

3 3433 08164779 8

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn

*J
Brit

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn

THE BRITISH
www.libtool.com.cn

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER.

1866.

44
VOL. XLIV.

LONDON:
JACKSON, WALFORD, AND HODDER,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

www.libtool.com.cn

2055

LONDON :
BENJAMIN PARDON, PRINTER,
PATERNOSTER-ROW.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXXVII,

ART.	PAGE.
I. Ireland <i>The Times</i> , September 16, 1865, to July 1, 1866.	1
II. The Author of John Halifax	32
1. The Ogilvies. 1849.	
2. Olive. 1850.	
3. Agatha's Husband. 1852.	
4. Head of the Family. 1854.	
5. John Halifax. 1857.	
6. A Life for a Life. 1859.	
7. Mistress and Maid. 1862.	
8. Christian's Mistake. 1865.	
9. A Noble Life. 1866.	
III. Auguste Comte	59
1. Auguste Comte et La Philosophie Positive. Par E. LITTE. 1863.	
2. Notice sur l'Œuvre et sur la Vie d'Auguste Comte. Par le Docteur ROBINET. 1864.	
3. Auguste Comte and Positivism. By JOHN STUART MILL. 1865.	
4. The Classification of the Sciences. To which are added Reasons for Dissenting from the Philosophy of M. Comte. By HERBERT SPENCER. 1864.	
IV. Congregationalism—English and American	90
1. History of New England. By JOHN GORHAM PALFREY. 2 vols. Boston.	
2. The Ecclesiastical History of New England. By JOSEPH FELT. Vol. 1. Boston.	
3. Congregationalism: What it is; Whence it is; How it Works. By HENRY M. DEXTER. Boston.	
4. Official Record of the National Congregational Council, held at Boston, Mass. June 14-24, A.D. 1865. Boston.	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE.
V. The Recent Financial Panic	125
Report of the Association of the Chambers of Commerce, presented to the Annual Meeting held in London, February, 1866.	
VI. Professor Boole	141
1. Various Papers on Linear Transformations, Differential Equations, the Theory of Probabilities, and other Branches of the Higher Mathematics. By GEORGE BOOLE.	
2. The Mathematical Analysis of Logic. By the same. 1847.	
3. An Investigation of the Laws of Thought. By the same. 1854.	
4. Treatise on Differential Equations. By the same. 1859. Second Edition. Revised by I. TODHUNTER. 1865.	
5. A Treatise on the Calculus of Finite Differences. By the same. 1860.	
6. A Treatise on Differential Equations. Supplementary Volume. By the late GEORGE BOOLE, F.R.S., Pro- fessor of Mathematics in the Queen's University, Ireland, &c. Edited by I. TODHUNTER. 1865.	
VII. Reform and the State of Parties	182
1. A Bill to Amend the Representation of the People in Parliament in England and Wales. 6th June, 1866.	
2. Electoral Returns, 1865, 1866.	
3. The New Reform Bill. By R. DUDLEY BAXTER, M.A.	
4. The History of the Reform Bill. By the Rev. W. N. MOLESWORTH, M.A.	
CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE	231

CONTENTS OF No. LXXXVIII.

ART.	PAGE
I. Maine de Biran	301
1. Maine de Biran : Sa Vie et ses Pensées. Publiées par E. NAVILLE 1857.	
2. Œuvres Inédites de M. de Biran. Publiées par ERNEST NAVILLE, avec la collaboration de MARC-DEBRIT. 1859.	
3. Œuvres Philosophiques de M. de Biran. Editées par M. COUSIN. 1841.	
4. Fragments Philosophiques. Par V. COUSIN. Tome deuxième. 1838. (Containing 'Introduction to the Posthumous Work of M. de Biran.')	
II. Photography	346
1. History and Practice of Photogenic Drawing. By L. J. M. DA-GUERRE. 1839.	
2. On the Application of the Chemical Rays of Light to the Purposes of Pictorial Reproduction. By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, R.H., F.R.S. The Action of the Rays of the Solar Spectrum on Vegetable Colours, and on some New Photographic Processes. By the Same. On certain Improvements on Photographic Processes, and on the Parathermic Rays of the Solar Spectrum. By the Same. Philosophical Transactions, 1839-43.	
3. Researches on Light in its Chemical Relations. By ROBERT HUNT, F.R.S. Second Edition, 1854.	
4. The Journal of the Photographic Society. Edited by H. W. DIAMOND, M.D., F.R.S., Vol. I—X. 1853-66.	
5. The Photographic News. Edited by G. WHARTON SIMPSON, M.A. Vols. I—IX. 1858—65.	
6. The Year-Book of Photography. 1861-66.	
7. The Total Solar Eclipse of the Sun, July 18th, 1860. By WARREN DE LA RUE, F.R.S. (Proceedings of the Royal Society, April, 1862.)	
8. Traité de l'Impression Photographique Sansels d'Argent. Par ALPHONSE POITEVIN. 1862.	
9. Traité Général de Photographique. Par D. V. MONKHOVEN. Cin-quième Edition. 1865.	
10. L'Art de la Photographie. Par DISDERI. 1862.	
11. Annuaire Photographique. Par A. DAVANNE. 1866.	
12. Photography : Its History, Position, and Prospects. A Lecture. By the Hon. J. WILLIAM STRUTT. 1865.	
13. Researches on Solar Physics. By WARREN DE LA RUE, Ph. D., F.R.S.; BALFOUR STEWART, M.A., F.R.S.; and BENJAMIN LOEWY, 1865.	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
III. Notes on Waterloo	391
Notes on the Battle of Waterloo. By the late Sir JAMES S. KENNEDY, K.C.B. 1865.	
IV. The Moral View of the Atonement	410
1. The Vicarious Sacrifice. By HORACE BUSHNELL, D.D. 1866.	
2. The Light and the Life of Men. By JOHN YOUNG, LL.D. 1866.	
V. Jamaica	452
Report of the Jamaica Royal Commission. 1866.	
VI. Les Apôtres	474
Les Apôtres. Par ERNEST RENAN, Membre de l'Institut. 1866.	
VII. The New Germanic Empire	503
1. L'Armée Prussienne. Par MICHEL CHEVALIER. 1856.	
2. War Map of the German States.	
VIII. Contemporary Literature	537
<i>History, Biography, and Travels.</i> —George's Oberland and its Glaciers. Parr's Life and Death of Jeanne d'Arc. Sunderland and Buzacott's Mission Life in the Islands of the Pacific. Howell's Venetian Life. Byrne's Cosas de Espana. Parkes's Vignettes. Carpenter's Last Days in England of the Rajah Rammohun Roy.	
<i>Politics, Science, and Art.</i> —Crump's Treatise on Banking, Currency, and the Exchanges. Willich's Results under the last Bank Charter Act of 1844. Richard's Letters on the Social and Political Condition of the Principality of Wales. Anstie's Notes on Epidemics. Our Postal and Revenue Establishments.	
<i>Poetry, Fiction, and Belles Lettres.</i> —Carey's Vision of Hell. Plumptre's Master and Scholar. Buchanan's London Poems. Webster's Dramatic Studies. Rosetti's Prince's Progress. Matson's Inner Life. Miller's Our Hymns. Trebutien's Letters of Eugénie de Guérin. Björnson's Arne. Browne's Views and Opinions. The Gentle Philosopher. Tytler's Days of Yore. Harington's Lynton Grange. Gotthell's Wealth and Welfare.	
<i>Theology, Philosophy, and Philology.</i> —Heard's Tripartite Nature of Man. Kiel's Biblical Commentary on the Books of Samuel. Delitzsch's Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job. Murphy's Commentary on the Book of Exodus. Kitto's Cyclopædia. Cyclopædia of Biblical Geography, Biography, Natural History, and General Knowledge. Statham's Sure Standards of the Faith. Essays on the Irish Church. Brady's Alleged Conversion of the Irish Bishops to the Reformed Religion at the Accession of Queen Elizabeth. Overbeck's Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism. The Conflict of Christ in His Church. Ainslie's Discourses. Kinloch's Studies for Sunday Evening. Rigg's Essays for the Times. Gill's Papal Drama. Blackley and Howe's Critical English Testament. Alford's New Testament for English Readers. Candlish on the First Epistle of John. Grosart's complete Works of Thomas Brooks. Gonge's Commentary on the Hebrews.	

THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY 2, 1866.

ART. I.—*The Times*, September 16, 1865, to July 1, 1866.

ON the 16th of September last, the telegraph announced to these kingdoms that a treasonable conspiracy had been discovered in Ireland, and that some of its leaders had been arrested. In the course of a few succeeding days many persons were suddenly thrown into prison; the documents in the office of the *Irish People* disclosed the fact that a considerable organisation had been formed in Ireland and America to destroy the government of the Queen in Ireland; and, even at a preliminary examination before a magistrate, the responsible law adviser of the Crown declared that a vast Communistic plot had been hatched in Ireland and the United States, its object being to subvert all order and property in the former country. The state trials which soon afterwards ensued proved that this was not an exaggerated remark, and showed conclusively that for several years an attempt has been made by agents from America, supported by the American Irish, to array the mass of disaffection in Ireland into a league against the rule of Great Britain; that this confederacy, in appearance at least, presented a very formidable aspect, having succeeded in making thousands of recruits, in collecting funds, ammunition, and arms, in sending numerous emissaries throughout Ireland, and in establishing a central administration at New York, and finally that a Fenian Republic, erected upon the ruins of the Constitution, was a vision more or less acceptable to no small a fraction of the Irish people. 'This conspiracy,' said Mr. Justice Keogh, in a very able and temperate address, 'was formed in this country for a

‘considerable time—two or three years at least; the object of its leaders was to extend it through all classes of the people, but especially the artisans in towns and the cultivators of the soil; its ramifications existed not only in this country but in the States of America; supplies of money and of arms for the purposes of a general insurrection were collected not only here but on the other side of the Atlantic; and finally the object of this Confederation was the overthrow of the Queen’s authority, the separation of this country from Great Britain, the destruction of our present Constitution, the establishment of some democratic or military despotism, and the general division of every description of property as the result of a successful civil war.’

Since the termination of the state trials, with respect to which we may say in passing that they were fine examples of the administration of justice, events of deep significance have happened. James Stephens, the principal leader of the movement, whose escape from prison through scandalous collusion excited great alarm at the time, for some time eluded detection, though a large price was set on his head, and, having ultimately escaped to France, enjoys widespread popular sympathy. During the winter several hundred persons, of savage, but bold and soldier-like aspect, were seen haunting the seaport towns; and no secret was made that these men, disbanded from the American armies, were to be the military chiefs of the insurrection. ‘These men,’ wrote Lord Wodehouse officially, ‘are Irishmen imbued with American notions, thoroughly reckless, and possessed of considerable military experience, acquired on a field of warfare, the civil war in America, admirably adapted to train them for conducting an insurrection here.’ At the same time most daring attempts were made to corrupt the troops in Ireland; ‘there was hardly a regiment,’ said Sir George Grey, ‘in which our enemies did not contrive to introduce themselves with the view of seducing the soldiers from their allegiance;’ and, though no serious impression was made, it is well known that in too many instances these fatal lessons have found listeners. Moreover, the manufacture of arms in spite of a vigilant and powerful police went on in several parts of the country; a considerable number of guns and pikes have been seized on different occasions; and it is generally supposed that those which have been found are only a small proportion of the whole. In view of these alarming circumstances, it is not surprising that in February last the Government should have applied for fresh powers, and that Parliament at a single sitting should have suspended the Constitution of Ireland. Since this necessary, but unfortu-

nate event, a great number of persons have been arrested ; large seizures of arms have taken place, and, the conspiracy having been suddenly stifled, there is no fear of a rebellious outbreak. But Ireland, though for the moment quiescent, remains in a state which all must regret, ruled undisguisedly by mere force, her rights and liberties in suspense, her people notoriously full of disaffection.

The explosion of these elements of disorder induces us to review briefly the condition of Ireland in its different bearings. As there is little evil without some good, so Fenianism, ominous and mischievous as it has been, has been attended with this advantage—that it has proved that not only the upper classes, but the great majority of the middle ranks, are on the side of order in Ireland. Addresses from the nobility and gentry have poured in to the Irish Government, congratulating it on its vigorous policy ; the juries, chosen with scrupulous justice from the orders of traders and agriculturists, have invariably, at the late state trials, returned verdicts according to the evidence ; the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland have denounced Fenianism in vehement language ; and there is reason to believe that the farmers, as a body, have little sympathy with an insurrectionary movement. There is some truth in Mr. Gladstone's remark, 'That the Executive must acknowledge with gratitude the strong and genuine Irish sentiment which has been developed upon this painful and critical occasion, and which has given strength to the law and its representatives.'

Yet those who would infer from these symptoms that Ireland as a nation is contented with its existing position and institutions, that the Irish people are loyal subjects, and, above all, that the state of the country need cause no alarm to the statesman, would fall into very serious error. It is, we fear, but the simple truth that in three of the four provinces of Ireland the large majority of the lower orders are hostile to the British Government and to the law under which they live ; and though quiet at this moment, they could not be relied on if a rebellion were once to assume a formidable aspect. Ascending higher in the social scale a feeling exists among the agricultural classes, almost the only middle class in Ireland, that they are more or less exposed to injustice from the state of their relations to the soil ; and though it is doubtful whether, in any event, they would give aid to an insurrection, they are not, except perhaps in the North, attached sincerely to the Constitution. As for the Catholic clergy, who possess an immense influence over these classes, they indeed condemn the Communistic outbreak which was a part of the Fenian programme ; but no one can doubt

that they are opposed openly to many of the institutions of the country, and especially that they inculcate the doctrine that Ireland is an oppressed and injured nation. Even among the higher orders in Ireland there is a sentiment that something is wrong in society, an opinion that some reforms are inevitable; while, as regards the economic state and prospects of the nation as a whole, though, taking a period of twenty years, there has been a great and happy improvement, a retrogression of late is apparent, and during the last thirteen years comparatively little progress can be traced.

The immediate causes of these phenomena are not difficult to be determined. The Fenian movement, in the shape it assumed, with its socialistic and republican theories, its organisation abroad and at home, and its vision of an Ireland regenerated by a vast Celtic crusade from the West, is obviously of American origin, and owes its existence to the military fervour created by the great war with the South, and to the sympathy between the millions of Irishmen settled in the United States, and their countrymen still remaining at home. The idea was propagated by a set of fanatics who had either witnessed or taken part in the scenes of the American contest, and it soon found a formidable embodiment among the masses of the Irish race, which spread on either shore of the Atlantic. Nor need we be surprised at the fact, if we recollect that, since 1846, two millions and more of the Irish people have emigrated from their native country with feelings, in the great proportion of cases, of bitter hostility to the British Government and to the ruling classes in Ireland, and that these sentiments, in many instances, are reciprocated by those who continue in Ireland and sympathise with their expatriated countrymen. Such a state of things was certain to produce disaffection more or less serious; and those who are really acquainted with the tendencies of the poorer classes of Irish in the southern, eastern and western provinces, will not be surprised that numbers among them should at least not disapprove of Fenianism. As for the Roman Catholic priesthood, any one who has studied their attitude towards the State for years, and their views on almost all Irish questions, can only expect that, though they abstain from encouraging violent and hopeless insurrection, they would stand aloof from the Government and its supporters, and would continue to urge strenuously what they think their own claims and those of the people. And as for the dissatisfaction of the upper classes,—though in part, as we shall endeavour to show, the result of complex political causes—and the recent decline of Ireland in opulence, the principal immediate cause of this is, that the

country between 1860 and 1864 experienced a series of unfruitful seasons which have greatly reduced the incomes of the wealthy, have sapped the sources of the national prosperity, and, even now, after two years, are only beginning gradually to disappear.

These causes, however, of the ills of Ireland are only immediate and superficial, and, in fact, are merely the symptoms of causes, deep lying and of ancient origin, to which the state of the country may be traced. The discontent of the Irish people, widespread in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, their hostility to English government and law, their antipathy and that of the Catholic priesthood to the order of things they see around them, nay, even to a considerable extent, the landed system and economy of Ireland, and the phenomena of her material condition must be ascribed to a variety of circumstances which the course of her history has produced; and which can only be understood by glancing at its principal incidents. The first great fact which marks the relations of Ireland with the rest of Great Britain is, that Ireland is a conquered country, not subjugated quickly and by overwhelming force, but overrun in the lapse of five centuries, and gradually appropriated by a foreign race, who destroyed the old institutions of the nation, uprooted slowly its leaders from their possessions, and reduced the people to bondage and serfdom by a long series of acts of oppression. Ireland, early invaded by Henry II., not even nominally subject to England throughout the long Plantagenet period, assailed vehemently by the Tudors, but not really annexed by them, and the theatre of bloody war under the Stuarts, was not thoroughly and finally conquered until she sank under the sword of William at the Revolution of 1688. But, during this lengthened space of ages, Ireland was being gradually colonised and settled by successive swarms of English and Scotch, who, in spite of fierce and unceasing opposition, spread by degrees over the whole of the country, eradicated the national usages and laws, thrust out the native chiefs from their lands, broke up the organisation of the native tribes, and planted themselves as lords and masters on the necks of a broken but resentful people. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Ulster had become very nearly English and Scotch, the Irish race being much diminished it; but in the remaining three provinces, while the owners of the soil and the upper classes were almost all of English origin, the aborigines formed the mass of the people, and continued rooted in myriads on the land which they still fondly considered their own, and from which they believed that their chiefs had been torn by every kind of wrong and injustice.

A conquest of this peculiar character—a long struggle of hostile races which terminated in the elevation of one to a position of mastery over the other throughout more than three-fourths of Ireland, and in the ruin of the Irish in Ulster—was a settlement in which it is impossible to suppose that the Irish people would contentedly acquiesce. Ulster, since the Revolution of 1688, has been attached to the British connexion, and loyal to the Government and the law; but—setting aside some other causes—the principal cause of this has been that Ulster is essentially English and Scotch, and that the subjugated Irish race are only a feeble part of the population. In Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, however, where the descendants of the old conquered nation are still the large majority of the inhabitants, dissatisfaction and disloyalty survive, occasionally smouldering and apparently extinct, but occasionally becoming more visible; nor can we doubt that the main cause of this—we shall touch on other causes afterwards—was the singular and unfortunate manner in which this part of Ireland was subdued, the conquerors and conquered being of different origin, exasperated against each other by long animosities, and locally associated while morally hostile. This cause should never be kept out of mind, when dealing with Fenianism or any other distemper which exhibits itself in the frame of Ireland; as Mr. Gladstone says, it explains why some ills of Ireland are inveterate, can be only palliated and treated indirectly, and cannot be remedied by any sudden process.

Unhappy, however, as were the circumstances under which Ireland was conquered and settled, time might, perhaps, have removed their effects, and ere now have united her races in mutual sympathy and loyalty to Great Britain had it not been for another influence which operated powerfully to keep them asunder, and to alienate the mass of Irishmen from England. In the great changes of the sixteenth century, England as a nation became Protestant, and the English and Scotch colonists of Ireland were almost all adherents of Protestantism. But the Irish people, with hardly an exception, remained steadfast to the old faith, and even to this day their descendants form the most Roman Catholic race in Europe. Thus the dissension of hostile religions came to increase the hatred produced by conquest; and Ireland became the melancholy battle-field, not only of mutually adverse races, but of Protestantism and Catholicism in fierce conflict. These religious dissensions were aggravated and embittered by a long train of acts of violence, confiscations, civil wars, and spoliations continued during more than a century, so that at last the national struggle took the shape of a sectarian

contest. At the settlement effected in 1688-90, Ulster was not only peopled by colonists, but was also in a great degree Protestant; while in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, the aristocracy was English and Protestant, the mass of the nation remaining Catholic, the two distinctions of race and creed dividing nearly the same classes. This state of things inevitably led to discontent and a feeling of dislike to the institutions and laws of England among the vanquished Catholic people; and it may be asserted that much of the sentiment of disaffection existing in Ireland is the result of the religious animosities inherited from the sixteenth century.

Yet even the fatal lines of demarcation caused by the distinctions of race and creed might have been gradually effaced in Ireland, had not Government and Legislation interfered to make them impassable and lasting. The Reformation which emancipated England from dependence upon the See of Rome, imposed on Ireland a State Church, representing only the faith of the conquerors, a monument of victory and confiscation, and opposed to the will of the mass of the people. This unjust and absurd institution arrayed against the influence of England the power of the Irish Catholic priesthood and the sympathies of their devout flocks; and even, from the first it was vehemently denounced as founded on sacrilege and sheer oppression. Then followed a series of penal laws, framed for the purpose of upholding the Church and limiting the rights of citizenship to its supporters; and these when vigorously applied to a nation of which five-sixths were Roman Catholics, became edicts of general proscription. These laws, growing by degrees more severe through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, shut out the Roman Catholic people of Ireland from most of the rights of British subjects, and produced of course their natural fruit in alienation, hostility, and disaffection. They did not, however, attain their climax until after the Revolution of 1688, when the celebrated Code of William and Anne was enacted by the Irish Parliament. The object of this detestable Code was to place the State Church in absolute supremacy and the Protestant aristocracy in complete ascendancy, and to reduce the entire Roman Catholic people into abject degradation and vassalage. The means adopted, as Burke has said, were well fitted for the odious purpose. The State Church was not only protected by every imaginable kind of device, but received the monopoly of education; every office and every liberal profession was appropriated to a Protestant oligarchy, and care was taken that the landed property of the country should centre in Protestants only. As for the Roman Catholics—that is, the nation in three out of the four provinces—

they were, in a single word, outlawed—the exercise of their religion proscribed, their authority over their children curtailed, their marriages with Protestants rendered invalid, their rise in life made ~~absolutely impossible~~, even the enjoyment of the remains of their property prohibited by jealous and malignant severity.

This Penal Code continued in force until 1778, when it was relaxed but only in a slight degree, and it cannot be said to have been repealed entirely until 1829. It formed thus a fundamental law of society in Ireland for three generations, and it cannot be doubted that its results were in the highest degree disastrous, and have left deep and permanent traces. By giving the Established Church in Ireland a factitious and most unjust supremacy it made it a dependency of the State and the appanage of an oligarchic sect, depriving it thus of moral strength, and it aroused not only against the Establishment, but also against the whole scheme of Government, the conscience and feelings of the Irish Catholics, that is, of the great mass of the nation. The Penal Code, by practically limiting the lands of Ireland to a few thousand Protestants and giving them all the privileges of the State, perpetuated the memories of confiscation and wrong, and made the aristocracy of Ireland, at least in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, that most mischievous and injurious order, a narrow, haughty, and exclusive caste, with no sympathy for the classes beneath them, and divided from them by a deep barrier. And as for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, it is needless to say that the Penal Code succeeded, to a considerable extent, in accomplishing what it intended against them. It drove many of their leaders into exile, and reduced the Catholic nobility and gentry in many instances to humiliation and poverty. It acted as a degrading influence on the whole mass of the Catholic nation, preventing them from hoping for advancement in the State, debarring them from the exercise of their natural qualities, and fastening the mass of them upon the soil in dull, ignorant, and hopeless serfdom. But, above all, it kept alive, and continued in their original vividness, the recollections of conquest and wrong, making the Irish Roman Catholic feel that he really was an alien outlaw, and that the order of society for him was a system of oppression and iniquity. To the Penal Code is unquestionably due much of what we see in Ireland at this day; the alien and disliked State Church, the peculiar traditions still cherished by many of the Protestant gentry, and the moral state of the Catholic people, at once depressed, discontented and disaffected, are, in part at least, to be ascribed to it.

The results, however, of this long train of unfortunate events

and bad were not only political and social; they left a deep and ominous mark on the economic condition of Ireland. One of the consequences of repeated confiscation was a numerous absentee proprietary, in race and religion different or hostile to the occupiers and cultivators of the soil; and it is hardly necessary to point out the mischiefs of this distribution of property. It was not only that such a class paid little attention to their estates, and consumed the produce in another country, it was that they remained aliens having little sympathy with the peasantry beneath them, and no feeling except to extract the greatest amount of rent possible. The restrictions placed by the Penal Code on the acquisition of land by the Catholics—as Burke predicted a century ago—threw the lands of Ireland into a kind of mortmain, giving a few Protestants a monopoly of them, and keeping them out of natural commerce. This not only discouraged the industry, the energy, and the thrift of the country, it had also a direct tendency to produce a class of embarrassed landowners—there being no check on encumbering land, although there was on its absolute transfer—and also to create an order of middlemen in evasion of the law against alienation. It is hardly possible to conceive a worse system of landed tenures than was the consequence of this state of things, or one more injurious to the country: and the evil of course was largely aggravated by all the other circumstances of Ireland, her poverty, backwardness, and disturbed condition. Of course, too, as we have noticed before, this unhappy tenor of Irish history found but too clear and mournful an expression in the state of the great mass of the peasantry in three at least of the four provinces. A century ago, seventy years after the settlement effected at the Revolution, the characteristics of the classes that form the farmers and agriculturists of Ireland, were in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, servility, a kind of sluggish apathy, and widespread and despairing poverty. When Burke and Arthur Young wrote, the economic structure of Ireland represented her history but too truly; its evidences were an idle and wasteful proprietary, in many instances non-resident; a grasping oppressive race of middlemen interposed between the owners and the occupiers of the soil, a degraded mass of peasantry and labourers, and a wretched and unimproving agriculture.

Nor have we even yet completed the tale of the causes which unhappily concurred to render Ireland the disgrace of the Empire. The healing and soothing influences of commerce would, perhaps, even in the last century, have removed some of her worst ills, have opened a way to Roman Catholic industry, have called into being a middle class to counterbalance the

Protestant oligarchy, have relieved the land from its swarms of paupers, have dissipated by the magic of comfort the evil memories of war and revolution. But, unfortunately, the narrow-minded policy which marked our whole colonial legislation until the days of Adam Smith and Pitt, was applied to Ireland with strict severity, and her relations in trade with the rest of the Empire were regulated by the mercantile system. The trade of Ireland was a colonial trade after the fashion of the eighteenth century ; that is, her natural exports were diminished ; her manufacturing industry was almost destroyed, and she was compelled to procure in the English market almost every article of luxury and ornament. This system of exclusion and repression, which formed perhaps the main grievance of Irish ' patriots ' in the last century, was, assuredly, a very minor evil compared to others we have enumerated ; nor do we deny that, in spite of it, the trade of Ireland made some progress, and that with happy and marked advantages. There is no doubt that in 1778, after nearly a century of settled government, the exports and imports of Ireland had increased immensely beyond what they had been, and that the result had been fraught with considerable benefit to the country. But the mercantile system, nevertheless, had reduced the commerce of Ireland to an amount insignificant compared to what it should have been ; and this mischievous effect of legislation in checking the development of progress that might have lessened the evils of the past, must be taken into account in any inquiry into the complex causes of the Irish Question.

Such, briefly, were the principal causes which, acting through a series of ages, made Ireland, what we know she was, during the century after the Revolution. Her condition has been fully described by writers of different genius and tendencies, but though their views may not coincide, they all agree in the general picture. They concur in this, that after years of settled government and established order, the distinctions of race and religion remained deep marked in the frame of society ; that if Ulster was comparatively prosperous, Leinster, Munster, and Connaught continued backward ; that the Penal Code had accomplished its work in elevating the Church of a caste into illegitimate and hated ascendancy, in producing a narrow oligarchy of proprietors, and in outlawing the mass of a nation ; that Ireland, bound in commercial fetters, was unable to expand naturally ; that the Catholic people, wretched as they were, clung fondly to their persecuted Church, and cherished the memory of its wrongs ; and that poverty and discontent were the normal state of three-fourths of the country. The gentle, acute,

and Christian Berkeley, lamented the impenetrable barrier which separated the Romish clergy from his own even in the commonest duties of life, regretted the arrogance and harshness of the squirearchy, and endeavoured, so far as in him lay, to call attention to the misery of the peasantry. Swift, less philosophic, contented himself with savage philippics against the laws which burdened the minority in trade, but drew ghastly pictures of the waste and brutality of the upper classes, and of the want of three-fourths of the nation. Burke traced the evil to its historical source, and showed conclusively that, governed as she was, Ireland never could become prosperous, and that she was a wretched dependency. And Arthur Young, that excellent observer, in his admirable economic sketch of Ireland, traced a striking picture of the material consequences of class ascendancy and landed monopoly.

Towards the close of the eighteenth century, the state of Ireland attracted the attention of William Pitt, in his conceptions at least, perhaps the greatest of the statesmen of England. Her sectarian divisions, her class dissensions, the domination of her Protestant aristocracy, the commercial checks upon her development, and the miserable depression of the mass of her people, were appreciated by him in all their bearings. He applied his vigorous and capacious mind to devise and execute a remedial policy. It was an age for preserving ecclesiastical establishments, and Pitt probably did not think that Ireland was ripe for religious equality. He thus left the State Church untouched; but he wished to raise from its degradation the fallen Church of the Roman Catholics by endowing liberally the Roman Catholic priesthood, and thereby to attract to the State the sympathies of the Roman Catholics of Ireland and their leaders. This measure was to be supplemented by Catholic emancipation in the largest sense; that is, not only were the cruel fetters of the Penal Code to be wholly removed, but the Irish Catholics were to receive the full benefits of complete citizenship. A policy like this, Pitt justly hoped, would at least lay the basis of a reconciliation between the Irish Catholics and their Government, would gradually obliterate their past wrongs, and, their energies being set free, would gradually bring them material prosperity. As regards the ascendancy of the Protestant caste, Pitt, evidently following Adam Smith, believed that a union with Great Britain would, in the course of time, effect its extinction; and this measure accordingly was a cardinal point in his plans for Ireland. At the same time he declared that Ireland was entitled to absolute freedom of trade, and he looked to the increase of wealth which would inevitably follow this change as

the best means of lessening her poverty. His policy, if not in all respects conformable to modern Liberal ideas, was truly noble and comprehensive; to this day it has not been equalled by any of his successors who have attempted to touch or mitigate the Irish difficulty.

Unfortunately, however, the policy of Pitt was not carried out on account of prejudices which only complicated the Irish Question. The Union was accomplished indeed, but in a manner which shocked the conscience of all honest and upright men, and under circumstances which almost made it a breach of faith to the Irish people. There can be no doubt that the general support which the Catholics of Ireland gave the Union was given under an implied promise that it would be accompanied by a series of reforms in the interest of their Church and themselves; and when it was discovered that this condition in the national compact was eluded, widespread distrust was the inevitable consequence. The Union, effected in this way by alienating the Catholics of Ireland from the British Government which had seemed to deceive them, compelled that Government to throw its weight in the scale of the Protestant oligarchy; and the result was that the influence of that caste, so fatal to the progress of the nation—its illegitimate and mischievous ascendancy—has hardly diminished for many years. During the generation that followed the Union, the political frame of society in Ireland continued in no respect altered; that is, favour, influence, and property were centred in the Protestant aristocracy; they monopolised all the patronage of the State; possessed all the local administration; engrossed nearly all the landed estates; and were allowed to oppress with impunity the Roman Catholic nation of three-fourths of Ireland. Meanwhile the Protestant Establishment still monopolised the ecclesiastical revenues of the country; the Church of the real nation continued in poverty, degradation, and contempt; and, the pledge of Catholic Emancipation having been repudiated as impracticable, the whole Catholic people of Ireland were kept deprived of the rights of citizenship, the lower orders held in subjection, the middle and upper rendered unable to take their natural place in society. From this state of things what could arise but a prolongation of the old evils—the iniquitous supremacy of class and creed—the monopoly of power by a sectarian caste—and a deep sense of injustice in the hearts of the mass of the Catholics, most powerful of course in the three provinces in which they formed the body of the people?

