a new era of Christianity, whose initial success was in great measure due to the manifest disinterestedness and apostolic poverty of its first founders. Above all, the clergy themselves will be delivered from a danger that threatens their personal character as well as their influence on others.'

The *Forum* for April has a rather too severe article on *Mrs. Humphry Ward as a Novelist*, by Mr. W. L. Phelps, who dwells particularly on her lack of humour and of the artistic faculty of selection. The points he makes are well sustained by illustrations from her various novels, the best of which is said to be *David Grieve*.

Church Quarterly Review (April).—The Rev. H. H. Jeaffreson in his article on *Modernism* says that 'the topics of dissension may differ among us and among the Romanists, but the fact of dissen-

sion exists alike in both communions; and the convert who has not chosen to close his ears will hear in Italy echoes of the surge on the English shore.' The position of the Roman Church is disappointing. In Italy the great mass of the people is 'equally listless whether they go to church or stay away; worship seems to have little effect on conduct, and the best of the bishops and clergy lament the prevalence of superstition and paganism. Of theological literature worth the name there is hardly any. In France, where the faithful are face to face with a bitter secularism, things are better; and in England and Germany Roman Catholics are stirred to godly rivalry by other Christians.'

The International Journal of Apocrypha (April) has an article on *Milton and the Apocrypha*. The stories of Tobit, Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees seem to have appealed most strongly to Milton. *Paradise Lost* owes much to the Book of Wisdom, and the conception of Uriel is based on Esdras iv. 'Milton's expansion of the Creation Story is based entirely on the Book of Wisdom, and his treatment thereof is acknowledged to have influenced religious thought to no small extent.' The number is full of interest.

Hibbert Journal (April).—The number opens with an elaborate *Credo*, the most notable point in which is the absence of the name of Christ. It is described as 'a challenge from the soul, delivered in the presence of hostile appearances.' The abstract Theism, lofty and remote, which is here represented, may inspire the few, but it would be powerless to move and raise mankind. Professor Muirhead in *Is there a Common Christianity?* comes to the conclusion that the non-controversial residuum held by all sections of Christians is not a faith, properly speaking, but a principle—that of 'the unity and the spirituality of life.' Professor W. James gives an interesting description of the philosophy of Bergson, the influence of which is undoubtedly growing, and presses home once more his favourite point of the contrast between logic and life and the supremacy of life over logic. Dr. Forsyth's article, *The Insufficiency of Social Righteousness as a Moral Ideal*, is as powerful as it is timely. It is based on the text, 'The effective sympathy of man for man has historically sprung from the grace and pity of God.' The truth of this principle will be further illustrated in the future, as we believe, present counter-currents notwithstanding. Other articles are: *The Message of G. K. Chesterton*, by J. A. Hutton, a strange deliverance by Rev. Alex. Brown on *The Over-Emphasis of Sin*—as if that were a danger of to-day!—and *Christianity and the Empire in Rome and in China*, by Rev. P. J. MacLagan.

Journal of Theological Studies (April).—Dr. Verrall opens this number with a careful study of *Christ before Herod*, that is the part played in the proceedings of the Passion by Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee. Critics have assailed St. Luke's narrative as improbable on various grounds, Loisy in particular describing the

episode as 'a legendary fiction accepted, or even invented, by Luke.' Dr. Verrall exposes the weakness of this criticism, showing that it rests upon a misunderstanding, a supposed suspicious parallel between the 'mockery' in the trial before Pilate and a similar scene in the presence of Herod. Dr. Verrall points out the essentially different character of the treatment of Christ recorded in the two narratives, and shows afresh the need of criticizing modern criticism. Mr. C. H. Turner's *Historical Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* is continued in this number and is especially concerned with the Epistles of St. Paul. His discussion of Marcion's relation to the text is very able and interesting. The Dean of Westminster contributes an article on *Lanfranc's Monastic Constitutions*, and thirty pages are occupied with the Coptic text of certain Apocryphal legends, together with a translation by E. O. Winstedt.