While this was the political state of Ireland for years after the Union, a great change was operating gradually in the

condition of her different orders, and, generally, in her material condition. Her wealth, measured by exports and imports, undoubtedly increased in a marked degree; and the opening of her trade with Great Britain was, of course, a considerable benefit to the nation. But the Union, by transferring the seat of Government from Dublin to London, augmented the number of her absentees; and this result was inevitably aggravated by every modern improvement in locomotion. The effect on a poor and discontented country was not without considerable mischief; it weakened any existing ties of goodwill between landlord and tenant, and contributed to the neglect of estates and to the general depression of industry. At the same time, the high prices of the war, and the consequent rapid rise of rents, alike encouraged the habits of waste which characterised the Protestant aristocracy, made them disinclined to grant tenures of any duration to their dependants, and gave their lands a fictitious value, which operated mischievously on the poorer peasantry. Simultaneously with this, the enormous 'protection' which the war and the corn laws gave to grain caused tracts of land to be broken up, and subdivided into small farms held by a miserable pauper tenantry, whose whole corn crops were absorbed in rent, and who maintained a precarious existence by the cultivation of the treacherous potato. This was the age when the landed system of Ireland finally assumed the form in which it continued down to our time, a narrow oligarchy of embarrassed proprietors consuming more than their share of the produce of the soil in exorbitant rents; a class under them of harsh middlemen exaggerating the vices of their superiors; and an immense and increasing population of small farmers, the mere serfs of their greedy lords, like a pauper army fastened on the land, whose eager and fierce competition for it was regulated, as Mr. Mill has observed, by the sheer necessity of a struggle for existence. In this state of things, there is no doubt that the condition of all the lower orders deteriorated from what it had been even in the course of the century before; they remained degraded and servile as ever; but they became poorer and more wretched. In Ulster the change was less felt, on account partly of her manufacturing industry, and partly of the agricultural customs which existed between the landlords and tenantry, both in the case of the larger holders at least, usually of the same race and faith; but in the other three provinces the material decline of the mass of the people is a fact proved by the clearest testimony.

The Emancipation Act of 1829 found Ireland in the condition we have described, ruled by Great Britain through a dominant aristocracy, in race and faith distinct from the nation

in three out of the four provinces ; that aristocracy in alliance with an Establishment that represented sectarian ascendancy ; the gentry and the upper landed classes, in many instances non-resident, and forming a burden upon the people by their waste, their embarrassments and their alienation from it, the mass of the population degraded and sinking gradually into pauperism, the whole landed relations of the country becoming perilous and economically unjust through extortionate rents and bad agriculture, the top of society not prosperous, while the bottom was decaying in misery. This condition of Ireland was made terribly apparent in the reports of a series of commissions which between 1830 and 1844 laid its miseries and dangerous features bare, but rather deplored it than suggested remedies. Without detracting from the undoubted merit of the Liberal Administrations which at this period endeavoured to cope with this state of things, we agree with Professor Goldwin Smith that their policy, though in the right direction, was, perhaps, owing to the exigencies of their situation, inadequate to redress the ills of the country. A great attempt was, no doubt, made to redress the political wrongs of the Catholics. The Penal Code was completely obliterated ; Roman Catholics were admitted to full British citizenship, and, under the government of Lord Melbourne, received their share of authority in the State ; and at the same time the insolent ascendancy of the Protestant oligarchy was really discouraged. The extreme pressure of the State Church upon the Roman Catholic peasantry, and its most direct and odious burdens were mitigated by the commutation of the tithes ; and this apparently shifted the charge of the Establishment upon the Protestant gentry. A liberal system of national education was also inaugurated by the State, and a great reform was made in the corporations which had been the strongholds of Protestant ascendancy. Nor were these measures without good fruit ; their effects were seen in the lessening of agitation, in the cessation of widespread and violent disaffection, in an undoubted growth of loyalty and obedience among the more wealthy Roman Catholics ; and, we are happy to add, in the indignant remonstrances of the oligarchy, who, for the first time, found out that the Government of Ireland was not exclusively in their interests.

But though these reforms were good and useful, they did not go to the root of the matter, or even approach the terrible evils that were festering in society in Ireland. They made Protestant supremacy less odious, removed some of the mischiefs of the Establishment, taught Ireland that there was such a thing as justice and equal rights between man and man, and diffused

principles of hope and content between the upper and middle classes of the Catholics. But they did not produce religious equality; they left the State Church erect and supreme, and thus to retain its enormous power; above all they avoided touching the problem of the condition of Ireland in its economic and material aspect. They did not cope with the deep-seated ills becoming apparent in the landed system of by far the greater part of the country, which, the fatal heritage of the unhappy past, were threatening the very foundations of society. While Lords Lieutenant and Chief Secretaries were congratulating cabinets on 'the peaceableness of Ireland,' while Roman Catholic gentlemen and barristers were becoming deputy-lieutenants and judges, and while the baffled Protestant oligarchy were muttering at the apostasy of the Castle, the whole state of the landed classes—in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, at least—was becoming fatal to national progress. Many of the landed gentry, crippled by the fall of the prices that followed the close of the war, were more embarrassed even than their fathers; while, owing to the pressure of the population, their rents were rather rising than falling, and thus they were incapacitated from improving the estates which they really burdened, and at the same time, were made indisposed to treat the peasantry with liberality or justice. Meanwhile, the middleman class was being placed in much the same position as their superiors, and the condition of the agricultural peasantry, under the influence of an increasing population, was becoming annually more unprosperous. Ulster still retained comparative welfare, though even in Ulster the subdivision of land was causing alarm to thinking persons; but in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, the tillers of the soil and the mass of the peasantry were, materially, in a declining condition. The census of 1841, revealed to the Empire the appalling fact that out of a population of 8,000,000 of souls, nearly all dependent upon the land, 3,000,000 were in abject penury, and 1,000,000 were only just above it.

The monster meetings of 1843—we use the celebrated phrase of *The Times*—brought out the real condition of Ireland in terrible, but distinct, significance. In every parish, east, south, and west, a regular organisation existed, headed generally by the Catholic priesthood, for the purpose of collecting the funds intended for the Repeal agitation, and of enlisting recruits for the service of the 'moral force' armies of Daniel O'Connell. These associations, like 'centres of infection,' diffused mischievous principles around, and gave formidable and undoubted evidence of the discontent of the people and their priesthood. A convention in Dublin, with O'Connell as its ruler, directed

the conduct of these bodies, corresponded with their delegates and officials, applied the 'rent' towards such objects as seemed fitting to the great tribune, and held weekly meetings to promote the cause of 'Repeal and Irish freedom.' Thus an image of a native legislature, returned and supported by self-made constituencies, and openly demanding the dismemberment of the Empire, and the complete subversion of social order, arose at the bidding of one man, and in three out of four parts of Ireland practically defied the influence of Government. It was in fact the union of the Catholic lower classes, at the instance of their priests and a demagogue, in an attitude of elaborate preparation, not to fight indeed, but to compel the redress of what they considered their just grievances. The vast assemblages which were held at distinct intervals in the three provinces, were the popular embodiment of this movement, as the weekly meetings at Conciliation Hall, represented its intelligence and government. No eyewitness could behold these gatherings, collected from different and often distant points, arrayed usually in excellent order, and commanded by their 'wardens' or their 'heads,' without feeling the proof they afforded of the hostility of the Catholic Irish to the constitution, of the power of their unrecognised Church, and of the poverty of the huge masses which, not employed in prosperous industry, were levied for such illegal demonstrations. In this last point of view, indeed, the monster meetings were the upheaval of a chaos of discontented poverty in blind, dull, but perilous, passion.

This state of things, there can be no doubt, had a deep influence on the sagacious minister who was then at the head of affairs in Great Britain. Sir Robert Peel very properly resolved to make O'Connell amenable to the law, and to show that the power of the Crown could put down 'moral force' sedition. He brought the leaders of Repeal to trial, and though ultimately unsuccessful he extinguished agitation for a time. But he was too wise not to see, in the state of Ireland in 1843-44, the symptoms of a society that required extensive and immediate reform in the interest of the safety of the Empire. At this juncture he fully appreciated the necessity of reconciling by some means the Catholic priesthood to the British Government, of uniting as many Catholics as possible to the Irish soil by the tie of property, of diffusing enlightened ideas among them, of breaking up by an indirect method the half-ruined Protestant oligarchy, of devising some expedient to improve the condition of the agricultural peasantry, of introducing capital into the country, and of thus quickening its decaying industry. By a policy like this, carried out boldly, he hoped gradually to cut off the springs of sectarian discord and class hatreds, to reduce

the amount of Irish discontent, and if not to remove pauperism, to make it of less formidable proportions. At the risk of his popularity and his fame, he induced Parliament to increase the Maynooth grant for the support of the Irish Catholic clergy, expecting thereby to win their sympathies in some degree towards the British Government. He contemplated making Trinity College, Dublin, a really national place of learning; and when he found that this was impossible, he founded the Queen's University, to provide a system of middle class education for the supposed benefit of the Catholics principally. At the same time he appointed a Commission to inquire minutely into the system of the ownership and occupation of land in Ireland, his known purpose being to mature a scheme for the speedy transfer of those estates which had become embarrassed hopelessly, of creating a proprietary of Catholics out of the wrecks of the Protestant landlords, and if possible of placing the relations between the Irish peasantry and their superiors on a basis less injurious to industry, and giving more scope to their energy and exertions. It was a policy, possibly not bold enough, but marked with statesman-like thought and prudence; and, next to Pitt, Peel deserves the credit of having been the most enlightened of the ministers who have dealt with the case of Ireland.

The events, however, of 1846, prevented Peel from accomplishing his designs. It is impossible to say what might have been the policy adopted by his successor, had Ireland remained in her ordinary condition. But the visitation of 1846-7, fell suddenly on a suffering people, and brought out in fearful clearness the vicious state of society in Ireland, showed the Irish difficulty in its worst aspect, and, at the same time, provided the means by which it was to be partly mitigated. In 1845 the frail root on which the mass of the poorer Irish eked out existence, betrayed symptoms of general failure, and in the next year, the whole crop perished. An awful and mournful spectacle followed; a nation full of elements of decay, weak, poor, divided, and ill-organised, was brought into conflict with sudden famine, and thrown on the verge of utter dissolution. The whole mass of the small farmers of Ireland, with their labourers, families, and connections, and the myriads of pauper beggars below them, were lifted up, as it were, from the soil, and cast for support on the charity of the Empire. Whoever beheld these haggard armies besieging the workhouses day and night, or crowding the roads for miles upon miles in long lines of pitiable wretchedness, must have been, not only appalled at

the sight, but led to regret the state of society which could have given birth to such misery. The paupers in Ireland, in 1847, were 3,000,000 of souls and upwards; in 1848, they had only sunk to 2,500,000; and the ghastly multitude would hardly have decreased, but for immense and rapid emigration. This, in fact, proved the only means of dealing with the population of a country which had become inadequate to support it; and terrible as the crisis has been, it has been, undoubtedly, a national benefit. The people of Ireland have been reduced by about 3,000,000, since 1846, in consequence of this enormous exodus; and this change, however fraught with individual and widespread suffering, must be reckoned as a necessary condition to the material improvement of the country. It freed Ireland from the mass of pauperism which was actually threatening to overwhelm it, and by leaving vast tracts of the soil unoccupied, it opened a way to a better agriculture. As may be supposed, it was less violent in Ulster than in the rest of the island; but in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, it took the proportions of the expatriation of more than a third of the entire population.

The results, however, of the Great Famine, were not confined to the uprooting of millions, and sending them to the United States; they penetrated the whole of society in Ireland. A great number of the embarrassed proprietary were reduced to absolute bankruptcy and want, in consequence of the failure of their rents, and the sudden stoppage of cultivation over a large part of the area of the country, caused by the disappearance of the population. The class of middlemen was almost extinguished, unable to meet their own engagements, and deprived of the rents of their dependents. Thus liberated, in part, from the burden of pauperism, and from the incubus of a proprietary, in race, religion, traditions, and habits opposed to the well-being of the nation, the land of Ireland, to a considerable extent, and especially in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, was laid open to a new state of things; and an opportunity was afforded for a great material improvement of the country. Yet signs existed that this hope of progress would be attended by some evil symptoms. It was not possible that three millions of souls already hostile to the British government, and to the order of things under which they lived, could depart into exile from their native land, under every circumstance of sorrow and suffering, and not feel the sentiment of wrong made more intense, more deep, more enduring. It was not possible that this vast multitude could scatter itself though the United States, become a large part of the American people, and, at the

same time, in a thousand ways, keep up relations with the race at home, of which it was so immense a fraction, and that disloyalty and disaffection would cease to infect the soil of Ireland. Nor was it possible that the Irish priesthood, whose power, prestige, and pecuniary resources were greatly diminished by the emigration, would be satisfied with this state of things, or acquiesce in the position they held in Ireland under the existing constitution. Thus while after the events of 1846, a prospect of real material improvement was opened for the first time to Ireland, her political state in some respects was threatened by many elements of disturbance. An exiled people across the Atlantic, a bereaved and isolated people at home, and a clergy hostile as ever to the law, have formed since 1846 the principal features of the Irish Question.

What, then, in view of this state of things, has been the policy of our statesmen to Ireland? If it has been judicious in some respects, it has been somewhat timorous and weak, on account, perhaps, of the immense difficulty of dealing with Ireland comprehensively in the existing composition of Parliament. It has been an attempt to improve the condition of Ireland by material means, and through the upper and middle classes, without much regard to the lower, and without any effort to cope with the political and sectarian ills of the country. A stringent Poor Law has been enacted, and has co-operated with the work of nature in increasing the efflux of population, and in clearing the soil for a new husbandry. The Incumbered Estates Act has transferred the lands of many of the embarrassed proprietary; has thus, to a considerable extent, relieved Ireland from a mischievous burden, and has created a class of Roman Catholic landowners in harmony with the Roman Catholic peasantry. Other useful measures have been passed to encourage the introduction of capital, to abolish practically the middleman tenures, and to simplify the alienation of land in order to bring it rapidly into commerce. It cannot be doubted that this legislation has been attended with very great benefits. The wretched swarms of pauperism have vanished, and cannot again settle down on the soil, to ruin every relation upon it, and to threaten society with a fearful evil. A bankrupt and most mischievous feudalism has been replaced in a large degree by a better order of solvent proprietors freed from the associations of their predecessors. Ireland has made considerable material progress; and, in 1866, notwithstanding several seasons of distress, is far wealthier than she ever was at any period before the famine. The poverty of the lower orders has diminished; the wages of labour has almost doubled; there is certainly much more physical comfort

diffused generally throughout the peasantry. Ascending in the scale of society, the agriculture of the island has advanced; large tracts have been reclaimed and enclosed; the land is centering in a richer class; farms have become more and more extended; and the intense competition for the possession of the soil, though far greater than it ought to be consistently with the general welfare, has undergone a marked diminution. The habits, too, of the upper classes have been changed in several respects; they are more thrifty, intelligent, and prudent, less intolerant than in the days of ascendancy; and though not particularly attached to governments which of late have somewhat disliked them, they are, on the whole, not a bad specimen of a somewhat harsh but respectable aristocracy.

But though the material progress of Ireland has been great during the last twenty years, the political and sectarian mischiefs which constitute part of the Irish difficulty, cannot be said to have much diminished. Nor, as we have intimated, has legislation attempted even to grapple with these evils; indeed, Government in some respects has made them more acute and exasperating. The increase of the wealth of Ireland has not caused the American Irish to forget the events of the great exodus, nor blinded the Irish at home to the fact that the land to which they long fondly clung is passing rapidly to a new race of occupiers. The Irish peasantry know well that legislation for twenty years has positively stimulated emigration; and that Government has made no attempt to ameliorate the harsh and peculiar relations which exist between the more humble farmers and the landlords who hold them almost in subjection. They know that the statesmen who have done so much to change the condition and civilisation of the upper and middle classes in Ireland have stopped short at the class of the peasantry; and that for them the occupation of the soil, under a system still of extreme competition, remains, at least in these provinces, unmitigated by liberal and generous usages. Hence, while Ireland has become more wealthy, the elements of disaffection and discontent have not decreased among her poorer population, except so far as they have been mitigated by greater general physical well-being; some causes, too, have tended to increase them; and the constant intercourse with America gives them unity and effective consistency. We should not forget that, since 1846, Ireland has three times been menaced by an insurrection with which, undoubtedly, the lower orders in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught sympathised in a greater or a less degree, and this, though the material progress of the island is an indisputable

fact. Moreover, since 1846, the causes of the animosity of sect continue in Ireland as before, and have become even more irritating. The State persists in keeping up the Establishment without any change whatever, with all its old associations of ascendancy, and with its obvious injustice to the nation. It still disregards the Roman Catholic priesthood, who, in turn, during the last sixteen years, have thrown themselves more decidedly than ever into the scale against the Imperial Government. And, the influence of this body remaining, it keeps alive the feeling of hostility to the Constitution among its flocks, and prevents the sentiment of loyalty to England from entering the hearts of three-fourths of the people. Thus the Irish Question, happily solved to a certain extent in its material aspect, continues almost entirely unsolved in its political and sectarian bearings.

These considerations, in our judgment, account for the present state of Ireland. The Fenian movement, viewed by itself, and with reference only to the persons directly and actively engaged in it, need not cause peculiar alarm, and doubtless will be, ere long, quiescent. It is not sustained by the peasantry openly; it wants leaders and positive support; and it is denounced by the Roman Catholic priesthood. But the Fenian movement is not the less a symptom of a deep-seated evil which, in certain events, might become perilous—an evidence of the rankling discontent of the people of three-fourths of Ireland, and of the Roman Catholic priesthood, provoked immediately from America, but resulting ultimately from a series of causes to be traced in the history of the country. And while the disastrous effects survive; while in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, the great mass of the lower ranks are hostile to the order of society; while the Catholic priesthood throughout Ireland are at heart averse to the Constitution; while the religious institutions of the country are odious to the majority of the people; while, notwithstanding considerable progress, the relations of property and industry with the soil are, in three out of four provinces, felt by the peasantry to be harsh and unfair; while, in this state of things emigration continues, and the small agriculturists are being uplifted in thousands yearly from their hearths and homes, it is certain that, under one form or another, disaffection will exist in Ireland, and possible that, in certain contingencies, it might assume a formidable aspect. It is a mistake to suppose that, because Fenianism has not been embraced by thousands openly, the spirit of Fenianism is not dangerous, or to measure the discontent of Ireland by the numbers of the avowed Fenians. The conspiracy, planned in a

time of peace, when the strength of England was undivided, was obviously so certain to fail, that it could not attract the open support of any order or class in Ireland, whatever sympathy it may have evoked, and for this reason, we do not doubt, it was especially condemned by the Roman Catholic clergy. But were England engaged in a war that would seriously occupy her forces, the case would be completely different; in that event, the condition of Ireland, of which Fenianism is a mere sign, would become fraught with extreme peril.

For these reasons the state of Ireland demands, in our judgment, serious attention in the interest not only of the island itself, but of the integrity of this great Empire. Can nothing be done to remove the causes of the dissatisfaction we have been noticing; to extinguish Fenianism and similar tendencies, not by the precarious method of force, but through the harmony of a united people, to establish in Ireland the foundations of a reign of happiness and national peace? Have the last efforts of statesmanship been tried, and does nothing yet remain to be accomplished to reconcile the authority of Great Britain, and the institutions under which they live, to the hearts and minds of the Irish people?

In discussing these questions let us do justice to what has already been achieved, since the great statute of 1829 for the first time admitted the Catholics of Ireland to the rights of British citizens. Let us allow that the tendencies of legislation for Ireland have been generous and well meaning, if not bold enough; that such measures as the Commutation of the Tithes, the Bills for Maynooth and National Education, and the opening of the Irish Corporations, have all been in a liberal direction; and that the Poor Law and the Incumbered Estates Act have in them elements of future improvement. Let us concede, too, the undoubted fact that, under liberal administrations, at least, the conduct of Government has been just and generous to the Catholics of Ireland, that they have received their share of the patronage of the State, and have been treated by it with confidence. Let us also distinctly bear in mind that, as the causes of the ills of Ireland run up to the remote past, so they cannot be immediately removed, that perhaps it may be as impossible to extirpate them as it would be to restore to its form a member long withered by disease, and that, however modern statesmanship may regret what has already taken place, it cannot recall the events of history. Nor should we forget, in common justice to British ministers since 1829, and with reference, too, to any schemes that may be devised for the welfare of Ireland, that any Irish policy must receive the sanction of the Parliament of Great

Britain ; that that Parliament is greatly divided in opinion on many Irish subjects ; that possibly a majority in it would not approve of many measures which the more enlightened of our statesmen consider necessary to the well-being of the country ; and that, accordingly, the whole Irish Question is one of extraordinary difficulty to deal with under any system of constitutional government. The Imperial Parliament, we must admit, is not, perhaps, the ideal we should choose to direct the affairs of a divided nation, politically identified with Great Britain, indeed, but distinct from it in many respects, and for ages despised and ill-treated by it.

The future policy of our statesmen towards Ireland should, however, we think be tolerably apparent. Her political and sectarian ills continue ; they will not yield to material reforms ; they require political and moral remedies. The principal of these complicated ills—that which most deeply affects society—is the repugnance of the Catholics of Ireland to the religious organisation of the country, and the opposition of the Romish priesthood to the Government in its relations to them. And if we reflect that this sentiment is that of five-sixths of the nation, and of those whom they most deeply reverence, and that, though not always visible, it is not the less deep-rooted and certain, we shall comprehend what a general cause of widespread alienation it is, and how perilous it is to the Empire. What then is the main cause of this sentiment, and why is it so steady and inveterate ? We answer, it is the stubborn maintenance in legal but iniquitous ascendancy of a State Church, which embodies the principles of conquest, confiscation, and proscription, to the minds of the Catholics in Ireland, and which, for the benefit of a small minority who form a distinct and hostile sect, appropriates the ecclesiastical revenues of the people. This is, and must be, the great cause of just complaint and general ill-will, assuming that the Catholics of Ireland retain the ordinary feelings of humanity. If a state insists on supporting a church for a sect against the will of a nation, that church moreover being rightly considered as a standard of past misgovernment and oppression, and endowed unrighteously with the property of the people, disunion between the government and the governed, and mutual antipathy must be the consequence. The ecclesiastical settlement of Ireland, in fact, is the prolongation by mere force of sectarian wrong against the popular will, thus outraging the conscience and exasperating the feelings of the great majority of the Irish nation.

Nothing shows more distinctly the injury inflicted on Ireland by the Church Establishment, and the extreme impolicy of

keeping it up, than the arguments of those who venture to defend it. No person, as Macaulay observes, would pretend, in the existing state of Ireland, to force such an institution on the people. It is admitted that any measure of the kind would be as monstrous as the attempts to compel the Scotch to submit to prelacy, or to coerce the Huguenots of France into conformity to the faith of the persecuting Bourbon. It is admitted, that any British minister who would dream of imposing on a considerable part of the community who form the British people a church from which they not only dissent, but which they had special cause to dislike, would be fitted only for a cell in Bedlam. Nor is it pretended that this Establishment does not provoke a great deal of discontent, that it does not tend to perpetuate the sense of past wrong and present injustice. Setting aside a few impracticable persons, will any one say that the Irish State Church does not shock the vast majority of the people, is not viewed by them and their priesthood as a grievance, and is borne by them for any other reason than because they are compelled to submit to it? It is obvious moreover—for on this point statistics are an infallible test—that, looked at as a proselytising church, as the means of converting the Catholics of Ireland, the Establishment is a complete failure; that it has never got beyond the narrow limits of the pale to which it was originally confined; and that, after the lapse of more than three centuries, notwithstanding every kind of support from state injustice and state domination, it remains the mere appurtenance of a sect, and not the church of a faithful people. That pompous array of bishops and archdeacons, of deans and chapters, of prebends and rectors, compared with the number of their flocks, are a mass of officers without a real army, the satellites of a deserted temple into which worshippers will not enter. In short, it is a conceded fact that the Irish Establishment is an evil in the abstract, that it is thought a wrong by the mass of Irishmen, and that it has most signally failed to accomplish its intended mission.

These being the indisputable facts, they decide the question in our opinion. The arguments, on the other side, are historical fallacies or irrelevant sophisms. First, it is said, that the Irish State Church is essentially the same as that existing in Ireland at the time of the Conquest; that the Romish Church is an innovation, and therefore that prescription and law concur in favour of the Establishment. The answer is, first, that although the Church which Henry II. found settled in Ireland was not Romish in the strict sense, it was assuredly not the Tudor Establishment, and that for many centuries, at least five-sixths of the nation have been Roman Catholics; and, secondly, that even if

the fact were so, it has nothing whatever to do with the matter, because, since the sixteenth century the Irish State Church has only obtained the support of a sectarian minority. Then it is said, that because the Irish bishops, or rather a majority among them, assented to the ecclesiastical revolution of the Tudors in Ireland at the Reformation, that assent binds the whole nation for ever, as if in the first place the mass of the people have not kept aloof from the Protestant movement, and as if in the second any act of the kind could be a permanent settlement of the question. It is argued, thirdly, that the Irish Establishment is especially guarded by the Union, and that to touch the one is to assail the other; to this we reply, that the Act of Union does not contain a single provision to guarantee the revenues of that Church, that since the Union a positive statute has curtailed these revenues by one-fourth, that Parliament, in another essential point, the number of the representatives of Ireland, has interfered with the settlement of the Union, and that, in any case, no statute whatever, however fundamental or important, can necessarily control the action of the legislature. As for the arguments that the revenues of the Establishment are principally paid by the Protestant proprietary, and that accordingly they are legitimately applicable to the religious uses of Anglican Protestantism, or that, after all, the Church affords an excellent supply of country gentlemen to a country injured by absenteeism; we say, of the first, that it is a new doctrine, that because the weight of a national charge falls principally on a single class, that class possesses a right to distribute it in such a manner as it thinks fit; and, as to the second, that it is a mere pretence that savours not a little of simony. As regards those who clamour about the sanctity of the property of the Establishment, we refer them to the palpable distinction between individual and corporate rights, and to the precedent of the Reformation; and as for the notion that the Anglican Church in Ireland and England is so essentially one, that the fall of the one means that of the other, we would leave that question, with much confidence, to any sensible bishop or clergyman of the Church of England in this country.

The time therefore, we think, has come to deal with the Irish State Church in the interest of Ireland and the Empire. That Church, we repeat is, at once, an influence opposed to equal government and justice, a perpetual incentive of discontent, and an absolute and ignominious failure viewed as a means to promote Protestantism. We may add, that it has been condemned in principle by every thinker and statesman of the age, and that it is not defended by any person who has not a positive interest

in it. Should its temporalities be abolished, vested rights being of course respected, we believe such a measure would do more to diffuse a feeling throughout Ireland that the domination of sect had passed away, and that the legislature had ventured to treat Ireland with real equity, and, consequently, to extinguish national discontent, than any other conceivable reform. Nor do we think the result impossible, provided the attack were at first confined to the extinction of the revenues of the Church, and did not embrace the larger question of the manner in which they should be distributed. It is on this point that so much difficulty exists in fact, and is always suggested by those who wish to evade the matter; and we think, therefore, that it should be avoided in any attempt to deal with the question in the first instance by the imperial legislature. On the broad issue that the Irish State Church is a mischief to Ireland, and should be abolished in its present state and legal position, we hope that the time is not distant when the House of Commons will affirm the proposition. The other questions which lie behind, the appropriation of the revenues of the Church, and the relation in which the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland should stand hereafter to the State, important and interesting as they are, should, we think, be postponed to the main question, which alone opens the whole subject. It is well known, that on these latter points less chance of a majority in the House of Commons exists than on the principle at least of the former.

Our own views and principles in relation to national establishments are well known; and nowhere do they find more abundant justification than in Ireland. In England and Scotland, the essential injustice of an Established Church is veiled by the greater equality and congruity of the established and the principal unestablished creeds; and the consciousness of it is not, as in Ireland, aggravated and envenomed by differences of blood, and vivid remembrances of civil and social oppression: but it is none the less unrighteous, and impolitic, and opposed to the broader and deeper views of national life which are so rapidly winning the recognition of statesmen, and so powerfully influencing their legislation. During the last half century, every Act of Parliament affecting ecclesiastical matters, has been the abolition of some prerogative, the redressing of some social wrong, the loosening of some of the various and complicate ligatures which bind Church and State together, and grievously hamper both; an advance towards that absolute religious and ecclesiastical equality in the sight of the civil law, to which every church and every individual has an indefeasible right. It would, therefore, be a glaring retrogression in the progress of just legislation, and an egregious blunder in policy, as well as a fundamental wrong

in principle, were the attempt made to redress the inequalities of ecclesiastical legislation in Ireland, by the endowment of the Catholic Church. It would no doubt be an approach to religious equality, but it would be an approach only; for if the Catholic Church, why not the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist Churches? There are only two principles upon which the national endowment of a church can proceed;—the principle that the endowed church is the true and the only true church; a principle which it is impossible to determine, inasmuch as it can be affirmed only by the church itself: and the principle of impartiality, viz., that all churches in the state shall receive equal favour from the state; a principle which it is impossible to apply: for, in a free country, where the rights of the religious conscience are recognised, every individual man, as well as every society of men, stands before the law on the ground of perfect equality. It is so in all civil legislation; it is the great glory of English law, that it extends its provisions to the very meanest of its individual subjects; that the civil rights of the pauper are as sacred as those of the noble. No civil legislation would be tolerated, that inflicted the injustice which establishments now inflict; or that provided only the rough and approximate equality which the endowment of all churches would provide. Hence there is and must be essential injustice in all state endowments of religion; the property which belongs to all citizens is appropriated to a class in virtue of a religious creed, which other classes do not profess. Any endowment of Romanism, for instance, would be as great a wrong to many Protestant consciences, as the endowment of Protestantism now is to Roman Catholic consciences. Nor would this be relieved by their own equal endowment; and there would still be great numbers in the nation, who from various causes could have no endowment at all.

It seems, therefore, a very blind policy to attempt to redress one anomaly by a method which would leave other anomalies unredressed; which could have no constant application, but would be ever fluctuating with the fluctuating fortunes of different churches; and which would be an inevitable and prolific source of perpetual embarrassments to government. We do not think that any such attempt would be successful. We cannot imagine a proposal that would more effectually combine various and incongruous elements of opposition. The Episcopalians of England would oppose it on the ground of strong Protestant feeling as well as on that of prerogative. The Free Churches of England would be united almost to a man, on the ground of their non-establishment principles. The intense antipathy to popery in Scotland, as well as the great extension of non-established principles there; and the like antipathy to popery among the Pro-

testants of Ireland, would also combine them in opposition to it. These would soon open the eyes of dreaming statesmen, and show them that an essential injustice cannot be rectified by multiplying instances of its occurrence.

There must be no ambiguity about the position which Free Churches, and liberal statesmen occupy in relation to establishments. We in England have long been fighting this battle. We have affirmed the religious wrong, the social injustice, and the practical impolicy of Established Churches, when the established Episcopal Church in England was almost as preponderant as the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland now is. Bit by bit we have won the equality that we claimed; in no instance by co-endowment of ourselves, but in every instance by disendowment of the church invariably favoured. The progress of events has practically justified us. Conviction of the justice of our principles has been gradually wrought in the public mind. The failure of the established and protected church to maintain her national character, and her integral unity; the alienation from her communion of half the religious part of the nation; the distractions and divisions into hostile parties of her own members; together with the marvellous growth and power of the Free Churches of the united kingdom, notwithstanding their disabilities, have conclusively proved the civil establishment of a church to be a blunder as well as a wrong. With all our desire therefore that the injustice done to the Roman Catholics of Ireland should be redressed, we cannot consent to a principle and process of doing it, which we have uniformly repudiated for ourselves. We must insist that it shall be done upon the principles, which in our own case have hitherto proved so successful. The only possible justice to all, the only policy that will ultimately and permanently give satisfaction to all, is to remove iniquitous prerogatives, to discontinue invidious partialities, to place every citizen, irrespective of his church or religious creed upon an absolute equality before the law. Let this be done in Ireland, and the Roman Catholics who now avow this to be their wish, will be content. With the history of the church in past times, with the example of America, and with the present condition of the Free Churches of the kingdom before us, we can have no reasonable fear, that left to itself, the church of Christ will abundantly take care of itself.

The suppression, however, of the Irish State Church, in its present form of exclusive domination, would be only one of the measures required to mitigate the discontent of Ireland. We have alluded to the unquestionable fact that in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, the legal relations existing between the owners and occupiers of the soil are not softened by the

kindly usages that prevail generally in Ulster and in England. In these three provinces the land is held for the most part by tenants-at-will, still often divided from their landlords by ancient memories of past wrongs, and too often completely in their power in consequence of the competition for farms. The harsh rules of the common law, unmodified by any of the milder customs which by degrees have grown up elsewhere, determine usually the dealings between these classes; and at the same time, the demand for land forces up its rent to so high a point that the tenant's bargain is frequently an unfair one. In the case of contracts between landlords and tenants of capital and position these evils are, of course, seldom felt; but in the case of the great majority of the tenancies in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, the occupier is unable, practically, to treat with the landlord on equal terms; poor, weak, and attached as it were to the soil, he is willing to offer any sum for it; and in this state of things the severity of the law, the absence of the customs we have referred to, and the rack-rents which are commonly demanded, are repeatedly the cause of widespread hardship. The condition of the landed system of Ireland, in three out of its four divisions, although undoubtedly better than it was, still bears too many of the evil traces of Mr. Mill's remarkable description. The land even yet, to a great extent, is in the hands of small farmers, completely at the will of their landlords, who offer extravagant sums for it, and accordingly are ever on the verge of insolvency. Any improvements they make only cause the rent to be raised upon a new letting; and whenever a season of distress comes wholesale evictions are the necessary consequence. Hence discontent, and the feelings of wrong, a very backward state of agriculture, a disquieted and dissatisfied peasantry, and sometimes the sudden depopulation of districts most sad to reflect on and fearful to witness. Even now, as regards a large part of Ireland, there is too much truth in Mr. Mill's remark, 'that it is hardly possible that a system of this kind should be other than a miserable agriculture.'

The legislature, as we have already intimated, has attempted to cope with this state of things by encouraging the transfer of the soil from the small farmer to the large agriculturist. It hoped that the change would either cause the former to emigrate to America, or would make him a contented labourer, and that it would create a class of occupiers who would be able to protect themselves in any dealings with respect to land, and so settle the Irish land question. It has been successful to a certain extent; the agriculture of Ireland has improved; considerable tracts have been consolidated, and have fallen into the hands of solvent tenants; and in Leinster, Munster, and Con-

naught, the landed system is on a better foundation than it ever was at a previous period. Still, the image of the old state of things remains too widely impressed on the soil in cottier tenancies, ~~serf-like occupiers~~, exorbitant rents, a poor peasantry, an unkindly state of feeling existing between the owners and occupiers of land, in some instances evidenced in crime, a want of hope, a distrust of the law, occasionally serious acts of injustice, and sometimes the clearance of districts in the supposed interests of merciless landlords. The process of consolidation, too, is going on but slowly of late, and the progress of Ireland, although rapid in the first years that succeeded the famine, has been latterly very small, and since 1860 has been arrested. The legislature, therefore, we think, should attempt to make a change in the relations between the owners and occupiers of the soil in three of the four parts of Ireland, in the interest of the smaller agriculturists, and thus not only benefit husbandry, but promote justice, and close a source of deep complaint among the peasantry. Such notions as 'a forced valuation of the land,' 'a maximum of rent,' and 'fixity of tenure,' we reject at once as measures of confiscation which never would be heeded in Parliament. But we see no reason why the usages with respect to the good-will of land, and the value of improvements made upon it, which practically give the agricultural tenant in England and in the North of Ireland a considerable property in the soil, even though his tenure be merely at will, should not be introduced into Ireland, the common law being superseded by a general statute instead of a custom. A change of this kind, in our judgment, would be no invasion of property; it would place the landed system of Ireland on the same footing in the four provinces; it would bind the peasantry more firmly to the soil, and give them at last an interest in it; it would contribute certainly to quiet discontent and promote good-will, as it would do justice; and we have no doubt it would improve agriculture, and put an end to a great deal of ill-feeling. We own that we see no reason why such a measure should be rejected by Parliament.

The two measures we have briefly indicated, the extinction of the revenues of the Establishment, and a change in the Irish landed system for the benefit of the small agriculturists, would, in our opinion, go a long way to remove gradually the Irish difficulty. They would, as we believe, do justice, would redress legitimate causes of discontent, would bring the law and the constitution in a greater degree in harmony with the people, and, we have no doubt, would tend to develop the happiness and the wealth of the island. Some other measures, of a like kind, we hope, might be ere long accomplished; thus we think that Trinity College, Dublin, ought to be made a

really national university, instead of being what it now is, a stronghold of sectarian ascendancy, so that the higher education of Ireland should be open equally to all communions. The proposed compromise, *v. the affiliation* of the Catholic University to the Queen's Colleges, is an imperfect and unsatisfactory change, though we are ready to believe that at this juncture, no more would be conceded by Parliament. As regards the fiscal arrangements of Ireland, we agree fully with those Irish reformers who insist that England in the last century did great fiscal injustice to Ireland, and that this has been one cause of her backwardness; but we concur with Mr. Gladstone's conclusion that the fact is not a legitimate ground for relieving Ireland from existing taxation, that her taxation is not really unjust, and that it would be impolitic in her own interests, to seek for any special exemption. Such a claim would degrade her in the face of the Empire, would make her appear a suppliant dependency, to be dealt with with an insolent tenderness, and might disentitle her to that political equality with Great Britain which she ought to aspire to. Ireland, nevertheless, may have good grounds for obtaining more of the State expenditure, than has been allotted to her of late; and we feel convinced that a certain outlay on the part of the State in some public works, especially in arterial drainage, would be not only just to Ireland, but of real and lasting benefit to the nation. We trust too that, ere many years, the whole provincial government of Ireland will be merged in the administration of Great Britain; and that in return the Royal family will repeatedly visit their Irish subjects. This change in our judgment would be important in winning the Irish people to loyalty, through the magic of the sovereign's presence, the influence of which on the Celtic nature it is not easy to overestimate.

That the policy we have endeavoured to indicate would at once redress all the evils of Ireland, we do not for a moment anticipate. For years, probably, in any case, Ireland will be a cause of anxiety to those thoughtful statesmen who appreciate the wants and the interests of these kingdoms, and who wish to see the different nations, that form the community of Great Britain, combined in a happy and united people in spite of distinctions of race and history. But we feel assured that the measures we have advocated will tend towards that noble consummation, will gradually pacify and enrich Ireland, will mitigate the angry passions which consume her, and diffuse contentment throughout her borders. To attain such objects, we would appeal to the interests and the feelings of all who have the welfare of the Empire at heart, and who really love

the British constitution. Is Ireland for ever to remain the peccant part of our illustrious England, her reproach in the mouths of those who envy her, her weak point in the eyes of her enemies? Are we always to hear in the councils of Europe, that Ireland is the British Poland, and that, in the event of an attack on our shores, the mass of Irishmen would welcome the invaders? Nay, is it to be said that constitutional government has been more than a failure in Ireland, that it has disregarded her essential interests, oppressed her by a Parliamentary majority, ignored her demands, and denied her justice? Is history to record that Imperialism fused France into a concordant mass of equal and patriotic citizens, that it healed the strife of Catholic and Huguenot, and staunching the wounds of a war of classes, and that the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain could not make the people of Ireland contented, or remove the effects of past dissensions? We hope, in the interest of our country and her fame, that such questions will receive in the future the answer which every good man must hope; and that they shall do so, we think will depend on this, whether our conduct to Ireland shall be, in its general principles, at least, such as we have endeavoured to indicate.

ART. II.—(1.) *The Ogilvies*. London: Chapman and Hall. 1849.

(2.) *Olive*. Chapman and Hall. 1850.

(3.) *Agatha's Husband*. Chapman and Hall. 1852.

(4.) *Head of the Family*. Chapman and Hall. 1854.

(5.) *John Halifax*. Hurst and Blackett. 1857.

(6.) *A Life for a Life*. Hurst and Blackett. 1859.

(7.) *Mistress and Maid*. Hurst and Blackett. 1862.

(8.) *Christian's Mistake*. Hurst and Blackett. 1865.

(9.) *A Noble Life*. Hurst and Blackett. 1866.

It is in general the duty of a critic to respect absolutely the incognito of a writer, but the 'Author of John Halifax' is so well known as the lady who was Miss Mulock, and is Mrs. Craik, that we commit no breach of confidence, and cannot be considered impertinent in speaking openly of her. She takes the title of 'Author of John Halifax,' so it seems, rather to identify her with that particular book than as a veil behind which she may conceal her own personality. It is the work which she offers, and which the public is willing to receive, as representative both of her style and character.

In the world of letters few authors have so distinct, and at the same time so eminent a position as this lady. Other writers are cleverer, more impassioned, more brilliant, but we turn from their eloquent words to her tales of simple goodness with a sense of rest and relief. Her records do not tell of strong mental conflict, of great wrong or crime; there are no bright lights and no dark shadows in her life scenes; and thus living in stormy and troubled times, rife with conflict and crime, those who are climbing the weary upward road can 'rest and be thankful,' when she speaks. And for this reason her most ardent admirers are found, not chiefly among those who lead a quiet, uneventful life, and seek in a novel for some relief from the monotony of it, but among the earnest workers and able thinkers of the time, those who are familiar with

'The power of the night, the press of the storm,
The post of the foe;'

for Mrs. Craik's great charm is a repose of manner, a quiet dignity of style, which, while it impresses all readers by its calm purity, appeals more especially to the cultivated and refined. *Restful* is, perhaps, the term that can best be applied to her writings. She does not look deep down into the inner conflicts, the great moral struggles of our nature from which George Eliot draws back the veil; nor can she reach the pure and lofty air of poetic inspiration in which George MacDonald soars; she does not even give us the broad, pleasant, infinite variety of human character and life which Anthony Trollope depicts, but she takes some quiet corner of the earth, which is planted with roses perhaps, or perhaps brings forth thorns and briars chiefly, and she says, 'See, men and women have lived and suffered here. Be patient and steadfast, you who live and suffer; endure as they endured, and you also will find rest and peace. Do right, do your duty, and be patient: all must be well, for God is over all.'

Very pathetic is this teaching, very powerful too in its earnest, absolute purity and goodness; for this is an author whose pages are unsullied by any taint. Good is good, and evil is evil; she believes in no doubtful border-land, no debateable ground between the two, and thinks that evil is not to be palliated or extenuated. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of a pure moral tone in the literature of fiction; for the influence of fiction on the manners and morals of a nation is almost incalculable, it acts most powerfully either for good or evil. A writer of fiction having first excited the imagination or kindled the enthusiasm of readers, who are for

the most part young and susceptible, can present them with an image of exalted virtue or of vice made attractive, which shall be all-powerful in its after-effects. It is no mean task to make the timid trust in God, and to help the trustful to hope; to make those who hope strong in faith, and the faithful victorious.

A writer of fiction who neglects his high vocation, and accepts only the low one of paid entertainer,—paid to amuse or excite, careless of means or result,—commits a crime against the age in which he lives, and against all future ages. So far as he has any influence, he uses it for evil and not for good. So far as he is able to act upon his generation he will leave it shallower, more flippant, more tolerant of evil, and indifferent to good than he finds it. And yet what is the aim of a great number of authors of the present day? Mainly to amuse indolent and languid people, and to excite in them a glow of feeling. As pain is a coarser and stronger stimulant than pleasure, they use crime and suffering as a goad to quicken the attention of the reader. At the same time many of the writers of 'sensation' novels give the homage which vice pays to virtue, by acknowledging that the outer form of virtue is desirable. Their 'Lady Audleys' and 'Aurora Floyds' assume even to themselves an air of innocence. They are worshippers of the world and the flesh, but beyond this they hesitate to advance.

It is reserved for Mr. Wilkie Collins alone to glorify and embody the world, the flesh, *and* the devil. In 'Armadales,' the 'Woman in White,' and others, we have an incarnation of every evil. These books do not teach a disbelief in purity and goodness, for the simple reason that they show no purity and goodness in which to disbelieve. So far as they contain any recognition of a high intelligence it is embodied in the detective police. The world is shown to be a world of force and fraud and universal devilry, held fitfully in check by the police in plain clothes. It is notable in works like these that any man or woman who stands in any way apart from, or struggles against, the general moral depravity is represented as either maniac or monomaniac. The character of virtuous man or woman seems, however, to offer less difficulty. Virtue appears to be the negation of character and intellect, and to mean the non-commission of crime. If, in addition to the non-commission of crime, a man or woman acts like a born fool, that is a virtuous man or woman. The gradations of character and intellect are born fool, monomaniac, clever villain,—male or female. The interest of such stories is the interest of vicious natures, unbridled passions, and open licentiousness; at the last come in the detective police, cleverer, more wicked, more unscrupulous than the criminals whom they

hunt down. The 'Miss Gwilt' and 'Mother Oldershaws' are not so much an insult to woman as an outrage on humanity, and the 'passion' of old Bashwood is a thing to make one weep with shame and indignation. If it were not for this one article of faith we might well say that such books contain an open avowal of crime, an unblushing advocacy of vice, that they have a polluting and depraving influence not second to that of the worst French novel ever written; but they do show the conviction that nothing in the heavens above or the earth beneath is so omnipotent as the detective police. It does not occur to the reader that Miss Gwilt will repent or relent, but he sees from the first that clever as she is, nay, great as she is, an 'overruling Providence'—the police in plain clothes—will ultimately assert itself. This higher power is treated with reverence and respect, never introduced unless some extraordinary agency is needed, and the universal vicious cleverness cannot keep itself in check.

'Can good men love guilty women, knowing them to be guilty?' we ask in amazement. Oh, yes! what does that signify? these minor points do not affect them. If a man is a fool he may be good and honest: if a woman is nine times worse than a fool, she may be virtuous; but even then there is no security in either case; for goodness, honesty, virtue are accidental ingredients of our nature. But given to any human being as much brains as a bird, and that human being will be vicious; for vice is a component part of intellect.

Miss Gwilt, Mother Oldershaw, and the Doctor are by far the cleverest people in 'Armadales'; and yet to say that the reader is uncertain which of them will murder the other, is very feebly to describe his realisation of their capacity for crime. Still there is one thing for which even Mr. Wilkie Collins deserves the gratitude of the public;—he has never written about children.

With what relief do we turn to the pages of one of the purest of our novelists, of one who does honestly believe in God and in his government of the world! And yet, perhaps, George MacDonald would offer a more perfect contrast to Mr. Collins than even Mrs. Craik. John Halifax is a good man, Hilary Leaf is a good and true woman; but we miss in both books the fervent glow of faith and love which shines through the pages of 'Alec Forbes of Howglen.' It seems as impossible for George MacDonald to portray vice as for Mr. Wilkie Collins to delineate virtue. He points upwards to the high ideal of our humanity, to the Christ who is our God and also our fellow-man; to God the Father, the Father of us all. He tells us that however low

we may fall the love of God can touch our hearts, and raise us and call out the true man ;—the man made in the image of God. And this, with beauty as a poet and eloquence as a man of genius, George MacDonald shows us. We rise from his books with higher aspirations and nobler aims, with more reverence for humanity and more faith in God. He has also the power of idealising, of seeing the ideal ; and therefore, in the delineation of character, he works from within outwards. When, in ‘Alec Forbes’ he tells how the child Annie is taken to the forge, he looks down into the heart of the smith and sees the tenderness and reverence for the ‘woman-child’ which such a pure, pale snowdrop can call out.

So Annie was left with the smith, of whom she was not the least afraid, now that she had heard him speak. With his leathern apron, caught up in both hands, he swept a space on the front of the elevated hearth of the forge, clear of cinders and dust, and then, having wiped his hands on the same apron, lifted the girl as tenderly as if she had been a baby, and set her down on this spot, about a yard from the fire, on a level with it ; and there she sat, in front of the smith, looking at the fire and the smith, and the work he was about, in turns. He asked her a great many questions about herself and the Bruces, and her former life at home ; and every question he asked, he put in a yet kindlier voice. Sometimes he would stop in the middle of blowing, and lean forward with his arm on the handle of the bellows, and look full in the child’s face till she had done answering him, with eyes that shone in the fire-light as if the tears would have gathered, but could not for the heat.

“Ay ! ay !” he would say, when she had answered him, and resume his blowing, slowly and dreamily. For this terrible smith’s heart was just like his fire. He was a dreadful fellow for fighting and quarrelling, when he got a drop too much, which was rather too often, if the truth must be told ; but to this little woman-child his ways were as soft and tender as a woman’s ; he could burn or warm.

“An’ sae ye likit bein’ at the ferm (*farm*) best ?” he said.

“Ay. But ye see my father deid (*died*) ——”

“I ken that, my bairn. The Lord haud a grip o’ ye !”

It was not often that Peter Whaup indulged in a pious ejaculation. But this was a genuine one, and may be worth recording for the sake of Annie’s answer.

“I’m thinkin’ he hauds a grip o’ us a’, Mr. Whaup.”

And then she told him the story about the rats and the cat ; for hardly a day passed just at this time, without her not merely recalling it, but reflecting upon it. And the smith drew the back of his hand across both his eyes when she had done, and then pressed them both hard with the thumb and fore-finger of his right hand, as if they ached, while his other arm went blowing away as if nothing was the matter but

plenty of wind for the forge-fire. Then he pulled out the red-hot *gad*, or iron bar, which he seemed to have forgotten ever since Annie came in, and, standing with his back to her to protect her from the sparks, put it on his anvil and began to lay on it as if in a fury; while the sparks flew from his blows as if in mortal terror of the angry man that was pelting at the luminous glory laid thus submissive before him. In fact, Peter was attempting to hammer out more things than one upon that *study* of his; for in Scotland they call a smith's anvil a study, so that he ranks with other artists in that respect. Then, as if anxious to hear the child speak yet again, he said, putting the iron once more in the fire, and proceeding to rouse the wrath of the coals:

"Ye kent Jeames Dow, then?"

"Ay: weel that. I kent Dooie as weel as Broonie."

"Wha was Broonie?"

"Ow! naebody but my ain coo." (*cow*)

"An' Jeames was kin' (*kind*) to ye?"

To this question no reply followed: but Peter, who stood looking at her, saw her lips and the muscles of her face quivering an answer, which if uttered at all would come only in sobs and tears.

But the sound of approaching steps and voices restored her equanimity, and a listening look gradually displaced the emotion on her countenance. Over the half-door of the shop appeared two men, each bearing on his shoulder the socks (*shares*) of two ploughs, to be sharpened or set. The instant she saw them, she tumbled off her perch, and before they had got the door opened was half way to it, crying, "Dooie! Dooie!" Another instant and she was lifted high in Dowie's arms.—*Alec Forbes of Howglen*, vol. i., p. 184.

It is impossible to read this account without being struck by its beauty as a picture. The artist looks not merely at the forge and the man and the child, and gives an accurate photograph of their appearance, but he looks into their hearts, and so can let us see not only *how* they are, but *why* they are; can give the subjective and idealistic treatment at the same time that he is a master of the realistic. In addition to the beauty of the picture, we cannot fail to admire the beauty of the execution, for language is to George MacDonald the luminous medium of thought.

Mrs. Craik, as we have said, stands invariably on the side of truth and goodness. These we never miss, but her books somewhat lack the great charm of beauty, of poetic richness of style. It is one of the chief misfortunes of almost every female novelist that her own education, as a woman, has been wretchedly defective. Her first novel stands ordinarily as an exercise in composition, and enables her to write English grammatically. Perhaps we ought rather to say, that it helps her to understand her own language. We find, for example, all Mrs. Oliphant's

earlier novels disfigured by grammatical errors and verbal inaccuracies, of which the more careful of her later books show few traces. She has, after some twenty years of practice, reached what should have been the starting-point; her early novels were exercises in composition which the public was called on to criticize and correct. In addition to this, that which is called the *education* of the majority of women leaves them not only without information, but without intelligent interest in any subject that does not immediately concern them. The past, with all its wealth of words and deeds, does not exist for them. They are shut in to the present, or rather, to some small fragment of the present. They are, as women, keenly alive to moral excellence; they have an instinctive perception of, and appreciation for it, they never lose their faith in it; no woman could write such a book as 'Armadale;' no woman could either believe in or delineate Miss Gwilt. At the same time, their intellectual insight is limited, and this must be the case whilst the intellect is dwarfed as it has been hitherto. It seems impossible for a woman to realize what an intellectual man is, what he does and says. Clever female novelists never let such a man speak at all; they know that they can see only the outside, and that they are ignorant of the machinery which sets the thing going, and the principle of the machinery; and so they discreetly tell you what kind of case it has, but nothing more.

'Christian's Mistake' is one of the most perfect of Mrs. Craik's stories, but the 'Master of St. Bede's' is a shadow. If he were not a shadow, the reader would find out that he was very unlike the master of a college, and that although a good, kind, quiet man, his mind is a blank. Mrs. Gaskell, again, has always put women in the foreground of her stories, very exquisitely and delicately painted; and with consummate skill she has left the men distant and shadowy like the mountains. The 'Author of John Halifax' shows equal discretion in her later and more perfect stories.

We have said that this lady lacks some of the higher beauties of style, but she possesses the great charm of simplicity and directness. She tells you a simple story, and she wishes you to know and feel that it is simple, and to receive it in all simplicity. The brook winds on, clear and fresh, through the meadows. You can see the pebbles and moss in its bed, and here and there a quiet trout beside a stone; it is all so simple and still that sometimes you are surprised at the life—that is the thought—there is in it.

Any reader who has failed to realize the excellence of a simple

style should read a chapter of 'Cradock Nowell;' under other circumstances such a penance need not be imposed upon him. Mr. Blackmore's aim appears to be to make his stream of thought and talk so turbid that it shall be impossible to ascertain if it is deep or shallow; to write a garble of Greek and Latin and unintelligible English, which is alike hateful and foreign to all three languages. For example,—

'But John, though fully alive to the stigmotype of his position, allowed his epidermis to quill toward the operator, and abstracted all his too sensitive parts into a sophistic apory.'

He would be a bold man who should venture to predict either that there was or was not anything under this film of pedantic conceit. Mr. Blackmore should either have put the story into English or into the fire. If we turn from such a writer to the 'Author of John Halifax,' we feel that she is not trying to impose upon us, and to make us believe that there is more than meets the eye in what she writes. We repay her by looking carefully for delicate shades of meaning and subtle thoughts, and are rewarded by finding them. In her later works her aim has become very obvious. She tries, as we have said, to tell a simple story simply. She acknowledges that there are great crimes and great criminals in society, many in every age who are overtaken by some extraordinary fate; but she sees that the greater part of mankind lead externally quiet and unexciting lives, and yet these are also life-dramas. They have their great apotheosis, and are consecrated by grief and pain. The child brings his share of joy and love and hope, and the man must see it perish on the cold earth, fade away amidst the daily cares and in the trivial routines of life; must see his hope grow wan and pale and then die. But joy and love and hope shall rise again, glorified even here upon earth; and he, too, shall rise with them, glorified, and able to look beyond the grave to the everlasting in the heavens. It is appointed to each one of us thus to learn to believe in the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. We have to find each one of us that the world—the temporal and visible—is not enough for an immortal soul, and that the invisible and spiritual can alone satisfy its longings. We learn this lesson, each in a different manner, but sorrow and suffering are the ministers appointed to proclaim it. Taking this view, the lady of whom we write does not seek for any extraordinary incidents to excite and awaken the interest of her readers, for with such a faith she can dare to take a simple, healthy good nature, and show how it is purified and refined by the fire of affliction.

It is interesting to compare the first novel of a writer like Mrs. Craik with the work of her later and maturer years. 'The Ogilvies' was published seventeen years ago. It is a story of wilful passionate first-love, and is written with a fire and enthusiasm wanting in later works; it gives also a promise of dramatic power which has never been fulfilled. We miss, however, the high moral tone of 'John Halifax,' 'Mistress and Maid,' and 'Christian's Mistake.' It is not that Eleanor Ogilvie and Philip Wychnor are not as good and true as any of Mrs. Craik's later heroes and heroines, but that her sympathy and that of the reader is centred on Katherine Ogilvie and Paul Lynedon, who are not so good. Katherine Ogilvie is a girl of sixteen, who falls in love,—*falls* is scarcely the right word,—she shuts her eyes and plunges headlong into love. Neither can we say that she falls in love *with* Paul Lynedon, for Paul Lynedon is unconscious of the state of this young lady's affections, being at the time in love with her cousin Eleanor. There is an overwhelming amount of sentimentalism in the first volume, and an evident conviction in the author's mind that fascinating men like Paul Lynedon ought to marry girls who passionately admire their fine eyes and wavy hair. But there are occasional scenes of remarkable power, and an indication from the first, of the struggle in the author's mind between her sympathy with Katherine's passionate love and the conviction that there is something higher and nobler than passion. Paul Lynedon is intended to be strong and dark, a lady's hero of the Byronic school, but he and all the other men in the book stand too prominently forward; so that the reader not only sees them, but sees *through* them, discovers that they are gauze and pasteboard. Paul Lynedon is rejected by Eleanor Ogilvie, and then takes the natural course of such men—he goes to Italy. Meanwhile Katherine marries her cousin Hugh, but does not promote, by this step, either his happiness or her own. After a few years, Paul Lynedon returns to England. He had forgotten the plain, dark, affectionate Katherine, but in a novel, he naturally loves at first sight the young and beautiful Mrs. Ogilvie. Just at the right moment the husband, poor Hugh, breaks his neck, and, after a short widowhood, Katherine Ogilvie consents to become Mrs. Lynedon.

Up to this point 'The Ogilvies' might have been the first work of any sensational writer, but at this point we find an indication of character which is well worthy of notice. The author feels that this story of passion and wrong-doing cannot end to Katherine Ogilvie either happily or peacefully—that it ought not to do so. Perhaps in real life Katherine's Nemesis

might not have come as heart-disease, but it must have come in some form, and the scene here described has great dramatic force.

Paul made her sit by the open window, while he leaned over her, pulling the roses from outside the casement and throwing them leaf by leaf into her lap. While he did so, she took courage to tell him of the letter to her mother. He murmured a little at the full confession, but when he read it he only blessed her the more for her tenderness towards himself.

"May I grow worthy of such love, my Katherine," he said, for the moment deeply touched; "but we must not be sad, dearest. Come, sign your name—your new name. Are you content to bear it?" continued he, with a smile.

Her answer was another, radiant with intense love and perfect joy. Paul looked over her while she laid the paper on the rose-strewed window-sill, and wrote the words, "Katherine *Lynedon*."

She said them over to herself once or twice with a loving intonation, and then turned her face on her bridegroom's arm, weeping.

"Do not chide me, Paul; I am so happy, so happy. Now I begin to hope the past may be forgiven us—that we may have a future yet."

"We may! We *will*!" was Lynedon's answer.

While he spoke, through the hush of that glad May-noon came a sound—dull, solemn! Another, and yet another! It was the funeral bell tolling from the near church tower.

Katherine lifted up her face, white and ghastly. "Paul, do you hear that?" and her voice was shrill with terror. "It is our marriage-peal—we have no other; we ought not to have. I knew it was too late!"

"Nay, my own love," answered Paul, becoming alarmed at her look. He drew her nearer to him, but she seemed neither to hear his voice nor feel his clasp. The bell sounded again. "Hark! hark!" Katherine cried. "Paul, do you remember the room where we knelt, you and I; and he joined our hands, and said the words—'Earth to earth—ashes to ashes?' It will come true; I know it will, and it is right it should."

Lynedon took his bride in his arms, and endeavoured to calm her. He half succeeded, for she looked up in his face with a faint smile. "Thank you! I know you love me, my own Paul, my—"

Suddenly her voice ceased. With a convulsive movement she put her hand to her heart, and her head sank on her husband's breast.

That instant the awful summons came. Without a word, or sigh, or moan, the spirit passed!

We have scarcely alluded to Eleanor Ogilvie and Philip Wychnor, the good people of the book. They are, in fact, very uninteresting. No doubt, from the first, Mrs. Craik has desired to show that there is something nobler than high birth,

more attractive than beauty, more powerful than intellect; she has always felt this, but has not always possessed the power of depicting moral worth in a pleasing form. There is a want of artistic power and insight in many of her books. She chooses in 'Olive' a deformed girl for a heroine, finding great difficulty in making this a pleasing or even a prominent figure in a work of art, she has to soften down the deformity; and so she gives you to understand that though Olive was deformed, no one noticed it. This is a mistake: the introduction of deformity in a work of art can only be justified if it teaches a higher lesson than beauty; it may do so; but clearly we must recognise it for what it is; and it must not deceive us by trying to *appear* beauty while it is deformity.

Again, in 'A Life for a Life,' we have the story of a man who is a prey to remorse on account of a murder which he had committed, and who feels that his crime must be expiated by punishment. But Mrs. Craik shrinks from the murderer, and cannot make him a hero; and therefore she is careful to inform you that this was not a premeditated murder, but a mere accidental blow. Now a man may regret an accident his whole life long; but, so long as he is sane, he cannot feel remorse for it, however disastrous its consequences; and the expiation of imprisonment would be a work of supererogation.

Even in the story of 'John Halifax' we have the same artistic and intellectual blunder—the characteristic irresolution of this writer. If we could erase half a dozen sentences from this book, it would stand as one of the most beautiful stories in the English language, conveying one of the highest moral truths. If it teaches anything it is the nobility of man as man. The ragged boy, with his open, honest face, as he asks the respectable Quaker for work, is no beggar; the lad who drives the cart of dangling skins is not inferior to Phineas Fletcher, who watches for him from his father's windows, and longs for his companionship in the garden and the fields; and the tanner—the honest and good man who marries Ursula March, a lady born—is her equal. Mrs. Craik might have shown that men, in the sight of God, are equal, and that therefore all good men must be equals upon earth. But no, she shrinks from the full expression of so startling a theory, and therefore gives John Halifax a little Greek Testament, in which is written 'Guy Halifax, Gentleman,' and we must conclude that all his moral excellence and intellectual worth were derived from *ladies* and *gentlemen* who had been his remote ancestors, but with whom he had never been in personal contact at all, since at twelve years old he was a ragged orphan, unable to read and write. It is impossible to

answer the question, 'What does the author mean by gentleman?' since this shadowy word in a book is a loophole through which she escapes from the charge of holding the very democratic view that ~~every gentleman is a~~ man of noble nature who leads an unselfish life. She does depict a noble nature and an unselfish life; but seeing that John Halifax did begin the world as a poor friendless boy, she might have allowed us to think that such a development was possible to man as man. We can't all of us find little Greek Testaments with the inscription 'Gentleman' after the names of our ancestors. Still this book is in many ways remarkable. We find a gradual development in 'Olive,' 'Agatha's Husband,' and 'The Head of the Family,' but not until 'John Halifax' does the author throw her whole weight into the scale of goodness. She finds that her power as well as her inclination is in that direction, and henceforth she strips off all outer amenities as of plot and circumstance, and aims at depicting good, but ordinary men and women, leading good and honest lives. Other novelists acquire the art of adding effect to effect, and horror to horror. This one gradually strips off all adventitious circumstances of interest, and tries to make her stories not rich and full but pure and high.