Primitive Methodist Quarterly (April).—Professor Jones Davies opens this number with an account of the much-discussed Hartley Lecture, by Mr. Day Thompson, on *Immortality*. He rejoices that the book has been rescued from the *Connexional Index Expurgatorius*. A few pages on *Pantheism*, by G. Fawcett, will open the eyes of some readers to the practical tendencies of certain current religious ideas, the mischief of which is greatly increased by the fact that their real character is not perceived. The paper on *The Immanent Will*, by J. P. Langham, based on Thomas Hardy's *Dynasts*, should be compared with this. The article on *Mendelism*, again, is very timely. It is important that ministers should understand as much as possible of current evolutionary theories and controversies. Other articles are on *John Aubrey*, *Antiquary*, *Richard Baxter as a Catholic Christian*, *M. and E. de Guérin*, *Tolstoy*, and the *Writings of Mr. Roosevelt*.

The Expositor (April, May, June).—Dr. H. A. Kennedy, of Toronto, who has recently been appointed Professor of Theology in New College, Edinburgh, contributes the first article in the April number on *Apostolic Preaching and Emperor Worship*. The antagonism between the Imperial Cult and Christianity accounts for many features in the New Testament, besides the well-known example of the Apocalypse. Dr. Garvie's paper on the *Righteousness of God* is solid, weighty and full of instruction. Rev. A. Carr debates again the question of *Covenant or Testament?* in Heb. ix. 16, without shedding much new light upon it. Dr. F. R. Tennant's examination into *The Positive Elements in the Conception of Sin* contains only a part of an argument to be developed in due course, which promises to be ethically illuminative. Dr. J. H. Moulton passes some acute criticisms on Professor Harnack's *Sayings of Jesus*. Respect for a great scholar need not imply belief in his infallibility, and the value of Harnack's vindication of the high antiquity and trustworthiness of 'Q' is pointed out by the Didsbury Professor. Sir W. Ramsay's papers on *Luke's Authorities in Acts i-xii* are being continued, and prove to be full of fresh information and suggestion.

The most important article in the June number is one which constitutes the first instalment of a *Historical Commentary on 1 Timothy*, by Sir W. Ramsay. In the course of it the Professor says, 'Those scholars who reject the Pastoral Epistles as un-Pauline are shutting themselves off from a most valuable help to the understanding of Paul.' This help will be illustrated and enforced by what promises to be a most useful commentary.

Expository Times (April, May, June).—Every number of this ably conducted periodical contains suggestive papers, notes and scattered contributions, but they do not easily lend themselves to summary, and a brief account is sure to omit points of interest. Amongst many others we may refer to Rev. J. M. Shaw's papers on *The Religious-Historical Movement in German Theology*, which furnish an appreciative criticism of a modern school of theologians who are virtually proclaiming a new faith—a view of Jesus and His Gospel which is true neither to Jesus' own teaching nor to His apostolic witness, and is not the Gospel that sinners need.' Dr. J. G. James describes the scope of Pragmatism under the heading *The New Philosophy*. Dr. J. S. Banks reviews a German book by Schaefer in an article entitled *A Spiritual Faith*. Rev. G. H. Gwilliams' article on *The Hebrew Prophets* is all too short—a criticism which must be passed on many articles in this Journal, contributed by well-known and able writers. The titles on the first page promise much but sometimes prove to be very tantalizing. The longest in the June number on *Synesius of Cyrene* extends to but two or three pages.

AMERICAN

Harvard Theological Review.—To the April number Professor R. M. Wenley contributes an admirable appreciation of the late Dr. Edward Caird. It has all the enthusiasm of a disciple who lived in Glasgow for 'twenty-four of the twenty-seven years covered by Caird's professorship.' A remarkable list is given of distinguished men who 'heard' Dr. Caird at Glasgow, including twenty-five who fill professorial chairs, the Archbishop of York and the Minister of War. 'The upshot of the matter is that, like Hume a century sooner, though in circumstances more favourable by far to personal leadership, he placed Scotland once more in the main stream of modern thought.' Of Dr. Caird as the Master of Balliol, Prof. Wenley says, 'The magnitude of the man developed a magnitude in the office, no matter how greatly it had been filled in the immediate past.' In regard to the results of Dr. Caird's teaching, it is claimed for him that he has done invaluable work by showing that, no matter how far we must go with modern science and scholarship, the last word lies with the spirit of man, not with the play of spectral atoms or the heedless crash of 'causal' history. The main position of Dr. Charles F. Dole, in a well-reasoned article on *Truth and Immortality*, is that the hope of immortality is 'the keystone'

of the structure of thought, in building which we use the best material. 'Put the hope of immortality into the crown of the values of life, and they cohere, and all of them take on new significance. . . . Refuse your keystone the place for which it seems to be fitted exactly, and you have put every precious value at risk.'

Bibliotheca Sacra.—Dr. W. A. Knight contributes an interesting comparison of the *Social Outlook in Matthew and Luke* to the April number. In the social teachings of these two gospels he can find no ground for reversing the relationships generally traceable in them. 'Matthew's interest and outlook are Jewish without being shut off from universal scope, while Luke's are non-racial without losing a very definite field of Jewish interest.' In both gospels our Lord is seen as 'a social Saviour'; in both there is the expression of 'deep concern for social welfare, but neither is socialistic.' In a brief but helpful paper Dr. Jerome D. Davis discusses *The Seat of Authority in Christian Religion*. He rightly says, 'If we find that the convictions and conclusions reached by our Christian consciousness agree with the great gulf-currents of Scripture, and with the general consensus of the Christian Church in all ages on the great, vital, fundamental principles of the Christian faith, we may feel pretty sure that we are right.' Dr. George D. Castor, in his study of *The Kingdom of God in Jewish Literature*, defines the kingdom as 'the divine power which is surely bringing the ideal Christian society to pass.' He summarizes the message of Jesus to those who are facing sociological problems thus: 'Inspire men, individual men and women, with a steadfast trust in the loving, righteous rule of God, inspire them with a devout purpose to imitate that rule even as Jesus did, and they shall be filled with the sovereign power of God to bring about on earth the conquest of evil and the triumph of love.'

American Journal of Theology (April).—The longer articles in this number are four. They deal with *The Resurrection Faith of the First Disciples*, *The Gift of Tongues in relation to Present Day Phenomena*, *The Red Heifer*, and *The Cosmologic Argument*. Professor Case of Chicago University seeks to prove that whilst the resurrection of Christ was real, it was essentially spiritual, and that the first disciples held that 'the risen Jesus was heavenly and appeared to men as a visible spirit, absolutely unencumbered by any of its former physical limitations.' Dr. Henke of Evanston finds a close parallel between the Glossolalia of the New Testament and recent manifestations in Chicago which constitute 'a recrudescence of psychic phenomena of a low stage of culture.' Professor Preserved Smith finds in the Old Testament rite of the red heifer 'a survival from animistic religion naturalized in the law of Israel.' Rev. W. H. Ward restates the cosmological argument for the being of God in the light of modern science. The hundred closely printed pages of *Critical Notes, Reviews and Discussions* contain a valuable repertory of information on recent publications and utterances dealing with subjects of interest to students of theology.

The Princeton Theological Review (April) contains an article by Professor Lang of Halle of thirty pages on *The Reformation and Natural Law*, and another of 107 pages (!) by the Editor, Dr. Warfield, on *Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God*. The remainder of the number consists of reviews of books.

The Review and Expositor (Louisville, Ky., April).—One of the chief articles, written by Dr. John Clifford of London, is on *Milton, the Typical Puritan*. It is marked by Dr. Clifford's characteristic fire and vigour. The writer of the first article on *Literature and the Moral Law* asks in idiomatic American phrase, 'What is literature, anyhow?' He answers his own question by the dubious definition: 'Any poem or story or essay which makes a permanent appeal to the emotions is real literature.' Dr. B. A. Greene writes on *Homiletical Hints for the Sermon on the Mount*. Professor A. H. Newman publishes his address at the Berlin Baptist World Alliance meeting, entitled *Baptist Pioneers in Liberty of Conscience*.

Methodist Review (New York, edited by W. V. Kelley; May-June) provides a varied bill of fare for all tastes. The following are some of the main articles: *Parables of the Kingdom in the Light of Today*, by Professor J. B. Thomas; *Horace Bushnell*, by L. H. Hough; *Sonnet-Hunting*, by Charlotte F. Wilder; *Petrarch, the First Modern Man*, by Professor O. Kuhns; *Teufelsdröckh and the Present Generation*, by Professor Gibbs; *Evolution and the Atonement*, by G. D. Chase.