'John Halifax' is the culmination of her power; and this the author recognises by invariably styling herself the 'Author of John Halifax.' In this book she retains something of the fulness and freshness of her youth. There is more vital energy and a greater variety of character than we find in her more recent novels, and then the story is told in such a way that the very deficiencies become merits and virtues. This lady's conception of the masculine character and nature is shadowy, and her children are mere rag dollies. Now the story of John Halifax is told by his friend Phineas Fletcher. Phineas is the son of a Quaker, and has been from his youth a great sufferer and confirmed invalid. His nature is delicate, susceptible, tender, and feminine. Indeed, for all practical purposes a woman might as well have told the story, but then no woman except a wife or sister could have had the necessary intimate relation to the hero. A wife would not have had it long enough, and a sister with another Greek Testament would have been very embarrassing. The author discovered, as we have said, the very best method of telling her story. What should Phineas Fletcher know of mankind and the world! He looks at his hero and his friend as a woman would do—simply believes in him and loves him. How can the lonely man understand children! He is scarcely familiar with the outside of them, and you don't feel sure that he knows they run upon two legs.

It is essential to the truth and unity of the story that it should be told in this manner, and the author could not have told it at all from another point of view. At the same time the reader knows that he sees the life of John Halifax through the mind of Phineas Fletcher, and therefore pictures it as fuller and stronger and more manly than it is; and yet can admire the exceeding delicacy of the delineation, and the beauty of the touches which a stronger man would neither have needed nor desired to give. The friendship of these two men—a friendship like that of Jonathan and David—is told without words; neither of them needs to protest, for we feel its truth and loyalty from the first meeting of the two boys to the last farewell that Phineas takes of his friend. The story of such a friendship would alone be a noble lesson, but with it is the story of a no less noble life. The friendless boy becomes the prosperous man, the struggles of his youth are succeeded by the sorrows of maturer age, but throughout we see the same resolute figure, bold and honest—the boy who could not tell a lie or deceive his master—the man who could not stoop to a mean or unworthy action. The story of his love is exquisitely told, with the kind of half-wistful comprehension which we should expect from Phineas Fletcher. Poor John thinks his love for the lady and the heiress hopeless, and intends to leave England as soon as he has recovered from a severe illness. Phineas contrives to bring Ursula March to see him.

And now the room darkened so fast, that I could not see them; but their voices seemed a great way off, as the children's voices playing at the old well-head used to sound to me when I lay under the brow of the Flat in the dim twilight at Enderley.

"I intend," John said, "as soon as I am able, to leave Norton Bury, and go abroad for some time."

"Where?"

"To America. It is the best country for a young man who has neither money, nor kindred, nor position—nothing, in fact, but his own right hand with which to carve out his own fortune—as I will, if I can."

She murmured something about this being quite right.

"I am glad you think so." But his voice had resumed that formal tone which ever and anon mingled strangely with its low, deep tenderness. "In any case, I must quit England. I have reasons for so doing."

"What reasons?"

The question seemed to startle John—he did not reply at once.

"If you wish, I will tell you; in order that, should I ever come back—or if I should not come back at all, you who were kind enough to be my friend, will know I did not go away from mere youthful recklessness, or love of change."

He waited, apparently for some answer—but it came not, and he continued :

"I am going, because there has befallen me a great trouble, which, while I stay here, I cannot get free from or overcome. I do not wish to sink under it—I had rather, as you said, 'do my work in the world,' as a man ought. No man has a right to say unto his Maker, 'My burthen is heavier than I can bear.' Do you not think so?"

"I do."

"Do you not think I am right in thus meeting, and trying to conquer, an inevitable ill?"

"Is it inevitable?"

"Hush!" John answered, wildly. "Don't reason with me—you cannot judge—you do not know. It is enough that I must go. If I stay I shall become unworthy of myself, unworthy of—— Forgive me, I have no right to talk thus; but you called me 'friend,' and I would like you to think kindly of me always. Because—because—" And his voice shook—broke down utterly. "God love thee and take care of thee, wherever I may go!"

"John, stay!"

It was but a low, faint cry, like that of a little bird. But he heard it—felt it. In the silence of the dark she crept up to him, like a young bird to its mate, and he took her into the shelter of his love for evermore. At once, all was made clear between them; for whatever the world might say, they were in the sight of heaven equal, and she received as much as she gave.

Ursula March—afterwards Ursula Halifax—stands quite apart from ordinary heroines. She is not beautiful, but she is young, bright, and resolute. She has decidedly a will of her own, and one suspects a temper also, but it never interferes with the comfort of husband, children, or friends, and only gives that spice of determination which no woman who has not a temper can acquire. She is a good wife and mother, and bears the sorrows which befall her very nobly and patiently: but her first attitude is always one of resistance. This we see not only in the following extract, but in her conduct at a later period, when a woman whose child has the small-pox is in the house, and her own children are exposed to danger:—

They were bonny eyes! lovely in shape and colour, delicately fringed; but there was something strange in their expression, or rather, in their want of it. Many babies have a round, vacant stare—but this was no stare, only a wide, full look, a look of quiet blankness, an *unseeing* look.

It caught Dr. Jessop's notice. I saw his air of vexed dignity change into a certain anxiety.

"Well, whose are they like, her father's or mine? His, I hope—it will be the better for her beauty. Nay, we'll excuse all compliments."

"I—I can't exactly tell. I could judge better by candle-light."

"We'll have candles."

"No, no! Had we not better put it off altogether till another day? I'll call in to-morrow and look at her eyes."

His manner was hesitating and troubled, John noticed it.

"Love, give her to me. Go and get us lights, will you?"

When she was gone, John took his baby to the window, gazed long and intently into her little face, then at Dr. Jessop. "Do you think—no—it's not possible—that there can be anything the matter with the child's eyes?"

Ursula coming in, heard the last words.

"What was that you said about baby's eyes?"

No one answered her. All were gathered in a group at the window, the child being held on her father's lap, while Dr. Jessop was trying to open the small white lids, kept so continually closed. At last the baby uttered a little cry of pain—the mother darted forward, and clasped it almost savagely to her breast.

"I will not have my baby hurt! There is nothing wrong with her sweet eyes. Go away; you shall not touch her, John."

"Love!"

She melted at that low, fond word; leaned against his shoulder, trying to control her tears.

"It shocked me so, the bare thought of such a thing. O! husband, don't let her be looked at again."

"Only once again, my darling. It is best. Then we shall be quite satisfied. Phineas, give me the candle."

The words—caressing, and by strong constraint, made calm and soothing—were yet firm. Ursula resisted no more, but let him take Muriel—little, unconscious, cooing dove! Lulled by her father's voice, she once more opened her eyes, wide.

Dr. Jessop passed the candle before them many times, once so close that it almost touched her face; but the full, quiet eyes never blenched nor closed.

He set the light down.

"Doctor!" whispered the father, in a wild appeal against—ay, it was against certainty. He snatched the candle, and tried the experiment himself.

"She does not see at all. Can she be blind?"

"Born blind!"

Yes, those pretty baby-eyes were dark—quite dark.

There was nothing painful nor unnatural in their look, save, perhaps, the blankness of gaze which I have before noticed. Outwardly, their organization was perfect; but in the fine inner mechanism was something wrong—something wanting. She never had seen—never would see—in this world.

"Blind!" The word was uttered softly, hardly above a breath, yet the mother heard it. She pushed every one aside, and took the child herself. Herself, with a desperate incredulity, she looked into

those eyes, which never could look back either her agony or her love. Poor mother!

"John! John! oh, John!"—the name rising into a cry, as if he could surely help her. He came, and took her in his arms, took both wife and babe. She laid her head on his shoulder in bitter weeping. "Oh, John! it is so hard. Our pretty one, our own little child!"

John did not speak, but only held her to him—close and fast. When she was a little calmer, he whispered to her the comfort—the sole comfort even her husband could give her—through whose will it was that this affliction came.

"And it is more an affliction to you than it will be to her, poor pet!" said Mrs. Jessop, as she wiped her friendly eyes. "She will not miss what she never knew. She may be a happy child. Look, how she lies and smiles."

But the mother could not take that consolation yet. She walked to and fro, and stood rocking her baby, mute indeed, but with tears falling in showers. Gradually her anguish wept itself away, or was smothered down, lest it should disturb the little creature asleep on her breast.

Some one came behind her, and placed her in the arm-chair, gently. It was my father. He sat down by her, taking her hand.

"Grieve not, Ursula. I had a little brother who was blind. He was the happiest creature I ever knew."

My father sighed. We all marvelled to see the wonderful softness, even tenderness, which had come into him.

"Give me thy child for a minute." Ursula laid it across his knees; he put his hand solemnly on the baby-breast. "God bless this little one! Ay, and she shall be blessed."

These words, spoken with as full assurance as the prophetic benediction of the departing patriarchs of old, struck us all. We looked at little Muriel as if the blessing were already upon her; as if the mysterious touch which had sealed up her eyes for ever, had left on her a sanctity like as of one who has been touched by the finger of God.

The blind child Muriel moves for a short time in a soft dreamy way through the story, with an influence felt by all. The relation to her father is very beautifully described:—

To see her now, leaning her cheek against his—the small soft face almost a miniature of his own, the hair, a paler shade of the same bright colour, curling in the same elastic rings—they looked less like ordinary father and daughter than like a *man* and his *good angel*: the visible embodiment of the best half of his youth.

The influence of Muriel is indeed an abiding influence, and in this again we see the writer's earnest truth, and her truthful-

ness to nature. The child is not introduced for the sake of two or three pathetic scenes, her death does not remove her from our view any more than it takes a child from the home and the heart of parents who have once realised the true and abiding tie between parent and child. Ursula can look down upon the face of her dead husband and say, 'How glad her father will be to have her again—his own little Muriel!' for she knows that death has been absence but not loss.

Mrs. Craik has, indeed, the rare power of indicating the ideal of every relationship; she cannot always show it, but she can, as we said, indicate it. How beautifully, in the following passage, she points out the very truth of one side of parental duty.

"But if things had been otherwise—if you had not been so sure of Maud's feelings——"

He started, painfully; then answered—"I think I should have done it still."

I was silent. The paramount right, the high prerogative of love, which he held as strongly as I did, seemed attacked in its liberty divine. For the moment, it was as if he too had in his middle-age gone over to the cold-blooded ranks of harsh parental prudence, despotic paternal rule; as if Ursula March's lover and Maud's father were two distinct beings. One finds it so, often enough with men.

"John," I said, "could you have done it? could you have broken the child's heart?"

"Yes, if it was to save her peace—perhaps her soul, I *could* have broken my child's heart."

He spoke solemnly, with an accent of inexpressible pain, as if this were not the first time by many that he had pondered over such a possibility.

"I wish, Phineas, to make clear to you, in case of—of any future misconceptions—my mind on this matter. One right alone I hold superior to the right of love—duty. It is a father's duty, at all risks, at all costs, to save his child from anything which he believes would peril her duty—so long as she is too young to understand fully how beyond the claim of any human being, be it father or lover, is God's claim to herself and her immortal soul. Anything which would endanger that, should be cut off—though it be the right hand—the right eye. But thank God, it is not thus with my little Maud."

'John Halifax' is, as we have said, up to the present time, the culminating effort of the author. She seems to stand, as it were, above herself, and to direct her own powers. She has thrown her whole strength into it, so that it is full and rich in incident beyond any other of her works. The simplicity of her style and the beauty of her pure nature have nowhere so full a grace, and we feel that it is a life-long acquisition to have known

such people as John and Ursula Halifax and Phineas Fletcher. Finding, however, that her power lay in the delineation of good men and women and of home scenes, she has, in her later works, abandoned still more the interest of plot and the delineation of varied character. Not one of her later works is in any respect so rich or so complete as 'John Halifax,' not one, with the exception of 'Christian's Mistake,' so healthy.

'Lord Erlistoun' is a story told also by a man, but then Mark Brown is strong and common-place, and so we cannot see why he should write a sentimental story. 'A Life for a Life' is not so much sentimental as morbid. Besides, the story is told twice over; and as there is very little of it, we don't care to read it once in a man's diary and once in a woman's. And a diary, as the novelist uses it, is such an incredible thing. It contains every incident which can at any time be available in the development of the story, and shows that the diarist was always in the right place at the right time, so as to hear and see every thing that it was essential he should hear and see. Now a diary out of a novel shows, curiously enough, that the diarist very rarely noticed, at the time they occurred, words and actions which proved afterwards to be of great importance, and the omissions of such a diary are far more remarkable than the entries. For this reason, the use of a diary is the only utterly improbable way of getting a story told, and to use two diaries instead of one, is to convert the improbable into a direct impossible. These faults, however, lie on the surface; whereas, if we look beneath the surface, we see the abiding excellence of the author. There is a noble self-renunciation in Jean Dowglas, and an earnest endeavour to depict true Christian repentance in 'A Life for a Life.'

'Mistress and Maid' is again a very good book. With characteristic indecision, the writer seems to have changed her plan, and her first intention is not carried out. Mistress and maid are separated whilst the character of the latter is still unformed, so that we do not see the life-long influence of the mistress on her maid. We see just enough to make us wish to know more. The uncouth girl is gradually tamed by two of her mistresses, and undergoes a very salutary discipline at the hands of a third, whose tongue and temper are a scourge. We want to know more about her, and to trace the development of her mind and character. This we cannot do, but we get occasional hints and glimpses, and at length the character of Elizabeth Hand stands out clear and strong. We recognise its truth and fidelity and beauty, and acknowledge this to be an accurate delineation of a class of women whom we are proud to call English servants.

The sympathy of the writer gives her a true insight into the nature of any good woman, and the parting between Elizabeth and her faithless lover is quite perfect in its way.

Tom stood there alone. He looked so exactly his own old self; he came forward to meet her so completely in his old familiar way, that for the instant she thought she must be under some dreadful delusion; that the moonlight night in the square must have been all a dream—Esther, still the silly little Esther, whom Tom had often heard of and laughed at; and Tom, her own Tom, who loved nobody but herself.

"Elizabeth, what an age it is since I've had a sight of you!"

But though the manner was warm as ever—

In his tone

A something smote her, as if Duty tried

To mock the voice of Love, now long since flown,

and quiet as she stood, Elizabeth shivered in his arms.

"Why, what's the matter? Aren't you glad to see me? Give me another kiss, my girl, do!"

He took it; and she crept away from him and sat down.

"Tom, I've something to say to you, and I'd better say it at once."

"To be sure. 'Tisn't any bad news from home, is it?" Or looking uneasily at her—"I haven't vexed you, have I?"

"Vexed me," she repeated, thinking what a small foolish word it was to express what had happened, and what she had been suffering. "No, Tom, not vexed me, exactly. But I want to ask you a question. Who was it that you stood talking with, under our tree in the square, between nine and ten o'clock, this night three weeks ago?"

Though there was no anger in the voice, it was so serious and deliberate that it made Tom start.

"Three weeks ago! how can I possibly tell?"

"Yes, you can; for it was a fine moonlight night, and you stood there a long time."

"Under the tree, talking to somebody? What nonsense. Perhaps it wasn't me at all."

"It was, for I saw you."

"The devil you did!" mumbled Tom.

"Don't be angry—only tell me the plain truth. The young woman that was with you was our Esther here, wasn't she?"

For the moment Tom looked altogether confounded. Then he tried to recover himself, and said, crossly, "Well, and if it was, where's the harm? Can't a man be civil to a pretty girl without being called over the coals in this way?"

Elizabeth made no answer, at least, not immediately. At last she said, in a very gentle, subdued voice—

"Tom, are you fond of Esther? You would not kiss her if you were not fond of her. Do you like her as—as you used to like me?"

And she looked right up into his eyes. Hers had no reproach in

them, only a piteous entreaty, the last clinging to a hope she knew to be false.

"Like Esther? of course I do. She's a nice girl, and we are very good friends."

"Tom, a man can't be friends, in that sort of way, with a pretty girl of eighteen, when he is going to be married to somebody else. At least, in my mind, he ought not."

Tom laughed, in a confused manner. "I say, you're jealous, and you'd better get over it."

Was she jealous? Was it all fancy, folly? Did Tom stand there, true as steel, without a feeling in his heart that she did not share, without a hope in which she was not united, holding her, and preferring her, with that individuality and unity of love, which true love ever gives and exacts, as it has a right to exact?

Not that poor Elizabeth reasoned in this way, but she felt the thing by instinct without reasoning.

"Tom," she said, "tell me outright, just as if I was somebody else, and had never belonged to you at all, Do you love Esther Martin?"

Truthful people enforce truth. Tom might be fickle, but he was not deceitful; he could not look into Elizabeth's eyes and tell her a deliberate lie; somehow, he dared not.

"Well then—since you will have it out of me—I think I do."

So Elizabeth's "ship went down." It might have been a very frail vessel, that nobody in their right senses would have trusted any treasure with, still she did; and it was all she had, and it went down to the bottom like a stone.

It is astonishing how soon the sea closes over this sort of wreck; and how quietly people take—when they must take, and there is no more disbelieving it—the truth which they would have given their lives to prove was an impossible lie.

For some minutes Tom stood facing the fire, and Elizabeth sat on her chair opposite, without speaking. Then she took off her brooch, the only love-token he had given her, and put it into his hand.

"What's this for?" asked he, suddenly.

"You know. You'd better give it to Esther. It's Esther, not me, you must marry now."

And the thought of Esther—giddy, flirting, useless Esther—as Tom's wife, was almost more than she could bear. The sting of it put even into her crushed humility a certain honest self-assertion.

"I'm not going to blame you, Tom; but I think I'm as good as she. I'm not pretty, I know, nor lively, nor young; at least, I'm old for my age; but I was worth something. You should not have served me so."

Tom said the usual excuse, that he "couldn't help it." And suddenly turning round, he begged her to forgive him, and not forsake him.

She forsake Tom! Elizabeth almost smiled.

"I do forgive you; I'm not a bit angry with you. If I ever was, I have got over it."

"That's right. You're a dear soul. Do you think I don't like you, Elizabeth?"

"Oh yes," she said, sadly, "I daresay you do, a little, in spite of Esther Martin. But that's not my way of liking, and I couldn't stand it."

"What couldn't you stand?"

"Your kissing me to-day, and another girl to-morrow. Your telling me I was everything to you one week, and saying exactly the same thing to another girl the next. It would be hard enough to bear if we were only friends, but as sweethearts, as husband and wife, it would be impossible. No, Tom, I tell you the truth, I could not stand it."

She spoke strongly, unhesitatingly, and for an instant there flowed out of her soft eyes that wild, fierce spark, latent even in these quiet, humble natures, which is dangerous to meddle with.

Tom did not attempt it. He felt all was over. Whether he had lost or gained, whether he was glad or sorry, he hardly knew.

"I'm not going to take this back, anyhow," he said, "fiddling" with the brooch; and then going up to her, he attempted, with trembling hands, to re-fasten it in her collar.

The familiar action, his contrite look, were too much. People who have once loved one another, though the love is dead (for love *can* die), are not able to bury it all at once, or if they do, its pale ghost will still come knocking at the door of their hearts, "Let me in, let me in."

Elizabeth ought, I know, in proper feminine dignity, to have bade Tom farewell, without a glance or a touch. But she did not. When he had fastened her brooch, she looked up in his familiar face, a sorrowful, wistful, lingering look, and then clung about his neck.

"O Tom, Tom, I was so fond of you!"

And Tom mingled his tears with hers, and kissed her many times, and even felt his old affection returning, making him half oblivious of Esther; but mercifully—for love rebuilt upon lost faith is like a house founded upon sands—the door opened, and Esther herself came in.

The heroine of the story, however, is the Mistress—not the Maid. And we turn from Elizabeth to the bright and resolute Hilary Leaf, who, of the three sisters, is, we conclude, *the* mistress. Hilary Leaf is a self-reliant, energetic little woman, who tries to keep school unsuccessfully, and then—a lesson to many other women under similar circumstances—keeps a shop successfully. She is really a very good little thing, and deserves a better fate than to marry the reticent Scotchman to whose lot she falls.

Robert Lyon and Hilary Leaf have been intimately acquainted, and have loved each other for some years. At length he leaves

England for India, having first begged Hilary "to trust him" in his absence. No one can be surprised that in an absence of ten years, during which he corresponds with her sister, but—in accordance, we presume, with Scottish notions of propriety—never writes one line to Hilary, she has many doubts as to whether she is to *trust him* as a friend or as a lover. The man who really loves a woman, and intends to marry her, and yet leaves her *free*, that is, imagines the possibility of her loving and marrying some one else, must lack either self-respect or true love, and most probably both. Robert Lyon could only have refrained from telling Hilary that he loved her and asking her to marry him when he returned to England, for her sake or his own. Now, Hilary would have gone down on her knees and thanked God for the assurance of Robert's love any and every day of his absence; it would have helped her in every trial that she had to endure. If he had loved her unselfishly he would have known this. Is it not probable that he actually did marry in India, and that he returned a widower, having left his children to the care of his wife's relatives in India? If not, his silence was neither true nor honest, nor creditable to him as a man. In fact, he has no more heart than a tailor's dummy. He is no more than a carved wooden head on an oak stick, and he has to be kept carefully out of the way that the reader may not see he is a stick. He comes home, however, and then there can no longer be any doubt. The good little woman will marry him after all, but she cannot go to India and leave the lonely sister—her only friend—now old and feeble. She tells him so, but the masculine element in his nature, which had apparently been dormant for fifteen years, revolts, and Hilary has every right to the sympathy of the reader.

"Robert, I want to talk to you about Johanna."

"I guess what it is," said he, smiling; "you would like her to go out to India with us. Certainly, if she chooses. I hope you did not suppose I should object?"

"No; but it is not that. She could not go; she would not live six months in a hot climate; the doctor tells me so."

"You have consulted him?"

"Yes, last week; confidentially, without her knowing it. But I thought it right. I wanted to make quite sure before—before. Oh, Robert—"

The grief of her tone caused him to suspect what was coming. He started.

"You don't mean that? Oh, no, you cannot! My little woman—my own little woman—she could not be so unkind."

Hilary turned sick at heart. The dim landscape, the bright sky, seemed to mingle and dance before her, and Venus to stare at her with a piercing, threatening, baleful lustre.

"Robert, let me sit down on the bench, and sit you beside me. It is too dark for people to notice us, and we shall not be very cold."

"No, my darling;" and he slipped his plaid round her shoulders, and his arm with it.

She looked up pitifully. "Don't be vexed with me, Robert, dear; I have thought it all over; weighed it on every side: nights and nights I have lain awake, pondering what was right for me to do. And it always comes to the same thing."

"What?"

"It's the old story," she answered, with a feeble smile. "'I canna' leave my minnie.' There is nobody in the world to take care of Johanna but me, not even Elizabeth, who is engrossed in little Henry. If I left her, I am sure it would kill her. And she cannot come with me, dear!" (the only fond name she ever called him) "for these three years—you say it need only be three years—you will have to go back to India alone!"

Robert Lyon was a very good man; but he was only a man, not an angel; and though he made comparatively little show of it, he was a man very deeply in love. With that jealous tenacity over his treasure, hardly blameable, since the love is worth little which does not wish to have its object all to itself, he had, I am afraid, contemplated, not without pleasure, the carrying off of Hilary to his Indian home; and it had cost him something to propose that Johanna should go too. He was very fond of Johanna; still—

If I tell what followed, will it for ever lower Robert Lyon in the estimation of all readers? He said coldly, "As you please, Hilary," rose up, and never spoke another word till they reached home.

Mrs. Craik's last novel, 'A Noble Life,' is by no means a happy effort. It has neither the interest nor the merit of an authorized biography. The original of the 'Earl of Cairnforth' is carefully photographed, and is accurate in every painful detail: this was unnecessary, and ought to have been impossible. The story, as a story, is too shadowy for analysis, and does not deserve the dignity of its two volumes, its broad margins, and large type. But 'Christian's Mistake,' which preceded this, is a very beautiful story. The title is rather puzzling, and the *mistake* not very obvious. Christian is a young governess, the orphan child of an unworthy father, and she marries an elderly and respectable college don, a widower with two children, whom she does not love. Of course *this* is not the *mistake*, if it is anything it must be called by a stronger name. But the Master of St. Bede's not only knows that Christian does not love him, but knows from letters which have fallen into

his hands before they were married, that she has felt a transient girlish affection for a worthless undergraduate. Again, that the Master did not return these letters was something much graver than a *mistake*. Ultimately, however, the sister of the Master's first wife suspects a previous intimacy with the undergraduate, and Christian has the satisfaction of an explanation with her husband. There must have been a *mistake* somewhere, but as we have said it is not obvious.

The author of John Halifax takes the unpromising material of this story, and it is pliant in her hands. She does not say that young girls should marry elderly men whom they do not love, but she sees this as a fact, and shows how a good man and a good woman would act, supposing they stood in this relation to each other. Dr. Grey does love his young wife, therefore he meets with no trials and no difficulties, and occupies a very subordinate place in the story. It is Christian whose life we follow with the keenest interest. She has great respect for her husband, and is very grateful for his kindness to her, but neither respect nor gratitude guides her; it is *duty* which is her watchword. She has undertaken the duties of wife and step-mother, and resolves to fulfil them righteously. We follow with increasing interest the still calm figure of the young wife, who bears so patiently all the discomforts of her new home. She has to suffer insolence from servants, insolence from the children, insolence from the sister of her husband's first wife, and to bear with a very exasperating habit of the Master's, that of reading at meals. But she endures to the end, and so finds with duty love, love awakened in herself, and called forth towards her from those whom she serves so faithfully. It would seem impossible to love the children—who are only interesting in so far as they are disagreeable, and yet they are gradually brought under the sweet influence of the young mother-in-law. The following extracts show some of the difficulties which she had to encounter:—

She took no notice of what was said, but merely desired the little girl to bring pillows and a footstool, so that she could hold Arthur as easily as possible till the doctor came. And then she bade her take off the diamond bracelets and the hanging laces, and told her where to put all this finery away; which Letitia accomplished with aptitude and neatness.

"There, that will do. Thank you, my dear. You are a tidy little girl. Will you come and give me a kiss?"

Letitia obeyed, though with some hesitation, and then came and stood by her step-mother, watching her intently. At last she said,

"You are crumpling your pretty white silk dress. Won't that vex you very much?"

"Not very much, if it cannot be helped."

"That is odd. I thought you liked fine clothes, and married papa that he might give you them. Phillis said so."

"Phillis was mistaken."

More than that Christian did not answer; indeed, she hardly took in what the child said, being fully engrossed with her charge.

Letitia spoke again.

"Are you really sorry for Atty? Aunt Henrietta said you did not care for any of us."

"Not care for any of you!" And almost as if it were a real mother's heart, Christian felt hers yearn over the poor pale face, growing every minute more ghastly.

"I wonder where papa can be, Letitia! Go and look for him. Tell him to send Barker for the doctor at once."

And then she gave her whole attention to Arthur, forgetting everything except that she had taken upon herself towards these children, all the duties and anxieties of motherhood. How many—perhaps none—would she ever win of its joys? But to women like her, duty alone constitutes happiness.

* * * * *

"Titia," said Dr. Grey, with sudden energy, as if the thought had been brewing in his mind for many minutes, "is there not a piano in the drawing-room? There used to be."

"Yes, and I practise upon it two hours every day," answered Letitia, with dignity. "But afterwards Aunt Henrietta locks it up and takes the key. She says it is poor mamma's piano, and nobody is to play upon it but me."

As the child said this in a tone so like Aunt Henrietta's, her father looked—as Christian had only seen him look once or twice before, and thought there might be circumstances under which anybody displeasing him would be considerably afraid of Dr. Arnold Grey.

"Did you know of this, Christian?"

"Yes," she answered, very softly, with a glance, half warning, half entreating, round upon the children. "But we will not say anything about it; I never did, and I had rather not do so now."

"I understand. We will speak of it another time."

But he did not; neither that night, nor for several days; and Christian felt only too thankful for his silence.

Sometimes, when after ringing at intervals of five minutes for some trifling thing, Barker had sent up "Miss Gascoigne's compliments, and the servants couldn't be spared to wait up-stairs;" or the cook had apologised for deficiencies in Arthur's dinners, by "Miss Gascoigne wanted it for lunch," and especially, when to her various messages to the nursery no answer was ever returned—sometimes, it had occurred to Christian—gentle as she was, and too fully engrossed to notice small

things—that this was not exactly the position Dr. Grey's wife ought to hold in his—and her—own house. Still she said nothing. She trusted to time and patience. And she had such a dread of domestic war, of a family divided against itself.

Great care has been bestowed on the three women who are alone prominent in this story, Miss Grey, Miss Gascoigne, and Christian. Miss Gascoigne, sister of the first wife, is second only in interest to Christian, and is cleverly but very imperfectly sketched. Like the children, she is excessively disagreeable; still, the author assures us that—

It may seem an odd thing to assert, and a more difficult thing still to prove, but Miss Gascoigne was not at heart a bad woman. She had a fierce temper and an enormous egotism, yet these two qualities, in the strangely composite characters that one meets with in life, are not incompatible with many good qualities.

* * * * *

Miss Gascoigne was not a bad woman, only an utterly mistaken and misguided one. She meant no harm—very few people do deliberately mean harm—they only do it. She had set herself against her brother-in-law's marriage—not in the abstract, she was scarcely so wicked and foolish as that; but against his marrying this particular woman. Partly because Christian was only a governess, with somewhat painful antecedents, one who could neither bring money, rank, nor position to Dr. Grey and his family, but chiefly because it had wounded her self-love that she, Miss Gascoigne, had not been consulted, and had had no hand in bringing about the marriage.

Therefore she had determined to see it, and all concerning it, in the very worst light; to modify nothing, to excuse nothing. She had made up her mind that things were to be so-and-so, and so-and-so they must of necessity turn out. *Audi alteram partem* was an idea that never occurred, never had occurred, in all her life, to Henrietta Gascoigne. In fact, she would never have believed there could be “another side,” since she herself was not able to behold it.

We must add the last sentences of this book, because they are the key, not only to this story, but to every story by the author of ‘John Halifax.’ ‘At last this hope had quite to be let go, and its substitute accepted—as we most of us have, more or less, to accept the will of Heaven, instead of our will, and go on our way resignedly, nay cheerfully, knowing that, whether we see it or not, all is well.’

Looking back, as we are now able to do, we find that this author has insight only through her sympathy, and that this fact accounts at once for her strength and weakness. She

cannot paint enthusiasm, she does not seek strength or height of character, but she looks for goodness. She knows a good woman through and through, but other women from the outside only. It is not that she understands all women and no men, for she cannot delineate the internal life of all women. Lady Caroline Brithwood in 'John Halifax,' is a complete failure. Miss Gascoigne is rather a clever sketch than a finished picture. At the same time her sympathy with a good man is complete on the moral, but defective on the intellectual side, and this deficiency is felt more in men than in women, because we need to feel the intellect of a man in whom we take any sustained interest. An accurate delineation of children needs also intellectual insight as well as sympathy; they are in a stage of growth and transition, and the physical and intellectual preponderate. Aaron and Eppie in 'Silas Marner,' Ninna and Lillo in 'Romola,' are the perfection of children, round, soft, loveable realities. Goodness in a loveable child is latent rather than developed, and it is certainly not the only attraction of childhood. But Mrs. Craik must find that or nothing in children. The disagreeable Atty and Titia are, therefore, spiteful, ill-natured grown people on a small scale, and the children whom she depicts are such in virtue only of their using baby-talk.

This lady lacks the deep and full insight of George Eliot; lacks even the knowledge of the outside look of all ordinary characters, which distinguishes so many novelists of only average ability. In language she has no wealth of poetical imagery; her views are neither broad nor profound, she has no wide field of vision, and the depths of spiritual struggle are unknown to her; but she looks high into the pure heavens, and points always upwards and onwards. All her charm and all her power lie in this marvellous purity of moral tone. There is no trifling with sin, no extenuating or making light of it. Right may be painful, it may entail suffering and self-denial, but it must be done. Wrong must be avoided. The petty meannesses and falsehoods of society, and its general insincerity, she never for a moment tolerates or condones. Her good men and women are absolutely honest and truthful to their superiors, their equals, and their inferiors. Surely we have a right to say that such teaching has at the present time an almost inestimable value, and that the 'Author of John Halifax' is doing good service both in her generation and for all time.

AET. III.—(1.) *Auguste Comte et La Philosophie Positive.* Par E. LITTRÉ. Paris : Librairie de L. Hachette et C^{ie}. 1863.

(2.) *Notice sur l'Œuvre et sur la Vie d'Auguste Comte.* Par le DOCTEUR ROBINET. Paris : Librairie Richelieu. 1864.

(3.) *Auguste Comte and Positivism.* By JOHN STUART MILL. London : N. Trübner and Co. 1865.

(4.) *The Classification of the Sciences. To which are added, Reasons for Dissenting from the Philosophy of M. Comte.* By HERBERT SPENCER. London : Williams and Norgate. 1864.

WE do not dispute the wisdom or honesty of a just eclecticism. Our greatest reformers and teachers have had more of the eclectic than of the creative element in their composition. We therefore feel that we are at liberty to make our selection from the completed works of any conspicuous innovator on established beliefs and traditional customs; and while we repudiate those portions of them which are obviously in collision with common sense, or indisputable facts, to preserve the noble 'guesses at truth,' the established discoveries, or the new methods of inquiry which such an author has been fortunately the first to offer to mankind. We are not bound to garner the chaff with the wheat, to save the quartz as well as the gold-dust of our intellectual diggings. In this eclectic spirit we therefore admire the candour with which Messrs. J. S. Mill and E. Littré, in the works named at the head of this article, and Mr. Lewes, in the 'Fortnightly Review,' have released themselves and their reputation from all complicity with the speculations and theories of the later years of M. Auguste Comte, while they give their unhesitating adhesion to the fundamental principles of the 'Cours de Philosophie Positive.' They have maintained their right to accept and apply the method of Comte to physical and social science as he applied it, and their right to stand aloof and refuse the guidance of 'the Bacon of the nineteenth century,' when, according to them, he deviated from his own first principles, reversed his method, gave the reins to his fancy, feelings, and self-will, appealed to his imagination for his facts, and his love-passages for an infallible revelation of the truth. They may be acquitted of all unfair dealing, in seeking, for a while at least, to cover with a decent veil of silence the shame of their master; to treat as unuttered the conclusions to which Comte's sociological law was leading him, and to abstain from either exposition or criticism of the 'Religion of Humanity.' 'The conspiracy of silence,' with the maintenance of which, in relation to his later performances, M. Comte reproached his English admirers, is, as

Mr. Mill honestly confesses, 'more than sufficiently explained by 'tenderness for his fame and conscientious fear of bringing underserved discredit on the noble speculations of his earlier career.' Mr. Mill, after a scathing scrutiny of the vagaries of Comte's later speculations, lets him down softly at last, with the admission that the names of Leibnitz and Descartes, like that of Comte, are associated with 'important discoveries and grand thoughts, 'and also with some of the most extravagantly wild and ludicrously absurd conceptions and theories which were ever 'solemnly proposed by thoughtful men.'*

Whatever truth was embodied in M. Comte's method of investigation into certain departments of fact, is added doubtless to the sum of things, and cannot be subtracted from human thought. The light which he kindled, such as it was, can never be put out; the suggestive hints that he gave for the study of various sciences; the conceptions that he formed of a philosophy derivable from the general principles involved in all the separate sciences, and the progress that he made towards a comprehensive classification and hierarchy of the sciences, according to the law of decreasing generality, and increasing complication in the subject matter, will continue to affect human thought for a long time to come.

While we admit all this, within certain limitations, we at the same time maintain that the completed life of a great thinker is often the best commentary on his philosophy. In agreement with Comte himself, and with some more ardent of his disciples than are either Messrs. Mill, Lewes, or Littré, we believe that Positivism is only partly understood, that no thorough-going application of the method of Comte has yet been made, and that his philosophy can not be truly appreciated until his later speculations are distinctly appraised. The history of Auguste Comte is, we think, an instructive and striking corroboration of the views which we ventured to express in this journal some twelve years ago, and justifies the course we then adopted. It may be 'English,' 'selfish,' 'unphilosophical,' to estimate a new method of inquiry by the solid advantages, or the personal consequences to which it leads, but whatever hard names are hurled at the proceeding, we believe that it is impossible to free the mind from the influence of the discovery of the close connection existing in the mind of their author between the '*Cours de Philosophie Positive*,' and the '*Système de la Politique Positive*.' Positivism loudly boasts that it deprives us of nothing for which it does not supply an adequate substitute. When, therefore, by a new and lauded method of inquiry all that we esteem of real or solid value to

* 'Auguste Comte and Positivism.' By J. S. Mill. Pp. 199, 200.

our hungering spirits is ruthlessly snatched from our grasp, and trampled down into the sands of the past; when all the majesty and holiness and power of God are boldly repudiated; when the tenderest and ~~most sacred names~~ and things are treated as chimeras of our imagination; when sin is ridiculed and pardon becomes impossible; when the soul herself is frittered away into a nexus of powers and faculties without centre or reality; when immortality, with all its fears and hopes, is transmuted into the memorial engraved on our tombstone, or the subjective appreciation yielded to our manes by the 'Positivist Society;' when all the glorious tremor of our spirit in view of the unseen, all the divine communion of the holy with their God is compensated for, by what appears to us to be a fetichistic commemoration of the dead, and all the religious experience of the church of the living God is explained away as a dream of effete theology; when morals are substituted for religion and the 'Supreme Being' of the new faith and love is asserted to be the entire race of man, past, present, and future—a conception which, in the Positivist sense, can only be formulated by minds that have passed through a laborious scientific training; when the entire systematisation of the new faith, hope, and love is so ineffably absurd, impractical, and inconsistent, that its most moderate expounders are compelled constantly to assure their readers that they are not joking, and are really anxious to be fair to the distinguished man who offered it to the world: * we are fain and forced to ask whether there is, or is not, any close or immediate connection between the calm and dispassionate theories of the philosophic Comte and the wild dreams of the Pontiff Comte. Some of his disciples would have us believe that there is no such connection; that we may be thankful for the one and despise the other; that the one is true, and that the other is premature and false; that the one follows the objective and relative method of inquiry, and that the other follows the subjective, dogmatic, and absolute method; that the one is the child of the Baconian and inductive philosophy, and the other the offspring of a diseased and weakened intellect, a retrograde, inconsistent, and one-sided view of human affairs; that the one reveals a mind delivered from the trammels of self, communing with facts, classifying sciences and generalising phenomena; and that the other reveals a brain driven back and in upon itself, spinning a universe out of its own *medulla oblongata*, and perhaps presenting the most amazing specimen of self-importance and overweening vanity that the world has ever seen. But, on the other hand, there are disciples of M. Comte, among whom Dr. Robinet and

* J. S. Mill, pp. 152, 153.

Mr. Congreve conspicuously figure, who not only embrace all this self-assertion as a new religion, but maintain that it was the original intention of Comte to advance it; that the germs of the whole absurdity are laid deep down in his system, that the philosophy of the sciences is a mere parenthesis in this general scheme; that from the first he aimed at the formation of a demonstrable faith, and saw the profound necessity of attending to the subjective inspirations of the affections, of even subordinating the intellect to the decisions of the heart, and of effecting the true synthesis of human faculties in the creation not only of the sociological law which is to interpret all history, but of the transcendental concept of the *Grand-être*, who is to inspire and respond to those affections.

It is our belief that Messrs. Robinet and Congreve are nearer to the truth than are some of the more sober and less enthusiastic followers of Comte. They are not utterly blind to a truth which was revealed at last to Comte, that the theologic stage is after all a fundamental one; that man must worship; that whether their science can formulate it or not, whether Comte's position is a mortal blow at positive philosophy or is not, man will find or make an object of worship, reverence, and love; that if the bleeding roots of our nature are torn from their resting-place, they will fasten and cling to any miserable fetich, batten on any spongy morass, eagerly close with any offers of nutrition and sustenance, rather than wither among the icebergs of those impressive laws of changeless sequence; that if Comte did not offer his miserable makeshifts of religious consolation, outraged human nature would soon avenge its cruel bereavements in some other fashion; that if the Positivist Society or Church did not rush into the breach, the broken heart of man, still 'hungering for eternity,' and crying for its Father and for peace, would close with any substitute for its rifled treasures rather than go frantic upon atheistic law. These men see with a deeper philosophy than the English sensational sceptics can do, that the jubilant chorus of satisfaction with which modern Positivists are striving to drive God from his creation, and from all human affairs, and virtually to make their own magnificent minds the measure of all things, supposing it to be successful, could end only in a re-iteration of old Paganisms and the creation of a new mythology. We believe that Comte's melancholy and ghastly systematisation of the affective powers of man, and his creation, as he thought, of a new priesthood, new sacraments, a new Pantheon, a new Calendar, a new Trinity, a new Virgin Mother, show that the progress of opinion in this direction can end only in a renewal of the Saturnalia of the latter days of Roman

paganism. Tremendous reaction must ensue if the religious nature of man ever tries, on any grand scale, to commit suicide; the convulsions wrought by the slow poison of Pyrrhonism are not likely to be less violent now than in other great crises of human history. If the Europe of the nineteenth century should cry, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,' the fear, the license, the audacity, the devil let loose from hell, are not likely to be less vehement than they were in Alexandria, or Rome, or Corinth, or Paris, in days which are never to be recalled without a blush.

In Mr. Mill's eloquent and candid exhibition of the presumption and absurdity to which the '*foi démontrée*,' and the '*nouveau sacerdoce*,' led the remarkable man, whose writings and life are now occupying our attention, he shows that the tyrannous and tremendous authority with which Comte would invest the supreme Pontiff of the regenerated humanity, the limit he would be entitled to place on the vagaries of the human intellect, the bold repressions by the same omniscient individual of all insurrection of the mind against the heart would create a spiritual tyranny more complete than was ever dreamed of by Innocent III., or Gregory the VII., by Mahomet, or any of his caliphs. Let us not be misunderstood: if the Positive Philosophy were proved to be an accurate and final exhibition of the truth, not merely about the heavens and the earth, physics and chemistry, but about the human and social life and national development of mankind, and if it appeared on intrinsic grounds that there was nothing for it, but to accept the cerebral theory of Gall, and the sociological law of Comte, as the final expression of human knowledge in which all the mysteries of conscience and religious life were to find their solution, we might wring our hands in despair over the misery of existence, and look with languid interest, though critical eye, on the dreams of the Positivist Society. Then judging for ourselves of the wisdom of this '*enfant terrible*' of the French Revolution, criticising, with Littré and Comte, the *Politique Positive* by the light of Positive Philosophy, we might not, on this supposition be justified in looking for the consequences and sequelæ of a system, or in estimating the latter by the former. However, that is not the whole case: we maintain that the Positive Philosophy is not proved to be true; that the creation of the absurdities of the 'Religion of Humanity,' is proof and admission that the Positive Philosophy is a scientific failure; that on the close examination of one who knows it best, it has been seen to leave out of consideration a vast and infinitely important element of human thought; that it is therefore essentially defective; that it utterly fails to do what

it pretends to do; that it does not generalise the main facts of human life and consciousness, and that it invites every miserable man who has accepted, or been brow-beaten by its professions, to imitate the wild dream of the greatest Positivist Philosopher of the nineteenth century. It is with this conviction of the value of M. Comte's supplement to his great work that we propose to devote a few pages not to the examination of his theories, for that has been already done by us on previous occasions, but to furnish our readers with the salient points in the life of the remarkable man who has already been so often mentioned.

In the present state of the literature of the subject, this is not an easy task. Diametrically opposite opinions are advanced with some acrimony by the biographers of Comte, and a very different estimate is put by each of them, upon some of the most fundamental facts, and important circumstances they relate. Both of them agree to invest the brow of their hero with a crown of mystic glory, and both educe from the painful commonplace and aggravated disappointments of his literary career, a title to the sentimental homage of mankind. One almost sickens to read that—'He would doubtless have failed to realise one element in the glory of the Founder of the universal religion if he had not also been crowned with the aureole of calamity, if he had not drunk to the dregs the bitter cup of social injustice in which the gall of treachery had been so largely interfused.* But neither M. Littré nor Dr. Robinet have convinced us of Comte's title as a man to our unhesitating sympathy or admiration. Some of the great enemies of established faith, however much we may have mourned over the misdirection of their powers, and may be ready to challenge and refute their conclusions, have yet conciliated our respect, and almost inspired our reverence. Such men as Pelagius and Spinoza, to say nothing of certain religious fanatics and great innovators on popular belief and established religion, have displayed a moral courage, an heroic endurance, a quiet calm, a charity and sobriety of judgment which have given them an enduring place in the affections and thoughts of mankind; but after reading Dr. Robinet's enthusiastic and sustained panegyric, M. Littré's broken-hearted musings, and Mr. Lewes' outspoken and generous words, we cannot get up any warm sympathy towards the angular individual who, from his boyhood to his grave, seems to us the most memorable example of self-sufficiency and censorious judgment, of whom we ever read. He was appalled at the ignorance and audacity of all who differed from him, and had most unhesitating condemnations for

* 'Notice sur la Vie d'Auguste Comte,' par Dr. Robinet, p. 170.

all who trod on his toes, or stood in his light. The struggles of the lonely artist, the briefless barrister, and the disappointed poet, can often draw out all our sympathies; but the mode in which Comte assessed modern society for the minimum of salary which he ought to accept from the universe for the great service he had done it, excites more of irritation than compassion: and more of contempt than either.

The mode in which he refers to events in his personal history, as illustrative of fundamental principles of truth, philosophy, and religion, should, we think, be hidden by his followers from all exoteric eyes. He treats the true revelation to the world of the relation between the intellect and the affections, as coincident with his love affairs, and explains the little matter of the sacraments to his *bien aimée* by referring to the period in his life when he abstained from coffee, wine, and tobacco;* while he hopes to make the whole world mourn the death of Mme. de Vaux, because he did not arrive in time to ask her a question about the object of worship which was accessible to woman.† Peculiarities like these, though highly diverting to unsympathising Christians, are at the same time accompanied by so many dreary reiterations of favourite ideas of exaggerated value, that they do not contribute to the impressiveness of the biography.

The life of Comte hardly repays the diligent study necessary to comprehend it, and even when comprehended, it does not greatly augment his claim to the gratitude or homage of mankind. Isidore Auguste Marie François-Xavier Comte,—stumble not, gentle reader, over this catalogue of cognomina, the subject of the present remarks, was placed by his parents under the protection of a constellation of human notabilities, and bore from his baptism an ambitious accumulation of names redolent of many associations, and some variety of mental and moral influences. I. A. M. F. X. Comte was born at Montpellier, in the year 1798, and in his early youth was educated in the college of his native town. From the first he displayed extraordinary quickness of apprehension, and independence of thought, and though amenable to the advice of those instructors, whose mental calibre he appreciated, he was early brought into collision with constituted authorities, and refused to submit to any rule which was not as he thought, either moral or intellectual. We find him permitted to deliver a whole course of mathematical lectures, at an age when ordinary children have scarcely mastered the first book of Euclid, thus employing the

* 'Vie d'Auguste Comte.' Par Dr. Robinet, p. 212.

† 'Discours sur l'Ensemble de Positivisme, Système de Politique Positive,' i. 266; see also pp. 248, 264, 265.

year which elapsed between his examination for the Polytechnic School and his attainment of the age at which it was possible for him to matriculate as a student. This event took place in 1814. Before he reached his eighteenth year, our young hero headed a rebellion against a *répétiteur* of the school, and for this act of insubordination was sent home to chew the cud of his own reflections, and commence business as a mathematical teacher on his own account. During this period he was on the verge of obtaining an appointment to a school which was to be fashioned in the United States on the basis of the Ecole Polytechnique. The idea was never realized; and Auguste Comte did not become an American citizen. It is almost worth while to speculate on the possible effect which American institutions, American freedom of speech, of worship and religious thought might have had upon him. Whether his vanity would have risen to the emergency, whether his speculations would have been materially different in tone, whether the Catholic Hierarchy would have seemed to him the masterpiece of human wisdom, which it afterwards became in his eyes, whether his almost delirious love of systematization would have been modified by the freer and more liberal atmosphere which pervades an Anglo-Saxon community, and whether his ambition to found the universal religion would have given to his Positivist Church dimensions at all comparable with the Mormon Theocracy we cannot say; but, upon the whole, we think it better that he was submitted at this critical epoch of his life to the repressive influences of the Bourbon restoration.

The history of Comte from this time onwards, seems to us to have been the record of short-lived friendships, disdainful quarrels, and angry separations. For three weeks he was the secretary of Casimir Perrier, but this was a relation that his hatred of authority did not allow him to brook. In 1818, when he was twenty years of age, he came for awhile under the influence of M. Saint Simon, and though it became tolerably evident that the principles of thought most characteristic of the philosophical systems of these two men were radically diverse,—and M. Littré has, we think, demonstrated the fundamental differences between them—yet, misunderstandings of a moral and social kind, created a premature rupture between the master and his disciple, and led Comte greatly to exaggerate what he calls, '*La funeste liaison à travers laquelle s'accomplit mon début spontané,*' and to estimate his '*rencontre avec Saint Simon,*' as a calamity without compensation. According to M. Littré, the two speculators were very much attached to each other, but from the position of pupil, Comte rose to be master;

and having struck out what he termed his theory of the sociologic laws, became decidedly disagreeable, and often, in the opinion of Madame Comte confounded his master in argument. It is grimly amusing to find that one matter in dispute between them was the following: whether savans or artists (that is, whether Comte or Saint Simon) should occupy the first or the second rank in the coming age of gold? Saint Simon's views of the supreme dignity and sovereignty of 'labour' led to a still wider divergence which appeared to the world in 1824. The publication in Saint Simon's '*Catechisme des Industriels*' of the first volume of the '*Système du Politique Positive*,' in 1822, and that under a general title, which obscured the authorship, sorely annoyed young Comte, and when in 1824 Saint Simon wanted to perpetuate the same subordination, the rupture between the two was complete. In the curious documents published by Littré (p. 24), Comte accuses Saint Simon of thinking that he having discovered certain ideas, it had become the duty and business of other people simply to develop them more fully, giving a new illustration of the keenness with which we all discern our own faults in the mirror of other lives. It was not until the year 1825, that, freed from the influence of Saint Simon, he is supposed to have fully grasped the idea of the Positive Philosophy.

On the 29th of February, 1825, his marriage with Mlle. Caroline Massin took place. The marriage was a civil contract only, arising from Comte's intense repugnance to any theological belief, and his repudiation of all ecclesiastical ceremony or consecration. It is difficult to fathom the mysteries of this marriage, and it would be indelicate to adjudicate as yet between the extreme views set forth by his two biographers. M. Littré speaks of passionate love, and even quotes sentimental passages from their correspondence; he recounts the self-sacrificing affection and devoted service rendered by Madame Comte to her husband, attributes his restoration from mental malady to her unremitting and enthusiastic attentions, endeavours to prove that even after the separation between them, Comte wrote to her in terms of profound respect; and, since his death, M. Littré has attempted, though without success, to procure funds for her maintenance from devout Positivists. But it is thus that Dr. Robinet describes the same transaction:—

'At the age of twenty-seven years, when in the full exultation of his career as innovator, but before he had reconstituted morality upon Positive bases, the unfortunate young philosopher struck upon one of the most dangerous rocks that obstruct the voyage of life. In spite of his family who appealed to his filial deference, in spite of society which requires congruity

'in such a union, he contracted the unhappy marriage which filled the remainder of his life with misery and regrets. On the 29th of February, 1825, without any consecration but the municipal registration, without any help save that of the official witnesses, in spite of the remonstrances of his father and family, he married the woman to whom he seemed to be drawn on as by a fatal spell. Too implicit confidence in the power of his heart, and too rigorous a feeling against the venerable prejudices of his home, betrayed him into this fatal mistake, the only serious fault of his whole life, the consequences of which pursued him even beyond the grave.*'

This last statement of Robinet is defended in the close of his volume, '*Le Positivisme après Comte*,' by details on which we do not here enter. M. Littré took Mme. Comte's view of the treatment of her marriage in her husband's will, and, we presume, agreed with her in the course she adopted; and he shows in his volume, in more places than one (*vide* p. 443), that Comte could be uncandid in the account he rendered of the disagreements which took place between him and his wife.

At the commencement of the following year, having published one or two brochures in the *Producteur*, and encountered some pecuniary difficulties arising from the somewhat prosaic proceeding of buying too expensive furniture, and from travelling to Montpellier, 'en grand Seigneur,' he commenced a course of lectures in the Rue du Faubourg Montmartre. He proposed in this course to give a dogmatic exposition of the Positive Philosophy; and many distinguished men, including Humboldt, De Blainville, Poinso, and other celebrities, were among his auditors. This course was completed in the year 1829, but between these two dates the most terrible calamity that can befall a human intellect prostrated and suspended all his powers. Of this we desire to speak with profound sympathy. M. Littré has given us a most elaborate account of this 'maladie mentale;' how bad digestion, melancholy thoughts, vexation with his friends, intense irritation arising from unacknowledged plagiarisms of his grand ideas, sleeplessness and angry threats, produced, at length, on his overwrought and excited brain the grievous calamity, mental aberration. Our author details the strange complications arising from the treatment that Comte received under these circumstances; how his mother wanted to abstract him from the care and treatment of M. Esquirol, took no notice of his wife, spoke of her as 'the woman with whom he had lived,' strained every nerve to put him into a religious house, and sought to secure an 'interdiction' for this purpose.

* '*Vie d'A. Comte.*' Par Dr. Robinet, p. 168.

Eagerly as this project was contrived by the mother, it was eminently distasteful to Madame Auguste Comte, whose intense alarm at the disastrous consequences to her husband of the ultimate removal of the interdict by a judicial act, led her with some finesse and great energy to save him from such degradation. The consequence was that M. Esquirol refused to give him up to any but his wife. The father and mother of Comte regarded his malady as an infliction from God, in consequence of his left-handed marriage. Their conduct on this occasion is ascribed by M. Littré to the motive of religious fanaticism, which he deems sufficient to explain, if not to palliate it. A most astounding letter from M. de Blainville is given, which details all the circumstances as they came under his own eye, and in which he admits to Madame Comte, for her advantage, that he had told several egregious lies about her husband's disease in order to secure the proposed interdiction. We are next favoured with a recitation of all the distress and annoyance which Madame Comte suffered from her mother-in-law, under the advice of two confessors, and with a description of the scene in which poor bewildered Comte was entrapped into a religious marriage in a private chamber, a scene which revolts us by its absurdity, and assumes quite tragic proportions from the bad taste of the priest and the madness of the bridegroom. Strange to say, the celebrated Abbé de Lamennais had counselled the mother of Comte to this preposterous step, under the hope of winning back to the Catholic Church a powerful thinker, and an honest revolutionary. We need scarcely say that it produced an aggravation of the cerebral malady. While the priest was prosing, Comte was blaspheming. There was perhaps 'method in his madness,' for he added to his signature the names Brutus Bonaparte, names which he held in abhorrence as those of men who had arrested the tide of human progress. Scarcely can we restrain a shiver of horror, at such a grim travesty of the most solemn sanctions of our holy faith.

Some compensation, however, followed this tragic occurrence, in the assistance rendered by Comte's father to his son and daughter-in-law, and in the free scope henceforth granted to Madame Auguste Comte, for the exercise of her thoughtful care and unhampered and unremitting attention to the invalid. Thus the philosopher was saved by the judicious treatment of his wife from the more aggravated forms of the disease, but suffered a profound collapse of all his powers. His melancholy was intense, at times leading him to meditate suicide. Once he plunged from the Pont des Arts into the Seine, but was

rescued by one of the Royal Guards. After this he more rapidly advanced to convalescence, the details of which are recounted by M. Littré, who concludes with these words: 'Tous ceux qui, disciples de la Philosophie Positive, en retirent journellement profit pour la conduite de leur intelligence et de leur cœur sont redevables à M^{me}. Comte, sans qui une grande lumière s'éteignait prématurément sous les fatalités de la maladie,' and he gives quite sufficient proof of his assertion; but M. Robinet in relating the same circumstances, attributes the cure entirely to the conduct of Comte's mother, implies that she never left him until he was virtually restored, and hints that the mortifying conduct of his wife led to his attempted suicide. We do not pretend to adjudicate on this delicate subject.

Towards the end of the year 1828, Comte resumed his public instructions and the oral exposition of his philosophical system, and between the years 1830 and 1842 he published the six volumes of his 'Cours de Philosophie Positive.' We do not undervalue the amazing comprehensiveness of this classification of human thought, nor do we fail to appreciate the luminous suggestions which accompany the exposition and link together the various branches of scientific knowledge. But we are far from giving to Comte the place which many of his admirers claim for him in the development of what he termed Positive Philosophy, or, indeed, from admitting the truth of any of those capital positions of his which have a savour of strict originality. M. Littré rests the fame, and grounds the reputation of his great master on the three following doctrines:—the hierarchy of the sciences; the separation of the abstract from the concrete in science; and the relative character of all human knowledge. The first and third of these positions is greatly affected by what is termed our philosopher's discovery of the great sociologic law, which is, that all human knowledge passes, or will pass, with greater or less rapidity through three stages, the *first* of which is termed the theological stage, in which the human mind refers all phenomena to the arbitrary action of supernatural and personal powers, culminating at length in the conception of one supreme and universally present Deity; the *second*, in which the supernatural powers are replaced by self-evolved conceptions of impersonal entities, and hence is termed the metaphysical; the *third* and final stage is that in which the mind is content to renounce all inquiry into cause, and devotes itself exclusively to the observation and classification of phenomena. Now, even M. Littré himself is dissatisfied with the completeness of this much-vaunted classification, and urges, with some plausibility,

that neither the industrial, moral, nor æsthetic development of society is entirely included under this scientific generalization. He goes on to show that the development of the human race takes four periods corresponding with four periods in the development of each individual, and adds these three little (!) matters of development in order to complete the sociologic theory of his Master; then, adopting the tone of dogmatism learned in the same school, he virtually addresses his young friends, the philosophers of Europe, thus: 'If you want to study sociology, and to complete what Comte left unfinished, I, who have thought the subject well over, assure you that you can only succeed as you take my hint, and expound my ideas *passim*. Buckle to your work, unfold my penetrating and fertile conceptions, and when you have exhausted their profound intent, I will graciously condescend to bestow a few more upon you.' We never saw such numerous appeals to intuition for the establishment of important propositions as in the writings of these Positivists.

It is highly amusing, and we may add, instructive also, to read M. Littré's history of the 'Positive Philosophy,' and his erudite enumeration of the happy guesses of great thinkers who preceded and predicted the advent of Comte. He gives us at length 'an opusculé' of Kant, who had clearly and forcibly urged the opinion that the true development of the reasonable creature man, cannot be seen in the individual but in the race. Society has moved as yet such a little way, that Kant can no more tell what shall be its ultimate form than he can say what is the trajectory of the curve, which the sun is performing amongst the fixed stars; but he believes in the possibility and consistency of a universal science of history, according to a concealed plan of nature which philosophical effort may discover. The principal criticism which Littré pronounces on Kant, is, his introduction of 'the metaphysical idea' that 'nature' does nothing in vain, and that Kant actually is foolish enough to hint the possibility of a wise Creator of the universe. Such an old-world notion as this is merely an intuition of the philosopher, and not a truth developed out of nature; and, finally, that Kant needed only to have grasped the doctrine of 'the three stages' to have unriddled the whole mystery of the Universe. The bounce and self-satisfaction of some of these criticisms sound more like the self-complacency evinced in the old Buddhist books than the modest humility of true philosophy. Condorcet is shown to have aimed at a principle of social development in his 'Tableaux de Progrès du Genre Humain,' but not to have succeeded in determining that principle.

Comte's sketch of the work of Condorcet,* gives the key to Littré's criticism, and we need not suppose that Comte plagiarized from him. The mode in which Littré reviews Saint Simon's relation to the Positive Philosophy is eminently offensive. He shows, with some ability, that Saint Simon's dream of referring all forces in nature to the law of universal gravitation, is a hopeless absurdity; but he parallels the absurdity of the application of the law of gravitation to the laws of human nature, with what he deems the greater absurdity inherent in *all* theology, namely, that an intelligent, living, voluntary force, could become in matter an inorganic and brute force! No man knows better than M. Littré, that no form of theology, except the dregs of Pantheism, could suffer such a statement to pass unchallenged. However, M. Littré, by an elaborate series of quotations from Saint Simon, shows how close he came to the ideas contemporaneously promulgated by Comte.

We do not, in these pages, presume to enumerate the opinions that often pass current under the name of Positivism; but it may be well to remind our readers that the name of Comte, in virtue of his emphatic exposition and comprehensive classification of modern science, is often credited as that of the originator of the science itself; so that methods of putting certain facts which we owe to Sir William Hamilton or Bishop Berkeley, to Descartes or Bacon, are not unfrequently called Comtism—a proceeding which is, in fact, as reasonable as to speak of the Irvingism of Tertullian, or the Calvinism of Augustine. Therefore we shall not discuss as Comtian doctrine, either the empirical origin and relativity of all human knowledge, or the invariability of natural laws. Mr. Herbert Spencer† shows how widely the habit has been diffused of describing even these ideas as peculiarly due to Comte. It may, however, be fairly admitted that the sociologic law of the three stages, is, as Mr. Mill observes, 'the most fundamental of the doctrines which originated with Comte; it is the key to his other generalizations, all of which are more or less dependent on it; it forms the backbone of his philosophy, and unless it be true, he has accomplished little.'‡

We allow that there is great plausibility in this generalization, but if we were to grant the classification of the sciences proposed by Comte, to admit the justice of their hierarchy, and of the dependence of the more complicated, less general, and modifiable phenomena upon those which he terms the most

* 'Cours de Philosophie Positive.' 47 Leçon.

† 'Classification of the Sciences,' &c., by Herbert Spencer, pp. 33, 34.