The Methodist Review (Nashville, edited by Gross Alexander; April) opens with a vigorous article by Dr. Fitchett of Melbourne on *The Secret of the Physical Universe*, in which he deals with Sir O. Lodge's last book, and comes to the conclusion that since the 'laws of nature were never anything else but shadows, we have nothing to rest in but the fidelities of God.' Bishop Hoss has a good subject in *The Creed of Methodism: Where can it be Found?* He does not favour the proposed new formulation of Methodist beliefs. A son of Bishop Granbery writes on *Method in Methodist Theology*; the wife of the accomplished editor of the Review contributes a suggestive paper entitled *Judas Iscariot: A Study*, and other articles deal with *Tolstoy*, *Roman Catholicism at Headquarters*, and *The Servant of Jehovah*. The whole number is well compiled and full of interest; and, lest hasty readers should miss its good points, the editor summarizes them in a dozen pages of his own.

FOREIGN

Theologische Literaturzeitung.—The increasing influence of the Modern Positive School is making itself felt in the critical journals which register and appraise the output of theological literature. In recent issues the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* has reviewed works whose

aim is to advance in the direction of orthodoxy from the Ritschlian position. Prof. Erich Schaefer's book—*Schriftglaube und Heilsgewissheit*—belongs to this category, and is welcomed by Dr. Lobstein as an encouraging sign of a growing consensus of opinion among theologians, the common factor recognized by exponents of different systems being the necessity of beginning with the religious kernel of traditional dogma.

Dr. Schaefer begins with the 'assurance of salvation,' by which he understands the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, of peace with God, of restored fellowship with God and all that is implied therein. The significance of the title of his work appears as he proceeds to show the relation between this assurance and the Scriptures. 'Such fellowship is established by no word of man as such, nor by the word of Scripture as such, but by the spirit of the living God alone.' On the other hand, the God in whose fellowship believers have the assurance of salvation, is 'the God of the historical revelation, the God of the redemptive history.' The centre of this revelation and of this history alike is Christ, who is to faith no mere figure in the remote past, but who becomes a present power by the spirit of God. Thus, in the believer's experience, knowledge of God takes the form of knowledge of Christ, and 'the historic Jesus manifests Himself to the believing soul as present, living and active.' This faith which has assurance rejoices in the presence of the Saviour, and therefore in fellowship with the God who justifies the sinner; such faith depends as a rule on the living word (*vita vox evangelii*) as it is proclaimed in the Church, albeit it may be expressed in various phraseology. In the Christian society fellowship is not in word only, but in the spirit of Christ; such fellowship awakens saving assurance, and the Church may therefore be said to convey the gospel to individuals.

The bearing of Dr. Schaefer's argument on current discussions concerning the fellowship of the Church, as well as on recent theological controversies, is plain. He contends that it is 'according to the will of God that our brethren should bring us to faith through their own personal witness to the gospel.' Dr. Lobstein's comment on Prof. Schaefer's reasoning is that, 'as a matter of fact, he who believes the gospel which the Church publishes, believes also the Scripture. Not that, without further consideration, he believes everything in the Scriptures, but he does believe those parts of Scripture which correspond to the gospel of the Church.' Both the author and his critic agree in affirming that the Scripture is the ultimate source of that witness to the gospel which is borne by the Church of Jesus Christ, and which results in the 'saving assurance' experienced by those who believe.

Dr. Schaefer claims that in his doctrine of assurance he differs, on the one hand, from the Roman Catholic Church as well as from the older Protestant orthodox, and, on the other hand, from extremer forms of Pietism as well as from Ritschlians and from the religious-historical school. From the extracts given by Dr.

Lobstein the following statement of his position has been summarized. In the last resort the Christian believes in Scripture because in it he finds the God in whom he believes and with whom he has fellowship. In holy Scripture Christians have to do with 'God in Christ.' The theocentric study of the Bible becomes christocentric, and supplies the standard by which to estimate the value of the various portions of the Bible.