‡ 'Auguste Comte and Positivism.' By J. S. Mill, p. 13.

universal and least complicated; if we yield the point to him, that from mathematics to sociology, he is correct in the order of their filiation as sciences, that his larger divisions embrace all abstract science, that he ~~has left out~~ nothing of importance, and is scientifically just, in reducing logic, metaphysics, ethics, æsthetics, and theology from their high position as science, to the entirely subordinate position of a method of studying other subject matter, though we allow that he has brought to his task great erudition, extraordinary mental compass and masterly grasp, we are yet prepared to dispute with him this main sociologic law. It is impossible to discuss this law of the three stages as expounded by Comte, without investigating the value of each of these concessions, not one of which we are disposed to make. It is curious to find that Mr. Mill endeavours to free the fundamental generalization from what he calls religious prejudice, and suggests the compatibility of what he terms the Positive mode of thought on this very subject, with a belief in an intelligent Author and Governor of the Universe, but in doing so, he appears to us to be confounding—we say it with deference—Comte's supposed discovery of the sociologic law, with the simple doctrine of the invariable sequences of nature. We are quite prepared to admit that a scientific conception of universal law is compatible with Theism; but we are at a loss to understand the possibility of combining Comte's estimate of Monotheism and metaphysics, and his condemnation of them, as merely provisional and imperfect methods of conceiving the phenomena of the Universe, with any possible admission of Theism, any belief in a living God. But, further, we consider that in Comte's articulate proof of the development of monotheistic habits of thought, he has arrived at an induction from a far too limited range of mental phenomena. Mr. Mill speaks 'of the unnaturalness of Monotheism to the human mind before 'a certain period in its development;' and of 'the superficial 'observations by which Christian travellers have persuaded 'themselves that they found their own monotheistic belief in 'some tribes of savages.' He says, 'that by our acknowledgment' 'the tradition of Monotheism was lost by all the nations 'of the world, except a small and peculiar people, in whom it 'was miraculously kept alive, but who were themselves continually lapsing from it.' But both M. Comte, in his elaborate treatment of the subject in the fifth volume of his '*Cours de Philosophie*,' and Mr. Mill, in his recent apology for these views, deliberately pass over all the evidence on this subject to be drawn from the hoary speculations of the East, and the monotheistic or pantheistic basis of all its more conspicuous religions. Every mythology with which we are acquainted.

reveals a process the diametrical opposite of Comte's theory in one important point, namely, a tendency to multiply rather than diminish the number of its Gods; and although it is obvious that a certain state of mental development or spiritual life is necessary to living intercourse with God, yet even if there were no facts on which to base the argument, the wide-spread exhibition of this tendency suggests the primeval glory of the conception, as it lighted up the night of our Semitic and Aryan forefathers.

Beyond all this, and independently of any detail, we conceive that Mr. Herbert Spencer is far nearer the truth than Comte, that 'there are not three methods of philosophizing radically opposed, but one method of philosophizing, which remains in essence the same. At first, and to the last, the conceived causal agencies of phenomena have a degree of generality corresponding to the width of the generalizations which experiences have determined, and they change just as gradually as experiences accumulate. The integration of causal agencies originally thought of as multitudinous and local, but finally believed to be one and universal, is a process which involves the passing through all intermediate steps between these extremes, and any appearance of stages can be but superficial.' Mr. Spencer further urges, that the conception of a single great entity, Nature, as the source of all phenomena, differs in nothing but name, from the consciousness of One Being manifested in all phenomena, and he even regards the ideal state of science in which all observable phenomena may be represented as a single general fact, as implying the postulating of some ultimate existence of which this single fact is alleged, and, therefore, a state of consciousness indistinguishable from the other two. With deeper philosophy than Comte's, Mr. Spencer shows that in the widest generalization of science the consciousness of 'Cause' remains as dominant to the last as it was at first, and can never be got rid of; that the consciousness of 'Cause' can be abolished only by abolishing consciousness itself. We have already observed, that M. Littré indicates serious *lacunes* in this sociologic law, on which he, and other admirers of Comte, nevertheless, pronounce such high-flown eulogies, but the most significant fact of all is this, that the later speculations and history of Comte inflate the gorgeous bubble till it bursts.

Dr. Robinet has laboured, and, we think, with some success, to show that the germ of all Comte's later speculations is to be found in his Positive Philosophy; and that the lesser works which preceded the '*Cours de Philosophie*,' still more emphatically indicate the strength of those social aspirations

which directed all his scientific elaboration, and to which it was merely an initial process. His argument is as follows:—The capital positions towards which all his philosophy points are, that all real phenomena, without excepting even the complicated phases of politics, are instances of invariable relations, and may be generalized under natural laws; but this is not all: the next is, that while our understanding passes from theological beliefs to positive conceptions, through the transitional process of metaphysical explanations, our active nature passes from the conquering military *régime* to the pacific or industrial state, through the transitional stage of mutual military defences. In order to maintain his theory of the connection between the theological phase and the military *régime*, he tells us that on the advent of the metaphysical epoch of Social Science, the military spirit received a notable check. In spite of all M. Comte's ingenious speculation and frequent suggestions, his love of system reminds us here of the Frenchman who said, 'Tant pis pour les faits,' for his theory requires us to believe that the military spirit was undergoing this transition before the days of Wallenstein or Gustavus Adolphus, of Marlborough or Frederick, of Napoleon, Wellesley, or Nicholas. But to continue; another of his capital positions is, that always and everywhere, the state of opinions and manners determines that of institutions; that ideas govern and overthrow the world; and that all social mechanism ultimately reposes upon opinions; consequently, when Philosophy passes from the theologic and metaphysic stage to its positive completion, political organization passes out of military into industrial activities. Without pausing to discuss the accuracy of this generalization, we notice finally a conclusion unquestionably sketched in his 'Cours de Philosophie,' which is, that a re-organization of the spiritual power is a necessary condition of social reform, and can only arise out of the production of a *demonstrable authority*, having for its organ a class of regenerated *Savans*, constituting a philosophic corporation or priesthood, empowered to effect a universal renovation. Thus, according to the 'Cours de Philosophie,' a Positive ethic would be eventually inaugurated, founded, as no other has ever been, on human motives, under the guidance of a spiritual authority unanimously recognised, and sanctioning a vast system of public and private duties.

Dr. Robinet exults in the assurance that the very last of Comte's efforts, entitled, 'La Synthèse Subjective,' commenced in 1856, had been exhibited in its germ in works published by him in the year 1822. Nothing, to our mind, more completely disenchanting the 'Cours de Philosophie' of its scientific glories,

or tarnishes the ripe bloom on this immortal fruit of Comte's genius, than Dr. Robinet's *naïve* admission that through all his scientific elaboration he was secretly pondering the creation of a 'nouveau pouvoir spirituel,' if not absolutely dreaming of the Pontificate in the 'nouveau sacerdoce' which he subsequently conceived, and which he imagined should transcend the power and glory he was able to attribute to Moses or Mahomet, Charlemagne or Napoleon, Buddha or Christ. The indomitable confidence and colossal absurdity of his later years are exhibited by his biographers and apologists, as they tell the somewhat melancholy story of a life in which there is little that is tragic but a disappointed vanity, amounting to the sublime. These developments are a striking commentary, as we take it, on the validity or otherwise, of his philosophical views. They at least prove to demonstration, that Positivism did not appease the yearnings of his nature, and they give a 'glaring instance' of the entire insufficiency of the merely scientific view of human life and destiny to meet the strong aspirations and fearful questionings of the human soul.

It must be admitted that Littré takes a different view from Robinet as to the early tendencies of Comte's mind towards any religious reconstruction of society upon a Positive basis, and he endeavours to show by a long letter of Comte's, addressed to M. Michel-Chevalier, that in 1832 Comte did not distinguish between religion and theology, and utterly repudiated both. The '*religiosité*' and the religious theories of the Saint Simonians, appeared to him the maunderings of weakness, but we think that all that Littré proves satisfactorily is, that Comte was intensely irritated with being described as a renegade disciple of Saint Simon.

Letters of a later date from M. Comte to Mr. J. S. Mill are, however, published by Littré, which do much to establish the point, that the fundamental principle and chief purpose in his life, was not the systematization of human thought, or the mere discovery of the law of development of the various branches of human speculation, but the reorganization of society.

Thus, in March, 1842, Comte congratulates himself on the agreement which Mr. Mill had accorded to the once favourite conception of the severance of the spiritual and the temporal powers. But the radical divergence of their views is conspicuous in this, that Mr. Mill was not ready to admit the feasibility or desirableness of the creation of a vast philosophic hierarchy endowed with consultative and semi-legislative functions, which would make them more terrible and less amenable to ordinary judgment than the College of Cardinals.

In another letter he seems to have been greatly interested in Mr. Mill's account of the Anglo-Catholic movement, and intimates that it is quite in harmony with all his theories, that an ultramontanist reaction, a conservative retrogressive movement of all religious factions and all philosophic opinions should herald the advent of the true Positivism.

In the same year, 1842, he shows by a letter to the same correspondent, that the idea of the Positivist Calendar was seething in his brain. He had already anticipated the time when all the ancient waymarks set upon our days, and months, and years, should give place to his system of commemoration for the great men who have contributed to the development of humanity. 'This,' says he, 'will be one of the most appropriate institutions for the promotion of the mental and moral development of mankind.' 'The mental and moral development of mankind' is to be effected, according to our philosopher, by a revolution which shall dethrone Christ, and exalt Cæsar, Shakespeare, and Bichat into his place, which shall raise Buddha, Zoroaster, and Confucius from their graves, and put these dead demi-gods into a European Pantheon with Moses and Descartes, St. Paul and Mahomet. Surely there has never arisen, since the days of the Apostle John, a more formal, deliberate, and literal exhibition of the conception of the Antichrist than is unfolded in this scheme of commemoration, which, so early in Comte's philosophic career as when he was publishing the concluding volume of his '*Cours de Philosophie Positive*' was dancing before his excited vision. The continuity of his two careers, the philosophic and the religious, is attested by the identity of the name which he gave to his political philosophy, with that of his fundamental opusculum of 1825.

A most characteristic specimen of the self-confidence of Comte is detailed at length by Littré, who shows how M. Guizot, when the Minister of Public Instruction, was importuned by our philosopher first to create a Chair of Systematic History of the Sciences, in the Collège de France, and then to appoint him its occupant. Guizot remarks in his '*Mémoires*'* on the interview, and on the correspondence which ensued on this subject, and admits that if he had judged it *apropos* to create such a chair, he should certainly never have dreamt for a moment of bestowing it upon the applicant. In these letters to M. Guizot there is a curious combination of self-interest and self-reliance. Their author exhibits wonderfully comprehensive views on the filiation of the sciences, and a marvellously keen eye to 'the main chance.' It was, doubtless, very galling to such a mind

* *Mémoires de M. Guizot*, vol. iii. p. 125.

as his, to spend several hours daily in teaching mathematics, and such a course of lectures as those which he proposed would have been interesting and instructive, but he outrages common sense and modesty when he would have a new Professorship instituted by the Government for his own advantage; and deliberately tells M. Guizot that it would be exceedingly difficult to find anybody but himself capable of filling it. In spite of various efforts made by Comte and his friends on his account, this mode of meeting his difficulties proved a failure. He held sundry public appointments which brought him in about ten thousand francs a year, a sum which, according to his own opinion, was insufficient to his requirements and tastes. The two principal of these appointments were in the Ecole Polytechnique, as *Répétiteur* of the department of Mathematical Science and Mathematical Examiner. On the death of M. Navier, the chair of the subject in which Comte was *Répétiteur*, became vacant, and for two months of the year 1836, he discharged, with great acceptance to his pupils, the duties incumbent upon the Professor. He was not, however, able to secure the much-coveted position, nor do we intend to lead our readers through the tedious recitation of the not unnatural prejudices which the manners, pretensions, and opinions of Comte excited against him in the minds of those who had it in their power to bestow upon him public appointments. Suffice it that he unquestionably had a singular faculty of irritating his friends, who, one after another fell from his side, and he certainly did not obtain more than a very moderate competence. At this period of his life, Comte was decidedly revolutionary in his sympathies, and, as a member of a Committee of the Polytechnic Association, he drew up an address to King Louis Philippe, encouraging the Citizen King in resisting the retrogressive conspiracies of the fallen monarch who had been his predecessor. Notwithstanding this, at the very commencement of the reign of Louis Philippe, Comte refused to make one of the National Guard on the ground of his avowed republicanism, but he was let off with a nominal imprisonment of three days, during which he was not prevented from continuing to give his mathematical lessons. He added to his various occupations the delivery of a course of gratuitous lectures on astronomy, to the working-men of Paris, which he continued to repeat during seventeen consecutive years. He found relief from his abundant scientific labours in music and the Italian Opera, and would sing 'La Marseillaise' with thrilling and revolutionary accent.

It is now necessary to refer to the completion of the sixth volume of the 'Cours de Philosophie Positive' as the preface to

that volume became the origination of a series of petty persecutions, which ended in Comte's expulsion from the Ecole Polytechnique and the eventual loss of all his income. Unfortunately, the offices he held required an annual election, and, therefore, exposed him year by year to the antagonism of those who could not sympathise with his philosophy, and in the said preface he naïvely informs the French nation of the uncomfortable circumstances in which he was placed by this annual election. To these personal details he devotes thirty-seven octavo pages, and the claim that he makes for himself, the publicity that he gives to his own history, the hectoring tone in which he speaks of those who differ from him are, under any circumstances, sufficiently irritating for a stranger to read. We need not then be surprised that his friends and his wife should have protested against his imprudence. Mdme. Comte, M. de Blainville, and Mr. J. S. Mill were alarmed at his folly, but the publisher, M. Bachelier, took special umbrage at some expressions used by Comte with reference to M. Arago, with whom he, M. Bachelier, was on friendly terms. Finding Comte indisposed to take any advice, Bachelier without farther consulting him published in Comte's own volume a repudiation of all complicity with his judgment. Comte in a towering passion brought an action against his publisher, demanded the suppression of the insulting paragraph, and laid his damages at 10,000 francs. This ebullition of anger, like every other incident in his own life, is pompously described by him: thus he writes: 'It only remains for me now to show that my moral energy is on a level with my intellectual vigour, and I felicitate myself that this great action may offer me a brilliant opportunity of appearing in the eyes of all as a more complete man than any of the individuals who have hitherto figured on the revolutionary arena.*' Comte pleaded his own cause, and, amid some laughter occasioned by the lofty and discursive tone of his address, gained his cause, but was allowed no damages beyond costs. The threats with which his celebrated preface and his public pleading resounded, soon produced their natural result, and at the next annual election he met with more violent opposition than ever. Although the prejudices excited against him were virulent and intense, they were not sufficient to obliterate the memory of his eminent and ill-paid services, or to drive him at once from his post. But if the prolonged and angry debates which were occasioned by his re-election, did not at once plunge him into poverty, they left no doubt either on his own mind or on that of his friends, that ultimate dismission from his various

* 'Auguste Comte et la Philosophie Positive.' Par E. Littré, p. 324.

offices in the Ecole Polytechnique was merely a question of time.

He never lost his own comforting sense of unparalleled importance. In the detail of these proceedings he speaks of his 'famous preface' with the utmost complacency, and promised that he would do full justice to all who had stood nobly by him in this passage of arms. The details of these proceedings were not published by himself, but have been given to the world by M. Littré in a series of letters which Comte addressed at the time to Mr. J. S. Mill. The unanimous re-election which had followed the angry storm, was, according to Comte, 'a perfidious concession of his enemies' to the instances of his friends, and only prepared the way for his ultimate rejection by a large majority. When, in May, 1844, it became once more possible to ventilate the subject of his fitness, 'All the passions,' says he, 'described 'in my "preface" have conspired to consummate this "iniquity," 'the nine hostile votes embraced among them an organ of the 'metaphysical party, and even theological animosities were 'formally represented by an *affilié* of the Jesuits.' But though Theology and Metaphysics conspired against him, he candidly attributes the most bitter opposition from which he suffered to the Geometers! who had been incensed, he says, by his treatment of their favourite study. He sat down in the almost delighted conviction that they would never forgive him for having reduced the honours and functions of the mathematician to a subordinate because a merely initial position, in the new philosophy of the sciences. The poor bigoted theologians, the prejudiced metaphysicians, in this first strife with the new *régime*, are verily out-done in animosity and narrow-mindedness by the outraged Geometers. All the diagrams in Euclid may be seen drilling on their uneven points, and approaching the great Iconoclast with threatening mien until he succumbs, not because he blunders between an isosceles and scalene triangle, not because he has failed to discern the difference between an hyperbola and an ellipse, but because he has dethroned diagrams and differential coefficients from the throne of the universe. This is his plaintive self-congratulation. M. Littré echoes the same kind of remonstrance anent his own failure to obtain one of the *fauteuils* of the Academy, charging his failure on his opinions rather than on his demerits; but whatever may be the claims of M. Littré to this coveted honour, it is clear that Comte simply received the punishment which will, at times, overtake any man, however excellent his intellectual parts, when he is decidedly presuming and somewhat disagreeable. On the occurrence of this disaster our philosopher was unfortunately deprived of all

his accustomed means of support. Still his impecuniosity, though it gave him great anxiety, did not abridge his moderate comforts. Generous and distinguished men who revered and highly appreciated his scientific attainments and philosophic originality came to the rescue. Few things are more characteristic of the mental condition of Comte than the mode in which he sought their aid, magnified his peculiar circumstances into an historical fact of great significance, invested himself in a halo of self-consideration, and tried to bring awkward and ill-digested systematizations of the future condition of humanity into harmony with the troublesome deviation from the new *régime* which was involved in the circumstance that neo-philosophers were aiding one another with means, instead of unitedly laying 'the temporal power' under contribution for that worthy purpose. He wrote letters of amazing prolixity, of overwhelming dreariness, and of the magnitude moreover of shilling pamphlets, to Mr. John Stuart Mill, who had been one of the first in this country to appreciate his scientific eminence, and who had generously espoused his cause by interesting wealthy literary friends on his behalf. When a handsome gratuity of 6,000 francs—an equivalent to his yearly income from the offices whence he had been expelled—was placed in his hands, he simply regarded it as the reasonable contribution made by the newly regenerated humanity to the greatest of its living teachers, and it was perfectly consistent with his natural vanity that he should express his indignant surprise, when, at the close of the year, it became manifest that he was not justified in regarding this gift as the first instalment of an annual pension. He is filled with sore amazement at the turpitude of the rich, who are blind to their duties to so great a philosopher. He covers his friends with reproach and insinuation, and threatens them with the melancholy disgrace of being accomplices in the notorious wickedness which had been inflicted upon him. We are not astonished to hear that the correspondence between Messrs. Mill and Comte was here brought to a termination. Our philosopher and his '*Système*' certainly do not appear to advantage by the side of commonplace Christianity.

The domestic distress of Comte is become common property by the publicity given to the matter by the partisans and enemies of the two parties concerned. We cannot refrain from a few words of comment on the cold-blooded manner in which Comte describes the cat-and-dog life which these highly important 'organisms' enjoyed in one another's society. According to his own showing, out of a fit of ungovernable sulkiness resulting from indisposition to receive a word of good

advice from his strong-minded and devoted wife, coupled with a difference of opinion as to domestic expenditure, they mutually agreed to separate, and our philosopher bound himself to supply Madame Comte's necessities to the tune of 3,000 francs per annum. He is certainly to be commended for this; and we should have commended him accordingly, if we did not find his self-consciousness declaring that he made this allowance 'to preserve the generosity of my character and develop the germs of greatness which my organization contains—the most precious portion of my being,' and if he had not coupled it in a letter to Mr. Mill with remarks 'on the value of transforming social embarrassments into pecuniary charges.' Many letters passed between the divided partners until the great change came over himself and his philosophical method, which arose out of his passionate attachment for Madame Clotilde de Vaux. After the premature death of his beloved, he gave Madame Comte an account of his new affection, and how he had declared Madame de Vaux to be his '*eternelle collegue et épouse*,' and was hurt and soured that his patient, absent wife would not lend a willing ear to these confidences. He entertained a certain kind of respect for the intelligence and character of Madame Comte, and on the occasion of her illness secured for her and remunerated first-class medical attention, but when sickness assailed him, and she modestly offered to nurse him, he flew into a passion of indignation and remonstrance, which, of course, settled the matter. The circumstances of his second conjugal attachment were as follows:—Separated from his wife, he happened to meet in the house of a *famille bourgeoise* a young lady, who was suffering from an analogous social misery. Her partner had been condemned for life to the galleys, and this community of mischance created sympathy, which ripened on Comte's part at least into adoring friendship, and a year of chaste and enthusiastic affection. The remarkable dedication to the memory of Clotilde de Vaux prefixed to the '*Système de Politique Positive*,' recounts the circumstances of their extraordinary love passages, which were grievously interrupted by the lady's premature death. M. Comte compared their enthusiasm for one another into a repetition of the noble *amours* of Dante and Beatrice, and having found that a vast proportion of human life had hitherto been unconsidered in the Positive Philosophy, he proceeded to reduce the *affective*, emotive, and moral elements of human organism to careful analysis, and to build upon facts which were revealed to him by his intuition, and which have only a subjective existence; not merely a new theory of human nature in the individual,

but a new construction of the social system of the universe, not merely a supplement to his philosophy, but the basis of a new religion. We are not intending to repeat in these pages the outlines of the miserable reconstruction of society, and the vain substitute for theology and religion which our erratic philosopher proceeded to deliver in oracular tone. We claim credit to have done so in this journal with some fulness twelve years ago.* Mr. Mill has favoured the English public with a most crushing and convincing exposition of its *bizarre* and extravagant pretensions, and pointed out its lamentable defects and inconsistencies. M. Littré, with no less zeal, has brought it face to face with Positive Philosophy, and at the re-appearance of Comte in the theological stage, exulting in his subjective method, he mourns with the sorrow and unction that one might imagine St. Bernard bestowing on Peter Abelard, or Luther on Carlstadt. He moans like a Hindu Brahminee does when she hears of the baptism of her eldest son, and all because poor Comte—as all other positive philosophers must do sooner or later—had found out that generalised phenomena of the objective world are not the whole of this mysterious life, and because by the irrepressible instincts of his heart and the intuitions of his intellectual nature, he was driven to worship, to feel after God, if haply he might find him.

We agree with M. Littré in some of his criticisms, but they go deeper into the whole subject than he appears to be aware of. One thing he has demonstrated, that Mr. Mill is not accurate and hardly candid in trying to establish a lien between Comte's Positivism and Theism; for here we have its most cautious disciple maintaining that 'the laws which man discovers are his only forces, securities, and masters,' and that to dream of any other in any sense is to go back from the high faith of Positivism to some form of the theologic stage. But the great charge that Littré brings against Comte is his complete change of method. The crucial instance chosen is the development of his entire social reconstruction from the cerebral theory of Gall, which he first accepts and then modifies by a purely subjective process. We have always felt the obvious presence of an unacknowledged subjective element in Comte's original acceptance of the intimate connection between functions of particular portions of the brain and specific mental faculties, which in his 'Cours de Philosophie,' he avowed on subjective grounds to be true, and left to the physiologist to demonstrate. But the physiologist has been unable to demonstrate anything but its incompatibility with

* 'British Quarterly Review,' April, 1854, Art. i.; and April, 1855, Art. iii.

facts, and here in the very nexus and nodus of his entire system, Comte was resting on a disproved and now discarded hypothesis. To make matters worse for a Positivist, he proceeded to modify still further this cerebral theory without any of the rational processes of verification, and to produce a system of the relations of men to men, their duties and religion on this fundamental conception acquired not in the method of induction or deduction, but by the intuitions of his imagination and love.

Comte insists on the danger of the insurrection of the reason against the heart, now that he has come by a supposed philosophical process to a demonstration of the superiority of the heart to the intellect, and though his philosophy has been one of the chief signs of such modern insurrection, now, says he, since the true faith is *demonstrated* and the *grand-être* created, there is no longer any necessity for such insurrection, and it must succumb to the power of the *heart*, expressed and embodied in the feminine influence, and the *nouveau sacerdoce*. Now, as Littré candidly admits, the old subordination of the intellect to the dogmas of revealed religion is far more rational than this. The contrast between the deference our intellect should pay to the Lord and Giver of life, to Him who is the Truth, and the Love, and the Eternal Life, and the submission claimed from the intellect of the 19th century to the Pontiff of the new religion, and to the memory of some French girls, however excellent their wit, their perfumes, their power of entralling an austere Merlin in their toils, is almost too offensive to state in words. This insurrection of the reason against the heart and against the '*ensemble des antécédents humains*' which Comte bewailed so pathetically, would, if he had lived a few years, have driven him back into the arms of the Romish Church, towards which his unbounded admiration of her great men, his Celtic blood, his love of system, order, and dogma, his mystical tendencies, which were for a while held in abeyance, were ever attracting him. The predictions uttered in this journal as to the mystic and mythologic course which the religion of humanity would unquestionably itinerate, if it were ever allowed full or free scope for its development, were rapidly fulfilled by the distinguished author of the '*Système de Politique Positive*.' The worship which he paid to the memory of his beloved Clotilde, the reverence for her memory which he enjoined on devout Positivists, and the dignity he vouchsafed to confer on the well-meaning people who watched with filial kindness over his latest days, were only the germs of the new paganism for which he prepared the way. In the latest of his works, '*La Synthèse Subjective*,' he endowed '*the world*' and the

other planets with a species of intelligence, and the faculty of feeling and acting. Their movements and their successive changes were accounted for, or, at least, conceived by him as the manifestation of a blind but reasonable will. He virtually fell back on the world-soul of the ancients, as the highest expression of his Positivism, and called *the earth* LA GRAND FETICHE, as he had called *humanity* LE GRAND ETRE. He actually gave the name of *destiny* to the laws immanent in the Cosmos, assigning *infinite space* as their dwelling place, and to this conception he gave the name LE GRAND MILIEU. In this threefold conception of the 'infinite space,' 'the great Fetich,' and 'the great Being,' he saw the Trinity of the Future, and the object of all human reverence and thought. The creation of a new Trinity was only paralleled by his speculation on the possibility of 'virgin-maternity,' and the high place to be thus given to the perfect embodiment of his '*vieure pour autrui*' in the good time coming. According to Littré, Comte, in his closing days, even admitted the necessity of which the human mind is conscious, for *wills* intervening in the affairs of the world. 'If this is true,' says Littré, 'the human spirit is 'necessarily theological, and the "theological," not the positive 'stage, is therefore its normal condition, and he urges that 'there would be as much folly in contending against this 'necessity as against any other organic necessities; but if so, 'says he, no more fatal blow has ever been struck at the 'Positive Philosophy.' We accept the lesson which we believe the divine and loving providence of God was teaching Comte, and confess with Littré that no heavier or more successful blow was ever aimed against the sufficiency of the Positive Philosophy.

In the year 1848 our philosopher was intoxicated with delight at the general confusion, at the overthrow of established governments, and reconstitution of society, for he discerned the dawn of the era, when his '*foi démontrée*' and his '*nouveau sacerdoce*' might possibly be established in France. It was then that the Positivist Society or Church was founded to guide the conduct of human affairs, to be a beacon light for the storm-tost bark of the Provisional Government, and to reveal to the bewildered eyes of men, the form of the august Pontiff of Humanity. Dr. Robinet gives great space to details of the formation of this *coterie*, and clearly regards its proceedings as grave historical facts. Three *rapports* were presented by enlightened members of the Society on the subject of 'labour,' 'revolutionary government,' and 'Positive education,' and it is somewhat edifying to observe that it is seriously proposed in these historical

documents that a *triumvirate* from the working classes should be endowed with all the executive powers of the state, that the duties of Parliament should be restricted merely to the voting of the supplies.

The most conspicuous of the efforts of M. Comte were the gratuitous courses of lectures delivered by him on the general history of humanity in the years 1849, 1850, 1851. These were never published. The programme of the course reveals, we freely admit, the wonderful range of his vision, and the pomp of his arrangement, together with his morbid love of systematization, and the craze of his later speculations. He ran over the whole of history, science, and philosophy, from his peculiar standpoints, and would often engross the attention of his audience from three to four hours in one of his comprehensive *aperçus* or *sommaires*. The lectures were first delivered at the Palais Royal, but the subject matter of the latest lectures of the course was distasteful to the Ministre de l'Interieur, and the lecturer was for a while deprived of the room. For one year more, through the adroit management of Madame Comte, who was often one of his auditors, the opportunity was again granted to him, but after the occurrence of the *coup d'état* in 1851, it was finally withdrawn.

M. Littré for three years conducted all the correspondence requisite to provide Comte with a moderate income from the contributions of generous friends; but, in consequence of some disagreement resulting from Littré's presuming to give his master unpalatable advice, Comte took the entire collection of the funds into his own hands, and gave it the grand name, 'subsidié positiviste.' With business tact and clever manipulation, a small sum was produced year by year sufficient for his moderate wants, and for the preservation of the holy place which he had consecrated to the worship of Madame de Vaux, and hallowed by therein developing the sacraments and glory of the New Religion. At length the philosophic visionary drew near his end, and after long battling with malignant disease of the stomach, he died, amid the odours of positivist sanctity, on 5th September, 1857. He was still busy with grand schemes, and was completing his systematization of *positive* ethics, when he was taken from his admiring disciples. The affection he inspired in the bosom of a few who remained faithful to the last, and the great kindness he experienced from the members of the family who had watched over him, the solemn interest he took in their future welfare, his obvious self-repression and denial of the flesh, his devout and constant reading of the *De Imitatione Christi*, his wild and impracticable

schemes for the re-construction of human society and the regeneration of mankind, his unbounded confidence in himself, and in a consistency which every one beyond his immediate circle disputed; ~~the strange Will~~ he made, bequeathing to thirteen executors his debts, his books, and the distribution of the permanent positivist subscription, to his separated wife and excellent *bonne*; the enjoined preservation of the *holy place*, consecrated to his love and the birth of the New Religion; the air of glamour and mystery thrown around him by his followers; the poverty and the battling with disease avail to throw around these closing days a tragic interest which we cannot contrive to feel in him until we see him treading the last sad tottering steps on the verge of objective annihilation and subjective immortality, yielding up his organism to 'La Grande Fetiche,' in sure hope of eternal remembrance by 'Le Grande Etre.' We willingly throw a veil over the transactions which followed his death, and on which such exceedingly discordant judgments are pronounced by those who are our only informants. It is clear that neither Dr. Robinet nor M. Littré can be implicitly relied on, in the estimate they form of the dispute between the thirteen executors of M. Comte and Madame Comte. We presume that the facts are correct, that the will of Comte was legally annulled by the courts of law, in consequence of the refusal of his widow to recognise the principle on which she was mentioned in it, and that the wishes of their master, rather than a legal instrument, guided the executors in their subsequent conduct. The widow refused to accept the pension which they were willing to supply from the *subsidiary positivist*, on the terms of the bequest, and it is not surprising that M. Littré's appeal to the public for her independent support did not meet with much acceptance. Both parties claim the honour of having paid the master's debts. The efforts of the Positivist Church to continue their organization, and the sublime claims that they arrogate, are scarcely worthy of further comment. Trading on the reputation of a great name, they may succeed for a while in being slightly amusing, but there is inherent weakness in their entire position. The philosophy and religion which they have baptized with a common name, are at war with one another. The philosophy of the religion is different in its method from the philosophy of the sciences, and is built on the radical defects and provisional character of that which had claimed to be sufficient, comprehensive, and exhaustive. Instead of meeting the invariability of the succession of natural phenomena with the possibility and probability of their modification under certain circumstances, when the Supreme Mind and Will, of

which they are the expression, has been concerned to reveal more of Himself to weak and ignorant mortals, than such invariable sequences could do, they have met these invariabilities, and this empire of sequence, with the unproved hypotheses of an intuitional physiology, with the subjectively discovered laws of human mind, with the metaphysical conception or fiction of *La Grande Feliche*, and *Le Grand Etre*, with the *ipse dixit* of moral philosophers who are now in the end of the world able in the exercise of their intuitional consciousness to determine oracularly the limits of the right and good, and with a system of observances, rites, and so-called worship, based on the recommendations of one who is, in their theory, an annihilated man. There is nothing either to hope or fear from these speculations or reveries. Acute and comprehensive generalizations have been made by Comte, even in his latest works; shrewd and penetrating glances were thrown by him on human affairs; but he has made, or shown, a breach in the rampart through which the entire army of metaphysico-theological conceptions may re-enter the closed citadel of the human spirit, and his career signally illustrates the hopelessness of philosophy to meet the needs and satisfy the yearnings of humanity. Victor Cousin's dictum concerning the cycle through which systems and methods of philosophy pass, is again confirmed. The scepticism which is the heir of the sensationalism and idealism of earlier systems, has once more led, as on many previous occasions, to a clearly-pronounced mysticism. It is not unjust to say that the most extreme form and thorough-going expression which scepticism has ever assumed, has ended in the elaboration of a system of subjective inspirations, infallible and personal authorities, in a cabalistic and fanciful ceremonial, in prophetic dreams, and mythologic fictions.*

Nevertheless, although Comte has thus, in his own person, conspicuously proved the absolute need of a Divine Revelation to man, we admit that the number of those who are influenced by his later speculations, or who will join the positivist society, and advocate the religion of *Le Grand Etre* humanity, is small in comparison with the number of those scientific explorers who partially, yet practically, accept the teaching of the positive philosophy in certain departments of thought and inquiry; who are content with the laws of sequence, who are striving to find them in the regions of human will and history as well as

* Even M. Littré himself admits, in passing, the intuitional basis and origin of the mathematic axioms (p. 532). This flaw in the Positive Philosophy of its most distinguished advocate will disgust Mr. J. S. Mill, who must clearly have bestowed on him labour in vain.

in natural phenomena; who are glorying in their supposed triumph over religious belief and theological dogma; who think that they can take the co-ordinates of all spiritual things, and thenceforward ~~confine their attention~~ to the world and time; who press a utilitarian theory of morals, while ignoring all true metaphysic, and whose whole philosophy seeks to establish itself in entire independence of the will of God or the will of man. In our belief the only reason why these distinguished men have not rushed, like Comte, into the depths of some new-fangled mysticism is, that he has been more comprehensive than the majority of them can be. As long as the attention of such thinkers is absorbed with a few grand classes of phenomena, they do not see the tendencies of their own reiterations. The departments of thought and fact, which they provisionally leave to the investigation of others, re-act imperceptibly upon their consciousness, give scope to the play of their higher faculties, and provide some of the feeble stimulus which their religious nature needs; but let them attempt to go round the circle of human thought and close it up, let them scientifically shut out the Infinite Personal God from their universe, let them dogmatically repudiate all dogma, and find in some great crisis of their life that they are possessed of heart and conscience as well as intellect, that they have an imagination as well as an understanding, let them quell the promptings of their own intuitional nature, and hush the voice that speaks from heaven, then will assuredly come the hour of their travail, and the disintegration of their philosophy. After an amazing panegyric on his master, M. Littré says, in a tone of deep melancholy, that 'the disciples of Comte are placed in the dilemma of rejecting the principles in the name of the consequences, or rejecting the consequences in the name of the principles of the Positive Philosophy. The adversaries of positivism,' says he, 'will take the former course with joy and triumph, and its adherents the latter with deep grief.' We candidly acknowledge some feelings of triumph as we reject, in the name of these consequences, the all-inclusive sufficiency of the Positive Philosophy to meet the needs of our being; but our triumph is swallowed up in a still deeper grief, that so many learned and thoughtful men should accept such a substitute for the religion and worship, the ideal, and claims of the Lord Jesus Christ, as is offered in this melancholy parody of His Perfect Life, His Holy Word, and the Church which He has purchased with His precious blood.

ART. IV.—(1.) *History of New England.* By JOHN GORHAM PALFREY. 2 vols. Boston.

(2.) *The Ecclesiastical History of New England.* By JOSEPH FELT. Vol. I. Boston.

(3.) *Congregationalism: What it is; Whence it is; How it Works.* By HENRY M. DEXTER. 8vo. Boston.

(4.) *Official Record of the National Congregational Council held at Boston, Mass., June 14—24, A.D. 1865.* Boston.

SOME men wish us to believe that the highest worship possible to man is the worship of humanity. His God, even in his best estate, is said to be himself by reflection—his own nature projected as an object of the imagination. But this is a low pantheistic dream. It would be nearer the truth to say, that according to the laws of thought, where the mind is fairly cultivated, man cannot avoid having an object of worship *above* himself—immeasurably so. It is true, our primary conceptions of natural and moral intelligence come from what we find within ourselves. But it is no less true, that the idea of the limited must necessarily suggest the idea of the unlimited, the idea of the imperfect the idea of the perfect. In this manner it is inevitable, that the Eternal, the Immense, the All-perfect, should be an object of thought; and the presumption surely is strong, that our conception of such a nature being thus a necessity, the object of the conception must be a reality. Good men have no doubt on this matter. They believe in the existence of this glorious Being, and when they learn to regard Him as expecting obedience and trust from them, and as extending His constant and tender care over them, they pass into a new region of existence: a breath like spring comes upon the soul, unlocking its hidden forces, diffusing over it a world of new beauties and filling it with new joys. There is no sense of life like that sense of it; no gladness like that gladness.

This new consciousness and new aspiration once possessed, is regarded by the wise as a gift from the hand of the Infinite, with which no lower hand must be allowed to intermeddle. Compared with the High and Lofty One from whom these influences have come, the potentates of the earth are shadows and vanity, and to Him accordingly supreme homage must be rendered. In the eye of conscience, the power that would interdict such a service, is not only the foe of conscience, but the foe of the Being to whom the conscience should tend its fitting allegiance. Two qualities are inseparable from life wherever you find it—a craving for its proper nutriment, and

the tendency to propagate itself. It must have its atmosphere of spiritual influences, which means religious association; and it must be allowed to extend the sphere of those influences so as to bring others within the circle of their power. With such minds, it is imperative that they should be spiritual, and grow through the influence of their spiritual relationships; and it is hardly less imperative that they should become the creators of the spiritual in others. Here, as elsewhere, the love of offspring is a deeply-seated passion. Here, as elsewhere, the tendency is to multiply some thirty, some sixty, some a hundred fold. Unspiritual men do not comprehend this. It is a region of experiences hidden from them; but it is not the less real on that account.

It is thus that religion has come to be so grave, so grand, and so potent an element in the history of the world. Hence the antagonism which has grown up so often between conscience as thus religious and enlightened, and the law-makers and law-administrators of this world who have not known what it is to possess hearts thus moved and consciences thus governed. Men believing themselves to be thus divinely influenced, have dared to say, could not but say—We are prepared to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, that is, all civil obedience; but we must be left to render to God the things that are God's; that is, all spiritual submission. Their secular relation to the delegated powers of earth, has not been more a fact, in their apprehension, than their spiritual relation to the Supreme Power in heaven; and when the power which has been delegated has presumed to intrench upon the province of the Power to which it has owed its delegation, the question has arisen, 'Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.'

As might have been expected, the men who were the first to claim this liberty for the human conscience were holy men of the Hebrew race. Among that race the voice of the prophet often rose in protest against the impieties of the king. Nor were such instances of resistance confined to men specially inspired, as were Elijah and Daniel. We meet with confessors of this order among men who based their conduct on the ground common to good men everywhere. 'Nebuchadnezzar spoke and said unto them, Is it true, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, do you not serve my gods, nor worship the golden image I have set up? Now, if ye be ready, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the image which I have set up, well; but if ye worship not,

'ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a fiery furnace: 'and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands? 'Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego answered and said to the 'king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee 'in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to 'deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver 'us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto 'thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the 'golden image which thou hast set up.' (Dan. iii. 14—18.) So the divine right of a king was to be resisted in the name of the King of kings. The conscience of the magistrate was not to become law to the private conscience in regard to religious duty. The three Hebrews had acquitted themselves faithfully in the civil 'affairs of the provinces,' which it seems had been entrusted to them; but religion was another sphere of duty, in which another authority was to be acknowledged as exclusive and supreme.

It was thus also with the first Christians. On this plea they separated themselves from established Judaism. On this plea they became to the Roman emperors what the three Hebrew confessors had been to the king of Babylon. They taught doctrines in the Hebrew synagogues which were new to them. They would not present an offering of any kind to the image which the Cæsars had set up. To refuse was to be branded as traitors, and to be liable to the penalties of treason. Still they refused. At intervals, during three centuries, their steadfastness in the avowal of this principle was put to the severest test, and was not found wanting. To the last, their maxim is, that in matters concerning religious life, they must obey God rather than man. They knew that it became them to be humble, and to seek light from every available source, but the ultimate decision as to what was, or was not, religious duty, was to be the decision of their own conscience.

With the reign of Constantine came an end to the times of persecution. Communities which had resisted state authority when exercised in the support of idolatry, appear to have submitted to it, even in matters of religion, only too readily, when it avowed itself the friend of Christianity. By this time, the spiritual life which had characterised the early church had in a great measure passed away. For some time, too, the action of the civil power in relation to ecclesiastical affairs was limited and cautious, and few seemed capable of suspecting how naturally this secular influence would grow so as to overshadow and deteriorate everything religious. When evils from this source began to appear, it was seen that good had come along with

them, and men were willing to believe that in this new and mixed order of things the good would be found to outweigh the evil. So change crept on, until the church which had been for centuries independent of the state, became not only closely allied with it, but in great part subject to it. Even during the middle age, however, there were at times signs of life breaking through the secular and ecclesiastical restraints which had been laid on all tendencies towards free thought and free action. The religious orders, praying monks and preaching friars, in their early history at least, were more or less appearances of this description. They rose, for the most part, as protests against the prevailing formality and worldliness.

But the Reformation of the sixteenth century was the grand reaction of this nature. Even the Reformation, however, was not a reaction against the alliance of religion with the state. It was a reaction against the subjection of conscience to the church. Men had to learn by degrees that the substitution of an Erastian in the place of a Papal supremacy might be no great gain. The churches of the Reformation cast off many of the dogmas and usages of the Papal church, but everywhere they became, to a large extent, the churches of the magistrate. The civil power had come into the place of the ecclesiastical.

The great change needed was, that the newly-constituted churches should have become independent, not only of the triple crown, but of every other crown. But this would have been to unlearn what had been the taught and accepted lesson of the church for more than a thousand years; and vast communities learn their new lessons slowly, especially when it is seen that they are lessons which may bring with them a serious loss of position and emolument.

Hence even the English Puritans, whose constant cry was for a further reformation—a *purser* church, were far from seeking their object in this direction. They had not a very favourable opinion either of the piety or of the morality of courts and cabinets, still the spiritual religion they wished to see established was expected to come from that source. The Papist sought his papal establishment, the Anglican his Anglican establishment, and the Puritan his Puritan establishment, the idea that the natural and best establishment of Christianity is that realized by its own spiritual power, had no place in the mind of any of those parties.

The story of the struggle between the court clergy and the Puritan clergy during the long reign of Elizabeth, is in many respects not a little painful and humiliating. The spirit in which ecclesiastical affairs were managed by the Queen, and by

her two favourite instruments—Archbishop Parker and Archbishop Whitgift—is often as much wanting in wisdom as in humanity; and we need all the signs of conscientiousness, and all that is scriptural in their theology, to give the Puritans a place in our sympathy, while dwelling with such iteration on small grievances, and feeling their way but so slowly in the direction of great principles. Could they have had the power of the magistrate at their disposal, they would have become towards all separatists and sects, very much what the court clergy had become towards themselves. Even such a man as Cartwright, the man most representative of the Puritanism in that age, declared that separatists could have no ministry, no sacraments, no church element among them!

The maxim of the court party soon came to be—No surrender. The Puritans, on the other hand, never ceased to pray for concession, and to manifest discontent with things as they were. To depict this warfare to the full, as it was exhibited in parliaments and convocations, in the universities and in the court, and in town and parish over the greater part of the kingdom, entailing as it did on multitudes of well-meaning men suspension, poverty, imprisonment, and sometimes death, would require the space of many volumes. But the subject has so lost its interest for modern thought, that no mind at all competent to the production of such a work is likely to undertake it. At every point the Puritan was made to feel what must always happen when the world is allowed to legislate for the church. But it mattered not. His conventional soul, like some souls among ourselves, could not learn the lesson which events were thus forcing upon his attention, but went on dreaming that if there was to be a church at all it must be a state church. That the Puritans should have invoked the sword of the magistrate against Romanism, we can understand, inasmuch as Romanism was not so much a religion as a vast political organization, charged to the utmost with treason against England. But there is too much reason for believing that Puritan intolerance would have been stretched far beyond that limit.

By degrees men made their appearance who had become weary of this hopeless antagonism between Prelate and Puritan. In the judgment of these men, if the Puritan had the advantage of his opponent as a theologian, he was equally at fault as a statesman. Neither party, with their principles, could be at rest among themselves, or at rest in relation to other communities. It began accordingly to be seen, that to religious peace, it was indispensable that religion should be politically powerless. The only end possible to persecution, was to ensure that religion-

ists should not have the power to persecute. Some good men now remembered that the first churches were clearly voluntary, and purely moral or spiritual organizations, formed without any tarrying for warrant from the magistrate, without the thought of looking for any such sanction. From the days of Wycliffe and the Lollards, England had never been without its secret gatherings of pious minds, seeking nurture for their religious life in such secret religious fellowships as were possible to them. In the time of Henry VIII. many of these 'known men' as they were called—men who were marked by peculiarities which would be sure to distinguish them—were seized, imprisoned, and even put to death. London was not without such associations even in the days of Queen Mary. The accession of Elizabeth gave new hope to such persons. Their assemblies became more numerous, and they grew to be less cautious in their proceedings. It was not, however, until some ten years after Elizabeth became queen, that any one of these associations ventured to take upon itself the form of a separate church.

The first instance of this kind appears to have been in the case of the church originated in London not later than 1570, under the pastoral oversight of Richard Fitz. Ainsworth and Robinson, names so honourably connected with the history of churches of this order at a later date, both make mention of this London church, and of Fitz as its pastor. It was, in their view, a church based on the principle now known as distinctive of Independency or Congregationalism. Some years later, Bury St. Edmunds became the scene of great excitement from the labours of the notorious Robert Brown, who, for a while, avowed his attachment to the widest principles of religious liberty. In Gainsborough, in Yorkshire, and especially in Southwark, self-governed churches were formed, based on those principles.

But the most memorable of all the associations of this description was that at Scrooby in Nottinghamshire. The manor-house at Scrooby had been in past times the occasional residence of the Archbishops of York, but at the time now under consideration it had become a great posting house, on one of the main lines of road between the south of England and Scotland. The postmaster bore the name of William Brewster. He was a man of education and of some means. He had been confidential secretary to Davison, Secretary of State to Queen Elizabeth, and his office at Scrooby was a government appointment. He was, moreover, a devout Puritan, and by inducing pious ministers to preach frequently in the neighbouring churches, he had succeeded in awakening a strong religious

feeling in the district. The people, as usual, becoming earnest Christians, were not content with the public services in the parish churches, but often met privately for prayer and Christian edification. Brewster placed the manor-house at their service for this purpose. Having lost all hope of seeing any satisfactory change in ecclesiastical affairs, the manor-house congregation became a separatist church, and the wise and holy John Robinson, a clergyman who had resigned his connection with the Establishment, became their pastor. After a while these proceedings attracted much attention. Persecution grew hot; and the obnoxious sectaries were menaced with much greater hostility. Fully aware of their danger, pastor and flock resolved to leave Scrooby, and to migrate to Holland to seek in that country the liberty which was denied them in their own. With much difficulty they succeeded in reaching their new home, and it was this English church in Holland which, some few years later, sent forth from their midst the Pilgrims of the Mayflower—the small band of men from whom the United States were in fact to receive, not only their Congregationalism, but their civil constitution.

Pitiless were the persecutions to which religionists of this class were exposed during what have sometimes been called 'the golden days of good Queen Bess.' The course taken towards them was just that taken by the Roman emperors towards the primitive Christians. They were loyal to the Queen—romantically so—considered in her civil capacity. But to the authority exercised by her in religious matters they could not submit. Inasmuch, however, as her ecclesiastical pretensions were based on the laws of the realm, quite as much as her civil pretensions, to deny her right to rule in the church was sedition or treason, quite as much as to deny her right to rule in the state. Copping and Thacker, two ministers at Bury St. Edmunds, were hanged on this plea; and Barrow and Greenwood, two offenders of the same class in London, were hung under the same charge at Tyburn. Scores were torn from their families, and doomed to pass long years in the miserable prisons of those days, not a few dying under their sufferings, petitioning for liberty almost day by day, but petitioning in vain.

It is true, the men subjected to these tortures, or menaced with them, sometimes became strong, even scurrilous, in denouncing the conduct of their opponents. The Martin Marprelate tracts were such productions as nothing short of the merciless conduct pursued by the ruling clergy could have provoked. The writer of those pieces discharged his scorn,

his satire, his wit, his ridicule, and his withering invective, without stint or weariness, in the hope of moving the contempt or execration of the public feeling against the objects of his assault. But to this day no man knows who Martin Marprelate was. No plausible conjecture on that point has come down to us. Martin Marprelate and Junius were alike samples of the bad influence which bad times never fail to call forth. The language, indeed, even of more sober men, was sometimes far from being in keeping with our notions of sobriety. In this respect there were cases in which both Puritan and Separatist must be confessed to have been at fault. One prelate complained much of this severity of speech. Cartwright replied, 'Your lordship can strike home with the edge of the sword, is it hard that you should be sometimes made to feel its weight as wielded by those who have not the edge of it at their disposal?' Truly the weapons of the weak were harmless compared with those which the strong could bring into play against them. The sufferers, moreover, for the greater part, were as subdued in speech as they were inoffensive in conduct.

Great, too, as may be the praise that is due to those English Congregationalists who were the first in modern Europe to avow that polity, it becomes us to guard against attributing to them an amount of far-reaching thought, which, for the greater part, they can hardly be supposed to have possessed. So far as the majority of them were concerned, their conceptions on this subject seem to have been very limited, and almost instinctive. Their philosophy of church liberty may be said to have been embraced in two ideas—liberty to judge for themselves as to what Christianity really is, and liberty to act for themselves in seeking good from it to their own minds, or in endeavouring to communicate good through its means to the minds of others. Freedom to embrace the Gospel honestly, and to guard and diffuse it earnestly and wisely, was the freedom of which they *felt* the need, and the freedom accordingly which they claimed and sought.

But simple as these conceptions may be, they comprehend all the free principles which the most elaborate and philosophical reasoning has often been employed to develop and establish in later times. They preclude all control of conscience from without, whether coming from pope or potentate, from hierarchies or synods, and they require men to leave to others the liberty they claim for themselves. These two ideas are the natural outcome of the intelligence and feeling that may be affirmed to be native to the human mind. They give us the spirit of the grand commandment—'Whatsoever ye would that others should

‘do unto you do ye even so to them.’ They embody the old English maxim—live and let live. And who shall estimate the reforming power for the world that will some day be found to have lain buried in those brief utterances? It was the heart of the simple men and women constituting the church in Scrooby, more than their heads, that made them what they were. But their feeling was to be prophetic, full of the seeds of things, which they would themselves learn more to comprehend from years and experience, and which minds of the most advanced intelligence would learn in time to appreciate. It is pleasant and instructive to be able to trace thus, the unconscious greatness which may have its home in humanity, even in the humblest of its children. There is One who never fails to see the beauty that may lie in such budding thoughts and sympathies, while heeding little the haughty pretensions of the ‘wise and prudent.’

The leaders in this movement, such as Robinson, Brewster, and Bradford, knew what they did. *They* saw how their principles tended to displace the received principles of Christendom on ecclesiastical matters. *They* could picture to themselves the new world that would make its appearance if such principles should once become prevalent; and, believing these principles to be of God, they could believe that such a day would come. In this hope they were prepared, not only to avow their attachment to such principles of free thought and free action, but to suffer in the cause of such maxims on any scale that might be found to be the will of Providence.

It was the hope of being able to give to these principles, so little favoured in the Old World, a settled home in the New, that prompted the Pilgrims of the Mayflower to their enterprise. But the experiment to which they committed themselves was difficult and hazardous on many grounds. Hitherto, their protest had been against allowing the State to legislate for the Church. In their view, churches should owe their origin to individual conviction, not to the action of secular law. But now they were about to give existence to a settlement in which both Church and State would be in their own hands. They have provided for their own spiritual government: they have now to provide for their own secular government, and they have to determine what the exact relation of the two powers should be to each other. Other colonists had become such mainly for commercial purposes. Religion, in their case, awakened no great concern. But in this case the adventure comes from religious motives, and the religious object is the great solicitude. It is true they were a chartered body, but that arrangement, while it was accepted as giving them title to the soil, left them

to create their own magistrates, to enact their own laws, and to act with a similar freedom in their ecclesiastical affairs. In fact, from the character of the men, and the object of the enterprise, the movement had become unique. The history of society had not seen anything like it. What marvel if, as a first experiment of its kind, it should not be found to have shaped itself at once into consistency and perfection in all its parts? Robinson, the pastor of this people, has given us sufficient information, as the following extract will show, as to their views concerning church organization:—

Ques. What is a church?

Ans. A company of faithful and holy people (with their seed), called by the Word of God into public covenant with Christ, and among themselves, for mutual fellowship in the use of all the means of God's glory and their salvation.

Ques. What are the essential marks of the church?

Ans. Faith and order, as the church in them may be seen and may be held to walk in Christ Jesus, whom she hath received. Faith professed in word and deed, showing the matter to be true; and order in the holy things of God, showing the form to be true; which are the two essential parts of the church.

Ques. How many are the offices of ministry in the church?

Ans. Five, besides the extraordinary offices of apostles, prophets, and evangelists, for the planting of the churches, which are ceased with their extraordinary gifts.

Ques. Show me what these officers be, with their answerable gifts and works.

Ans. The pastor, to whom is given the gift of wisdom for exhortation. The teacher, to whom is given the gift of knowledge for doctrine. The governing elder, who is to rule with diligence. The deacon, who is to administer the holy treasure with simplicity. The widow, or deaconness, who is to attend the sick and impotent, with compassion and cheerfulness.

Ques. By whom are these officers to have their outward calling?

Ans. By the church, whereof they are members for the present, and in which they are to administer.

Ques. What if the officer be found unfaithful in his place?

Ans. He is by the church to be warned to take heed to the ministry he hath received, to fulfil it, which, if he neglect to do, by the same power which set him up he is to be put down and deposed.*

Robinson further taught, that any competent number of Christians desiring to be formed into a church may be so formed; that no church has a right to control another, or to interfere with it, except in the way of advice; that church

* *Appendix to the Six Christian Principles* of Rev. W. Perkins.

officers, when chosen by the brethren, should be ordained by the elders of the church, when practicable; that marriage should not be regarded as a sacrament, but should be performed by the magistrate; that there should be no holy days except the sabbath, and appointed days of fasting or thanksgiving; that intelligent brethren may prophesy, or give religious addresses to the congregation, with the consent of the elders.

These are the principles which were to be harmonised with the altered state of things in the New World. In New Plymouth—the colony of the Pilgrims—and in the colony founded a little later at New-Haven, persons became freemen only by the suffrage of those who were already freemen; and as the original freemen were all persons of religious character, chosen that they might be eminently the guardians of religious interests, only men of that character would be allowed to share in the privilege and responsibilities of the franchise. In the State of Massachusetts, of which Boston soon became the centre, the franchise was restricted to men who were formally church members, and was forfeited by those who ceased to be such. The consequence of these arrangements was, that within less than twenty years, the government of all these colonies passed into the hands of a minority of the male members in each State, of a minority that does not seem to have numbered more than about one-third of the whole. Only by such means, it was presumed, could the religious objects contemplated by the early colonists be preserved, and this course was accordingly taken. By that time the population of Plymouth had grown to about 3,000, that of Massachusetts had risen to 15,000, that of New-Haven numbered 2,500.

It will be seen at a glance that nothing could be more intimate than the blending of the civil with the ecclesiastical interests of the community which was determined by the above arrangement. Every man who would go to the polling booth or the ballot-box, must go by the way of the communion-table. If he would win suffrage at the hustings, he must first gain it at the church meeting. In accordance with this type of legislation, was the law which compelled attendance on public worship; and another which prohibited the originating of any new church without the consent of the magistrates and the existing churches of the district. As the churches virtually gave the franchise, it was expedient that they should be under some such oversight.

The maintenance of the ministry was at first by voluntary contributions, made after the public service on the Lord's day. But this primitive usage was soon superseded by a tax for that purpose. The people of Boston retained the voluntary custom

longer than any other community. The landing at New Plymouth was in 1620. Twenty years later the ministers of New England had come to be a little above eighty in number, which was about a minister to every three hundred of the population. More than half these men had been graduates of Oxford or Cambridge. The majority came from Cambridge, that seat of so much bold Puritanism in the days of Elizabeth. They were most of them men whose convictions were sincere and thorough, who had been familiar with danger and suffering in the mother country, and who were prepared to endure much, or to dare much, if need be, in their new home. Some of them were men of property, and by descent or marriage were well connected. Careful provision was made, as early as possible, for the education of the young, and for the encouragement of sound learning. Neither ignorance nor idleness were to be tolerated. The law was constructed so as to leave no place for either. Harvard College, now a university, dates from this time.

Nothing could be more easy than to charge the New England Congregationalists with inconsistency in adopting the semi-church and state policy above described. But several considerations deserve attention here. First, while the voyagers in the Mayflower declared their attachment to the principles now known as Congregational, the stream of emigrants who followed in their track during the next twenty years were, for the most part, simply Puritans, who had not advanced so far in their views of church polity, though they before long gave in their adhesion to the Congregational system with surprising unanimity, and learnt to defend it resolutely. Second, these people migrated as churches, or as religious persons whose great object in seeking a new country was that they might there form themselves into churches. So that in this case, all that would create the state was in the church. If there was to be a state at all, it was unavoidable that the church, or what was virtually the church, should give it existence. Third, there were pious men in those days who were pleased to dwell in imagination on the picture of a nation so religious in its character that all the old causes for jealousy in the relations between things civil and things religious would cease, the church and the state consisting of the same persons, baptized into the same spirit. This, in their conception, was the reign of the saints, said to be so clearly set forth in prophecy; and America, they were willing to believe, was destined to realize this vision. Fourth, the object of these voluntary exiles in seeking a home in the wilderness, was, that they might secure to themselves an enclosure within which to enjoy religious liberty, according to their views

of such liberty. To this end it was felt to be necessary, at least through the early and feeble stage of their history, that their settlements should not be exposed to the propagation of all sorts of opinion, which must soon convert the asylum in which they had sought quiet and freedom into an arena of strife and confusion. Every man's fireside is sacred. No man should presume to take his place there unbidden. The colony was all this to the colonists. It had been created by their joint action, and at much cost, and they had a right to determine the conditions on which the stranger should be admitted to its privileges. But this guardianship supposes the presence of force, and the action of force, if it is to secure religious interests, needs to be in religious hands. Thus the circumstances of those New England settlers were special. Ordinary rules did not apply to them. To have attempted the application of such rules would have been suicidal. The salvation of the state is the supreme law. The calm and sagacious Robinson had foreseen all this, and the course taken was substantially the course he had advised.

But to carry out a scheme of this novel description would be difficult. The choice, however, was, between the trouble of resisting innovators, or seeing themselves outnumbered by such new-comers, and their grand object a failure. Even the settlers at New Plymouth had their firmness tried in this way. New arrivals of emigrants soon came to that colony, many of whom were far from having the Pilgrim Father spirit in them. Among the persons of this description was one Lyford, a minister, and a man named Oldham, who with others had obtained permission to sail for New Plymouth, mainly from the merchant company in London, which still had a kind of charge of the settlement. These men, especially Lyford and Oldham, plotted to raise a faction in the colony, and would have changed the face of everything. But they were among men who were not likely to be inobservant of their conduct. Their treachery was detected, and they were expelled with a strong hand. Lyford proved to be a despicable creature. Oldham was a rash man, intent upon change.

But it was in Boston that this 'New England way' of government, as it was called, was brought to the severest test. So early as 1630, some half dozen persons had been apprised that their discourse and conduct were not satisfactory to the community—a community that had erected its own home, and who must be allowed to choose its own inmates. The obnoxious persons submitted to this decision and withdrew. But it was otherwise with Roger Williams, in 1631. Williams was a Welshman, a native of Carmarthen, a man endowed with

much acuteness, but which was always liable to be obscured and misguided by the haste and passion incident to his race. He had been a student in Jesus College, Oxford, is supposed to have taken orders, and to escape the pursuivants of Archbishop Laud he had fled to Massachusetts. Reports concerning his piety and his ability had reached Boston before him; and in consequence, only a few weeks after his landing, he was chosen teacher in the church at Salem. He was then about twenty-five years of age; but he began his labours by declaring that he could not hold communion with the other churches of Boston, until they should have publicly professed their repentance for having at any time communed with the Episcopal congregations in England; and by declaring further, that the magistrate has no authority to punish breaking of the sabbath, or in the case of any offence against the first table of the Decalogue. This first table was then understood to embrace, not only the law of the sabbath, but the precepts relating to idolatry, perjury, and blasphemy. Complaint of this conduct was sent to the church at Salem by the authorities at Boston. What followed is imperfectly known; but, during the greater part of the next two years, Williams acted as a sort of co-pastor at Plymouth. At the close of that interval he returned to Boston, and again became teacher in the church at Salem.

By this time, the zealous reformer had obtained further light. He now declared that the royal patent gave the people of Massachusetts no right to the soil they possessed; that such right could only come from compact with the natives. He at the same time refused to be present at the fraternal meetings among the ministers of the district, lest such conferences, however voluntary at present, should end in Presbyterianism. But, at this stage in his career, Williams seemed to be in some degree open to impression from the arguments of opponents. As the result of a discussion with the neighbouring ministers, he professed to abandon his notions concerning the invalidity of the royal patent; and having insisted strenuously that all women should come to church veiled, he conformed to the more successful reasoning of John Cotton on the other side, though not convinced by it.

So there came to be some hope of peace. But, within the same year, Williams returned to his old opinion touching the patent; reiterated his censures upon those who had not repented publicly concerning their having, at any time, communed with the churches in England; and taught further, 'publicly, that a magistrate ought not to tender an oath to 'an unregenerate person, for that they thereby have com-

'munion with a wicked man in the worship of God, and cause 'him to take the name of God in vain.' In this last point, we see an instance of the sort of refinement and excess to which the mind of Williams was always liable. The ministers discussed this question with him, and the civil courts left him time to consider the matter. In the meanwhile, the church at Salem applied to the magistrates for a new grant of land. No, said the magistrates, not until the case of Mr. Williams, and your own conduct in relation to him, shall be in a more satisfactory condition. This answer brought things to extremities.

Williams sent a letter to the church at Salem, urging them to write to the other churches complaining of this proceeding as a deep wrong. But the churches were silent. His next step was to call upon the Salem people to renounce all connection with the other churches. That the Salem people refused to do. He then wrote to his unmanageable flock, renouncing all fellowship with them, and declining to be present any more in their assemblies. But his wife persisted in going to the Salem services, whereupon he decided that he would worship no more even in his own family. It is easy to see the temper that must have been in all this, not so easy to see the wisdom. But this conduct was not the result of any malignity. It sprang from a native restlessness and excitability, which his sharp intellect had not patience enough or power enough to control. Everything in the history of this gifted and estimable man, warrants the following description of him from the able pen of a Boston Unitarian :—

'Williams had great virtues, and some of them were of that character which peculiarly wins and attaches. He was eminently courageous, disinterested, and kindhearted. If (in his early days, at least) he belonged to that class of men who have no peace for themselves except in sharp strife with others,—if the *certaminis gaudia*, the joy of quarrel, made an indispensable condition of his satisfaction of mind—he was incapable of any feeling of malice or vindictiveness towards opponents. Though in his controversies he uses strong language, as was his wont on all occasions, a tone of friendliness is scarcely ever abandoned. Differ and contend he must. For him a stagnant life was not worth living. When he had made a few proselytes to his last novelty, and so far prevailed to have his own way, he would start off on some new track, impelled by his irresistible besetting hunger for excitement and conflict. But with all this, he had a sweetness of temper, and a constancy of benevolence, that no hard treatment could overcome, and no difficulties or dangers exhaust or discourage.'—*Palfrey's History of New England*, i. 417, 418.