In his concluding chapter Dr. Schaefer dwells on the human element in the Scripture which has approved itself as the Word of God by its revelation of God in Christ as our Saviour. He deprecates all attempts to make 'a clean-cut division between the word of God and the word of man.' Human imperfections in the Scripture occasion no anxiety to the believer. Discrepancies and outgrown conceptions have never hidden from sinners the glory revealed in the Bible, namely, the glory of the grace of the almighty God and of His Christ, and the glory of our salvation.

Theologische Bundschau.—To the April and May numbers Prof. Wobbermin contributes a comprehensive and striking article on *Modern Theories of Matter*. The mechanical atomistic theory, which is also described as 'naively metaphysical,' is rightly said to be the theory generally held by those who claim that the 'scientific' view of the world is anti-Christian. The ultimate elements of the material world are declared to be material atoms, absolutely simple, unchangeable, indestructible and indivisible. Prof. Wobbermin asks: How is it that these absolutely simple and unchangeable atoms attract and repel each other? Why does an atom yield its dependence and become the servant of another atom, if there is neither causation nor purpose in the world, as this theory assumes? In the 'natural' world-order the atoms must, in and of themselves, be indifferent to each other; but that conception implies that the atoms could not combine either into more complex forms or inorganic and organic bodies, much less into the cosmos.

Two modern theories are held by Wobbermin to be not purely scientific. The scientists who advocate them are influenced by philosophical presuppositions. Ostwald's 'energetic' theory completely eliminates the conception of matter; it is reduced to a form of energy. Mach's 'phenomenal' theory is examined at length; physics, and indeed all natural sciences are, according to Mach, concerned only with our sensations, that is to say with sensations as given in our consciousness. All that natural science can do is to determine the relation of these sensations one to the other, and to arrange them in due order. The passage from sensations to external objects is unjustifiable, because 'unscientific.' Wobbermin convicts Mach of inconsistencies, but holds that his theory does not affect the religious view of the world. His reasons for rejecting as unscientific the assumption of the existence of an external world furnish no valid reasons for asserting that the world of religious

faith is a mere metaphysical creation, a vain product of the imagination.

The theory which most justly claims to be based on genuine scientific research is, Wobbermin maintains, the 'kinetic' theory of atoms, otherwise known as the 'electron' theory. It is not necessary to quote his statement of this theory, for which Helmholtz prepared the way, and with which Lord Kelvin, Sir Oliver Lodge, and Prof. J. J. Thomson have made English readers familiar. It is pointed out that popular exponents of this theory sometimes assume, without any scientific warrant, that electrons are the ultimate constituents of the material universe. 'The infinitely little, revealed by scientific research, is not an absolutely little, but a relatively little.' Wobbermin's most instructive article closes with the reminder that the latest researches into the nature of matter bring us to a *regressus in infinitum*. Hence 'this spatial, material world—the world of natural science—is not the entire and the ultimate world.' This conclusion accords with the fundamental position in the religious view of the world, according to which 'the material world is a world of empiric, but not of absolute reality, having the basis and the end of its existence in a world belonging to a higher order—a world of absolute reality—the world of the living God and of His holy, loving will.'

There is nothing absolutely new in the sketch of Jacqueline Pascal, by M. Victor Giraud, in the April 15th *Revue de Deux Mondes*; but her portrait is drawn with great freshness and distinction, and most of the personages of Port Royal—St. Cyran, Racine, Mère Angelique and Mère Agnes—come into the picture. In the order of intelligence and literary genius, the saintly and heroic sister of Blaise Pascal is said to be inferior to her illustrious brother, but in the order of the heart, of morality and sanctity, she is pronounced and shown to be 'distinctly superior.' Her life presents 'the simplicity and the unity of a fine classic tragedy.' When once she had found her path in life, she followed it with a keenness of energy, a rigour of logic, 'a need of going to the end of her sacrifice, in short with a virility of heroism of which there are few examples.' In her, 'French idealism has found one of its highest and most memorable expressions.' The same number also contains an elaborate and appreciative analysis and exposition by M. de Wyzewa of Mr. Andrew Lang's *The Maid of France*.