Eight years after his landing in Massachusetts Williams became a Baptist, but a Baptist of his own order. He was baptized anew by a layman, a member of the Salem church, but he soon had doubts as to the validity of what had been done; and had to the last a notion, that no baptism could be what it should be, except as administered by apostolic hands. Could Williams have moulded the state of Massachusetts according to his will, it is clear that his system would have been narrower and hardly more tolerant than that to which he was opposed. That submission to the vote of a majority, however, which he scorned in Boston, he lived to enunciate as a fundamental law in the State of Rhode Island. Time brought wisdom, so that at last, he could talk of the folly of deferring to 'such an infinite liberty of conscience,' as some men were disposed to claim, to the destruction of all right and order in church and state. He could even threaten to punish the Quakers for their insolence in the use of the words 'thee' and 'thou.'

But the influence of Williams in Massachusetts proved to have been very limited. When he left that province, there were not twenty persons remaining in it who were known to be in sympathy with his opinions or his proceedings. It was otherwise with the next trouble of this nature which befel the people of that colony. The Antinomian controversy, in which Mrs. Anne Hutchinson figured as the heroine, widely infected the community, and at a time when it was especially important that the settlement should have been at peace within itself. Just then, the Indians were threatening it with a formidable war; and Archbishop Laud, and the council at home, were intent upon sending a force into the colony to bring it under 'Canterburian' discipline. In England, too, at that juncture, there was a growing discontent, and a strong feeling was rising in favour of emigration. News came by every vessel, that not a few men of wealth and mark were meditating the sale of their property, and a removal to the wilderness of the New World, in search of freedom. To be prepared to resist the Indians, and to meet a possible attack from England, required that every man in Massachusetts should be ready to do his duty: and nothing could tend more to turn friends from their purpose who were thinking of joining them, than the news that the new settlement, which was to have been so peaceful a home, had become a house divided against itself. But this mischief was to come.

Mrs. Hutchinson and her husband sold an estate at Alford near Boston, and followed John Cotton from Boston, in Lincolnshire, to Boston, in New England. In the judgment of this

gifted lady, Mr. Cotton, and her brother-in-law, Mr. Wheelwright, were the only ministers within her reach at Alford, who were not tainted with what was technically called *legalism*—which meant *Arminianism*, or something very like it. By degrees she learnt to talk in the same strain in Massachusetts. Some of the male members of the church at Boston were wont to assemble on the week-day to review the services of the past sabbath, and to refresh their memories concerning them. Mrs. Hutchinson convened an assembly of women, before whom she dissected and criticised the sermons of the preachers from week to week. This she did with so much skill, that a large number of those who listened to her seemed to imbibe only too readily her captious and censorious spirit. Often this mistress in theology, and the more zealous of her partisans, would rise and leave the church when certain preachers entered the pulpit, or when things were said which this new school of critics regarded as unsound. As usual with persons of this order, all Mrs. Hutchinson's favourite notions were given forth as having come to her by a special illumination from the Holy Spirit. Sanctification was not only the work of the Spirit, but it was His work in such sense that man's moral nature was purely passive under it, and when achieved, to talk of sanctification as an evidence of justification was to talk Arminianism. The young Governor of Massachusetts, Henry Vane—afterwards the great Sir Harry, so conspicuous in English history—was carried away by her influence.

In our time we hardly comprehend what it was to charge a preacher in those days with Arminianism. It was to identify him with such men as Montague and Laud, and with preaching the favourite doctrine of Papists and Jesuits. The slander, if credited, was nothing less than ruinous. When the ministers, and such of the magistrates as regretted this unhappy state of things, began to think of adopting measures to restore peace, Wheelwright, by his discourse in the pulpit, and others by their discourse out of it, gave evidence enough of their desire to rouse their faction to a resistance by force. Numbers who should have been ready to bear arms for the public safety, refused to do so. But, thanks to the calm wisdom and firmness of Winthrop, their schemes were counteracted, and the commotion was effectually suppressed. Mrs. Hutchinson, and some of the more conspicuous agitators, were banished; but such of the delinquents as were prepared to make any reasonable promise of peaceableness were allowed to remain. By this wholesome rigour the state lost scarcely a subject whom it was desirable to retain, and so lasting was its impression that during the next

forty years Massachusetts knew little or nothing of trouble in the same form.

Five and twenty years later came the memorable conflict of the colony of Massachusetts with the Quakers. But that trouble did not arise from within. It was an assault from without. No one need say a word in vindication of the character of the Society of Friends as they have been known to the present generation, and to some generations past. But two centuries since, the sort of inspiration claimed by their predecessors bore its natural fruit; and the marvel is, that one of the most irrational and extravagant of sects, should have softened down into one of the most prudent and self-controlled.

George Fox and his early followers made strong claim to liberty, but what liberty really meant they had still to learn. It is a simple maxim, that no man is free to plead liberty of conscience in his own case, at the cost of invading liberty of conscience in the case of his neighbour. But that maxim was violated without scruple by the Quakers of those days, and often in a manner which exposed them to the charge of insolence, indecency, and blasphemy. It was not enough that they should be free to have worship among themselves, they must be free to disturb the worship of others at any time, and in any manner, however offensive, to which their divine impulses were said to have prompted them. Nothing could exceed the sort of religious Billingsgate with which they bespattered priests and magistrates who did not assent to their doings and utterances.

The rulers of Massachusetts were made aware that zealots of this character were likely soon to make their appearance among them; and they provided that all such persons would be imprisoned upon their landing, should be banished, and the penalty incurred by a banished man who should presume to return was death. Among the many who had been banished from Massachusetts no one had ever been known to brave the extreme sentence by returning without permission. But in this case, the court of Boston had not well understood the strange mixture of idiocy and obstinacy with which they had now to deal. Their homestead was their own, and they had a full right to protect it even at the cost of inflicting capital punishment on obstinate intruders. But suppose the subtlety of illusion, and the strength of will, in this particular class of offenders should lead them to defy this last penalty—to glory in the thought of doing so? That question, it seems, had not been considered. The case nevertheless arose. Four men and one woman challenged these legislators to execute their 'bloody law' upon them. Thus bearded, the Massachusetts men did not flinch—the four men

and the woman were hanged. It surely would have been wiser to have trusted to some less terrible means. This the authorities themselves practically confessed by their altered policy afterwards. The scene presented a struggle for victory. It was defiance meeting defiance. And the fanatics proved to be the victors. The antics of the victorious party now became in Massachusetts all that they had been years before in England.

‘Far and near they disturbed the congregations at their worship. George Wilson at Boston, and Elizabeth Horton at Cambridge, cried through the streets that the Lord was coming with fire and sword. Thomas Newhouse, having delivered in the meeting-house at Boston, the message with which he alleged himself to be charged, broke two glass bottles “in a prophetic manner,” proclaiming, “thus will the Lord break you in pieces.” One wretched woman, Mary Brewster, made herself a spectacle by walking about in a gown of sackcloth; and another exhibited herself with her face smeared with grease and lampblack. “Deborah Wilson was constrained, being a young woman of very modest and retired life, and of sober conversation, as were her parents, to go through the town of Salem naked, as a sign.” Lydia (Wardel) being a young and tender, chaste woman, as a sign to them (the church at Newbury) went in—though it was exceeding hard to her modesty and shamefaced disposition—naked among them.’—*Palfrey*, ii. 483.

The conduct of the Quakers was restrained by law in the other colonies, but only in Massachusetts was it punished with death.* It had not been found difficult to guard against hostility from persons who would have introduced the old church and king doctrine into New England; and the collisions which came up in Massachusetts between the rulers of that state and the Presbyterians and the Baptists were not considerable, compared with the gravity of the consequence with which the state had been threatened by the Antinomians and the Quakers. Both Presbyterians and Baptists were allowed to remain in the colony, and to commune with the churches, so long as they were disposed to acquit themselves peaceably. But the settled polity of the churches in Massachusetts was Congregational, and neither Presbyterians nor Baptists were allowed to pursue any course regarded as exposing the settlement of things in that form to any danger.

It was not unnatural that the parties so restrained should be inclined to brand this policy as intolerant and persecuting. But their opponents said, in effect, ‘If you wish a Presbyterian colony or a Baptist colony, America is a wide place, create one. The benefit of all that we have done in making our

* *Palfrey*, ii. 472.

'home what it is, shall be at your service so long as you are peaceable; and if you cannot be peaceable you have only to do as we have done, provide for your own wants, at your own cost, according to your own convictions. But whatever it may be necessary to do to guard our own dearly-purchased rights against infringement will be done.' It should be remembered that Presbyterianism, now for the greater part taking a foremost place in the cause of civil and religious liberty, was in no such position at that time. The Presbyterian party of that day was scarcely less rabid in its hostility to sects than Laud himself: and, unhappily, the New England Independents were so haunted by the remembrance of the doings of the men who had avowed themselves Baptists at Munster, and had such a remembrance of the strife that had grown up between Baptists and Pædobaptists in Holland, that their minds were not in a condition to look dispassionately at the points really at issue between themselves and that class of emigrants. The Massachusetts men were, no doubt, more at fault in their course towards the Baptists, than in any other connection of that nature; but even here they had their case, and the fault was not all on one side. Baptists and Pædobaptists were alike Congregationalists. They should have known how to live amicably together, and there were regions in the New World in which that was to be found possible.

Such restraints on freedom of action and utterance in regard to religion or government, as obtained in New England, could not have been at all justifiable, except in new colonies, and colonies founded as those colonies were. We wish we could report that the Congregationalists of that state had been—as they certainly should have been—the first in the states of America to demand an intelligent separation of the church from such state relations to the civil power. But that honour does not belong to them. The Baptists of Rhode Island, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, and even the Presbyterians in Virginia, were all in advance of them in regard to this great principle. Not until so late as 1833 did the last trace of taxation for the support of ministers of religion pass away from the statute-book of Massachusetts.—*See* Lang's '*Religion in America*,' chaps. iii. iv.

The men in the Mayflower embarked as Congregationalists. Many of the later settlers in New England migrated, as we have said, as Puritans. They became Congregationalists in the new country, but for the most part with but an imperfect apprehension of the issues logically inherent in the principles of that system. In the beginning, the necessities of their position was regarded as demanding the mixed sort of polity which they adopted; and we suppose we must say, that at a later

period, the love of power seemed to grow with the long possession of it, so that nearly two centuries were to pass before Congregationalism in America was to become the consistent thing it now is. It was long with American Congregationalists, as it was with our own Congregationalists in the time of the Commonwealth, when many, both Baptists and Pædobaptists, in the special and transitional course of things then present, were content to take parish pulpits, and to become ministers of parishes, under the sanction of the English parliament. But it was always a principle in the New England churches, that they should choose their own officers, and exercise their own discipline, and as a rule they did so; but, as we have seen, there might be circumstances in which the churches of the district, or the civil court, would interfere with that liberty. Even in the case of the churches of Rhode Island something of that nature might take place, though much less probable than in Massachusetts. In Rhode Island, 'liberty of conscience' in point of doctrine' was allowed; but that plea was not to be urged in favour of anything 'directly repugnant to the 'Government or laws established,' a limitation which the men who banished Roger Williams from Salem would have deemed quite sufficient to cover their entire proceedings in his case.

The retention of the church and state principle for so long a time in Massachusetts became the occasion of serious evils before it was abandoned. As the population increased, and as the old religious fervour diminished, a distinction obtained between what was called a *parish* and what was called a *church*. The parish consisted, in our sense, of the congregation, coming from the district, and was strictly territorial; and the church, consisting of communicants, was an interior organization, regulating its spiritual discipline according to its own laws. But as the people of the congregation, or parish, were taxed for the support of the ministry, they naturally learnt to claim some influence as to the choice of the minister when a pulpit became vacant; and by degrees the parish came to be more influential in relation to that vital proceeding than the church. The fact of recognising the parish in a religious sense, and for a religious object—no matter who might be found in it—proved fatal to the power of the church. By the old law of Massachusetts all powers emanated from the church: but now the tables were turning far the other way, the power of the church might be swamped by the local community.

Of course, in so material a matter as the choice of a pastor, considerable deference would generally be shown to the feeling of the church members. But where differences of opinion arose,

the parishioners might choose a minister in defiance of the communicants, and the communicants would have no veto against that proceeding. In this event, a large number of the communicants might withdraw, and form another church; but by so doing, though they should have been the majority, they would forfeit all claim to the property of which they had been, at least in part, proprietors. Indeed, it was ruled by law, that the church could not hold ecclesiastical property, but a body not of the church, the parishioners, were the only legal holders of it. So the church existed as a purely spiritual organization, but as a spiritual organization which might be overruled in its gravest proceedings by a power encircling it which was not spiritual, but worldly, as worldly, in fact, as general society has commonly been. The church, founded in individual conviction, might thus become the slave of an external society created by law. To most of our readers this will seem to be a very odd sort of Congregationalism. And certainly, for the credit of that system, it was high time that this state of things should come to an end.

Now it was when the Congregationalism of Massachusetts had come to be of this mongrel description that Unitarianism began to make its covert progress in that state. When the choice of the minister came to rest with the world rather than with the church, and when the means for the support of the ministry were exacted by the staff of the constable, in place of being left to the willinghood of a Christian people, no marvel if some strange things came to pass. Unitarians, for the most part, are as little in favour of popular voluntarism as high churchmen, and with good reason. Experience demonstrates that this system must be a sickly and feeble thing whenever it is left to be self-sustained. It must be galvanised by state pay if it is to seem to exhibit any hopeful measure of church life.

It is common to reproach Congregationalism with a tendency to generate and to perpetuate rationalist opinions, from the fact that the Unitarianism of America originated mainly with men who called themselves Congregationalists, and that it has been perpetuated chiefly by men who so describe themselves. But in truth, Congregationalism is wholly guiltless in this matter. It is hardly too much to say that it did not exist in New England when Unitarianism made its appearance there, nor for some while afterwards. Congregationalism knows nothing of a state-paid ministry, nor of the polity which subjected the will of the churches in Massachusetts to the will of the general community. The early settlers, as a measure of necessity, had

subjected the state to the church; the later emigrants, as a measure of worldly expediency, subjected the church to the state. It was under a system of this order, the church and state system, that Unitarianism grew up, and became formidable in Massachusetts. It should, however, be stated, that the man who beyond any other may be described as the father of Unitarianism in America, was a Mr. Freeman, of Boston, rector of the first Episcopalian church founded in New England. This clergyman brought his congregation over to his new creed. It is well known, too, that in Connecticut, Unitarians, with the help of a revised Prayer-book, have been disposed generally to seek their home among Episcopalians.

Still, it is a fact, that in 1810, of 361 Congregational churches in Massachusetts, 96 became avowedly Unitarians, and the state of many not included in that number was far from satisfactory. Things had long been tending towards this result, when the imprudence of a partisan necessitated the abandonment of the mask somewhat earlier than was intended. The defection of Freeman and his congregation dates from 1785, soon after the War of Independence. It was not until some twenty years later that the declension among the Congregationalists became such as to occasion public controversy. The preachers of this class were cautious in their policy. They did not assail orthodoxy, nor did they preach Unitarianism. They exercised their ingenuity in keeping to a neutral track. They had all subscribed to the old Trinitarian standards, and great was their indignation when it was said or insinuated that they had abandoned Trinitarian doctrine. But in 1804, Dr. Wade was placed in the divinity chair at Harvard. Dr. Morse, an eminent minister of Boston, protested against the appointment, and charged the new professor with heterodoxy. Great was the outcry against Dr. Morse. Dr. Wade, it was said, had accepted the orthodox doctrine at his ordination, he had never disavowed it, and what could be more illiberal, intolerant, ill-mannered, than to prefer such a charge against him? Was it not to accuse him of insincerity, of untruthfulness, of little less than perjury? Could anything be more in the spirit of the Vatican? The experience of Dr. Morse under this storm of invective was not enviable.

Nevertheless, Dr. Morse was right. It was quite true that the new professor, like many of his clerical defenders, had never publicly cast off his old creed; but it was no less true that they had cast it off mentally, and were only waiting for the convenient season in which to declare that they had done so. Sooner than they wished, necessity was laid upon them to take

this course. In 1815, Dr. Belsham, the well-known Unitarian minister in London, published his life of Lindsey, a Unitarian minister who had seceded from the Church of England. Belsham had been in frequent correspondence with the Unitarians of Massachusetts for some years past, and in this volume he congratulates his readers on the progress of Unitarian sentiments, especially in New England, mentioning by name a number of ministers who might be enrolled as converts. Memorable was the excitement produced when the notorious chapter on 'Unitarianism in America' became known in that country. What say you to this, gentlemen? was the language of the orthodox. Is this true, or is it not? Dr. Channing, then a young man, endeavoured to vindicate his brethren against this imputation. But it availed nothing. Dr. Worcester demonstrated its truth, and from 1815, the separation between the orthodox and heterodox Congregationalists was determined.

It is not a little remarkable that the early history of American Unitarianism should have presented so strict a counterpart to what had taken place among ourselves half a century earlier. With us, the Unitarian or Arian defection of the last century began with the ministers; with us, it was long a covert defection; with us, to breathe a suspicion of the existence of declension was to be charged with ignorance, intolerance, and malignity; with us, the crisis came, in which what had been concealed so long could be concealed no longer; and with us, the heterodox few who adhered to the minister in possession, commonly retained the place of worship and its property, in defiance of those who, while retaining the old faith, were obliged to seek their edification in some new organization. The parallel in the two cases, in all these instances, is a significant chapter in church history. In 1815 there were not more than two churches in Boston that could be said to be orthodox. But Dr. Worcester's manly exposure of the hollow state of things existing at that time, was not a little damaging to the new school of religionists. The secrecy with which they had stolen their way along until pulpit after pulpit had been secured, and the eagerness with which they clung to the parish edifice and property, and to their state pay, did not speak well for their generosity, or even for their sense of honour. The letter of the law might be in their favour, but the moral element against them was something higher than the letter of the law.

The first step consequent on the feeling excited by these revelations of change, was the law which allowed the tax payer to determine the religious denomination to which his contribution should be assigned. By this means, after a time, the

Unitarian minister was made to depend for his support on the taxable persons who might happen to belong to his own congregation, or to be of his own creed. The next step was the law of 1833, which abolished the religious tax altogether, and left the religion of the United States to the action of the voluntary principle. Massachusetts should have been the first to demand that affairs should be brought to this issue. But she was not. Her place, we are sorry to say, in relation to this great principle, was not so much to lead as to follow. It is too often the manner of our American brethren to come to their wisest opinions slowly, and then to be impatient if others do not come to them in a hurry.

But even voluntarism did not put an end to the system of church and parish. There are, indeed, some hundreds of churches in the States which exist after our own manner, having entireness from within themselves, ceding no governing power to any persons who are not members of the church. But that is not the usage in New England. There, it is common for one set of persons to combine to form an ecclesiastical society, so called because their object is the maintenance of religious worship, while another combines in the same place to form the church, whose great object is to be Christian communion and edification. The parish, in the eye of the law, is a body corporate, which the church is not. The parish only can sue and be sued. Hence the holding and management of all property is with the parish. It takes upon itself all alterations or repairs in the church, the letting or sale of pews; in short, the receipt and disbursement of all monies, minister's salary included. The following is from a document very recently adopted to determine the relative and joint action of church and parish in the choice of a minister.

'Whenever the —— church and society shall be destitute of a settled pastor, and a new one is to be obtained, a joint committee of the church and society, consisting of seven persons, of whom four shall be chosen by the church and three by the society, shall provide a supply for the pulpit, and take all necessary measures to that end. The church shall have the right in all cases to select a pastor (or colleague pastor, when it may be deemed expedient by the church and society to settle a colleague pastor) to be proposed to the society for its concurrence. If it shall concur in said election with the church, a call shall be given by the church and society conjointly, to the person selected; but if the society do not concur in the selection, the church shall select again, and so again, from time to time, until the church and society shall agree in a choice, and when so agreed, a call shall be given to the person so selected, by the church and society as stated above, that is, jointly.'

So the parish or congregation may veto the decision of the church on this important question without limit. This may not be a union of church and state, but to us it must bear so much the resemblance of a voluntary compact between the church and the world, as to seem to be greatly adverse to Christian purity, and quite incompatible with real church liberty. It is true, in the choice of a minister, our churches generally show some regard for the feeling of the congregation, but the congregation has no power to veto the decision of the church. It is true also that the trustees in whose hands the edifice for worship is vested, are a body not necessarily consisting of members of the church, but they are always the members of some church, are always chosen by the particular church, and their sole office is to see that the property is not alienated from its pledged uses. Enough has been said to show how the American state of things came to exist, and to explain how it has come to be perpetuated. But nothing can be said in defence of this usage that would lead an English Congregational church to think for a moment of conforming to it. Our American brethren concede, that the primitive custom was that which obtains among ourselves, and nothing need be said to induce our churches to stand fast in their greater purity and liberty.*

Somewhat more than two centuries passed between the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers at New Plymouth and the acceptance of pure voluntarism by their descendants. We have seen something of the history of Congregationalism in New England during that interval; and we must not forget that the Congregationalism of Old England during those years presents a chapter in modern history which merits attention from the statesman no less than from the divine.

The policy of the English government in reference to religious thought during the reign of James I., and during a great part of the reign of Charles I., was the policy of repression. The Puritans were discountenanced and persecuted; but the severest measures were reserved for the Separatists. This, as we have seen, was the reason of the exodus in our religious history, when the streams of emigration flowed towards Holland, and especially towards New England. But with the commencement of the civil war many an exile returned, and many a voice doomed to silence, or to utterances in secret, ventured to speak openly. So, too, the secret assemblies of Congregationalists ceased to be any longer secret. The power of the bishops had passed away, and it became the concern of wise men to see that the spirit of their lordships did not pass into the policy of their

* See Dexter's 'Congregationalism,' 206—213,

successors. Too soon, however, it became manifest that 'New Presbyter' was but 'Old Priest writ large.'

The Independents in the Westminster Assembly of Divines did not utter the sentiments of religious liberty so fully as many of their brethren had done, and were then doing, out of doors. Had they said more in that place they might have achieved less. By their moderation, no less than by their courage, they succeeded in laying a wholesome check on the passions of the more intolerant in that convention; and by protracting discussion from point to point in its proceedings in favour of a greater liberty, they rendered important service to their friends in Parliament, who were disposed towards the same enlightened policy. The place of the small band of Independent ministers in the Westminster Assembly was a place of special difficulty, and the skill and fidelity with which they acquitted themselves have been recognised by all generous men as entitling them to high praise. Gradually, the Congregationalists—Pædobaptists and Baptists—became the strength of the Parliamentary army. Milton and Cromwell became a concentration of the light and power so conspicuous ere long in that class of men. Their enemies would have made them slaves, and appealed to force for that end. But their answer was—We do not mean to be slaves; and the sword which then came from its scabbard was to be felt as having its place in hands that knew how to wield it.

The English Commonwealth was the creation of English Congregationalists. The Presbyterians were its bitter assailants. The miscellaneous elements in the army which contributed to give power to Cromwell, did little to aid him compared with what was done by those religious men who had been forced from their homes into the battle-field by religious persecution. If we may credit Lord Clarendon, a bitter enemy, Oxford became a more efficient seat of learning in the hands of the Independents than it had been through more than one generation past; and if we may accept the testimony of the honest Richard Baxter, who was no admirer of Congregationalism, the churches of that order were pervaded by more than the usual amount of intelligence and piety, and their influence on the state of religion through the country was a manly and effective influence.

Under the rule of Cromwell, such a voice went forth from England as had not gone from it since the days of the Plantagenets. The man who then governed, made strong by men like himself, balanced the powers of Europe at will, and made our island-home—this grand settlement of the old sea-

kings—for the first time, mistress of the sea. Had Cromwell accepted the crown, and had he left a single descendant resembling himself, the blood of the hero of Marston Moor and Naseby might now have been on the English throne. How it would have fared in that case with the great question of church and state, or with many other questions, we can only conjecture. Possibly something like the 'New England way' would have been tried, but that could not have met with general approval, and at best would have been only another stage of transition. Constructions which had been the work of centuries were demolished, the reconstructions to come into their place could not be the work of a day.

But the Restoration came, and good men among us were to pass through another baptism of suffering before the England of to-day could become what it is. With a Stuart upon the throne, liberty of conscience—indeed liberty of any kind, was not possible. According to the favourite maxims of that house, nations were made for kings, and peoples for priests. Our pious fathers had to bide their time. With the accession of William and Mary came comparative freedom.

Shallow historians talk of the licentiousness which passed over the land after the Restoration as a reaction against Puritanism, and would have their readers suppose that the saints were to blame for its existence. If the saints could speak, they would say that they found that sea of filth about them from the beginning, that they did not create it, but did what they could to check it, and to render it as little mischievous as possible. Their policy in this respect may not have been in all instances the wisest. But strong men are commonly more or less onesided. When we think of the brutal sensualism and stupid bigotry which characterised the mass of the people in England from the Restoration to the beginning of the present century, we feel that the hand of those Commonwealth's men who so far checked the surges of that flood of ignorance and animalism, must have been a hand of no ordinary power. The Duke of Monmouth's rebellion, and the Revolution of 1688, showed that earnest piety and the love of liberty had not ceased to exist. But during some thirty years the policy of the Government had been to strangle Nonconformity, and that policy had been successful in a far greater degree than is commonly supposed. Then came that dreary eighteenth century! The settled liberty, and the material prosperity of the country under the house of Brunswick, did not prove favourable to piety. The ruling clergy in the Established Church included many men of learning, but the men even of their own order

below them were ignorant, intolerant, and often grossly licentious. The Presbyterian congregations, which were mostly wealthy, gradually became Arian. The aristocratic rule natural to Presbyterianism, made change in that direction comparatively easy. The Congregationalists continued steadfast in the faith. The defection of the Presbyterian churches caused many to secede from them. Some of these seceders joined the existing Congregational churches. Many formed themselves into new churches of that order. Hence, since the middle of the last century, English Presbyterianism has dwindled away in about the same proportion that Congregationalism has increased. The age of Watts and Doddridge will not be supposed to have been an age in which Congregationalism was greatly wanting in piety or learning. But the great Methodist revival, which was so antagonistic to the formalism of the Established Church, came as a healthy stimulus on the Nonconformist congregations. Since that day the history of Congregationalism in England has been that of a steady and very perceptible growth.

At present, the comparison between English and American Congregationalism stands thus. In 1863 the orthodox Congregational churches in the United States were 2,865, from a population of some thirty millions. The churches of the same order in England and Wales were at the same time 2,650, from a population of not quite twenty millions. So the English and Welsh Congregational churches were nearly equal to those of the United States, though formed from a population one-third less. But if we take in Scotland and Ireland, where Congregationalists are few, the proportions in this respect between the two countries are more on a level. With a population nearly equal to that of the United States, we then count all but the same number of strictly Congregational churches. Romanism in Ireland, and Presbyterianism in Scotland, have presented an almost impassable barrier to Congregationalism in those directions: and our brethren in America have had similar experiences. Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Methodists, to say nothing of Romanists, have secured possession of large portions of territory, and have made their systems, in a great degree, indigenous to them.

But there is one respect in which the vantage ground has fallen very conspicuously to our brethren on the other side the water. They have not had an ancient, wealthy, haughty, and powerful established Church confronting them every where, and intent upon neutralizing and crushing them at all points. What we have done, has been done in the face of this colossal antagonism, and to have kept abreast with our transatlantic brethren, with the odds so greatly against us, is something.

Nothing strikes an American congregationalist more, on coming to England, than that the position of the Episcopalian church should be so elevated and overshadowing in its relation to other denominations. Our brethren sometimes feel as if they could not breathe in such an atmosphere—must die in it. But we none of us know where we can breathe, or where we can manage to live until we are tried. It is true, the wealth of the Established Church is enormous, her prestige is fascinating, her learned men are not few, her arrogance and exclusiveness are marvellous, and with eyes like Argus and hands like Briareus, she can subject all who dissent from her rule to a breadth and depth of social persecution not easy to describe. Churchmen would not, for very shame, put a hundredth part of the persecution into the form of law, which they practise daily and without a blush in their social relations. But if, in the face of all this, we are where we are; what might we have been if, in common with our American brethren, we could have secured for ourselves a fair field and no favour?

If we reckon with the English Congregational churches, the village chapels, out-stations, and preaching places connected with them, the aggregate of 2,650 would rise to not less than 8,000.

We have seen that the early Congregational churches included the pastor, the teacher, and the elder, as officers, and that in addition to the deacon there was the deaconess. This continued to be the order of things in New England for the space of more than one generation. But the only functionaries recognised for some while past have been pastors and deacons. The platform of 'Church Government and Fellowship,' adopted by the National Council at Boston, last summer, consists of the old standards on that subject, moderately revised. A few passages from that document will show more satisfactorily, than any thing we can say, in what respects English and American Congregationalism, as existing at present, may be said to be identical, or to be different.

In the instrument mentioned, 'Christ's Catholic and Universal church' is described as consisting of 'the great company of God's elect, redeemed and effectually called from the state of sin and death, into a state of reconciliation with God.' No matter where these persons are found, they are in the real catholic church, though the particular body to which they belong may be so unscriptural in its organizations as to be no church at all. The visible church consists of such persons visibly organized.

'The members of one church,' it is said, 'ought ordinarily to dwell in such vicinity to each other, that they can meet in one place; so

that every city, town, or convenient neighbourhood, shall have its own church complete and distinct. And ordinarily the members of one church ought not to be more in number than can conveniently meet for worship in one assembly, and manage their affairs by one administration. Yet, if there be many congregations distinct from each other, in one town or city (whether their several parishes be distinguished by Geographical lines or otherwise) they ought to regard themselves and each other, as so many branches of Christ's one catholic church in that place.'

American Congregationalists repudiate the word Independent. With them, it is too significant of isolation, which they discountenance. They maintain, distinctly and emphatically, that every church should be institutionally and really independent, not subject to any authority foreign to itself. But though it is not to submit to legislation from without, it owes much deference, on the ground of common Christian principle, to the expressed feeling and judgment of neighbouring and sister churches. In many cases, it is said, such aids from the wisdom of others should be sought. This brings up a feature of American Congregationalism which deserves grave consideration. The following extract from the chapter entitled 'Councils,' will show what we mean.

'1. Councils of churches, orderly assembled, to declare the opinion of churches on any matter of common concern, are an ordinance of Christ, and are necessary to the communion of the churches. That Scripture example, where the church at Antioch sent messengers to the church at Jerusalem, for consultation and advice, on a difficult question, is sufficient warrant for such Councils.

'2. The churches invited to assist in a council, are represented by messengers or delegates, chosen by them for the particular occasion. By ancient usage, the pastor of a church, having been duly recognised as its presiding elder or bishop, is always expected to be one of its messengers; and the letters convening the council, invite each church to be represented by its pastor and delegate. Yet in the council when convened, there is no distinction of authority between the pastor and other delegates.

'3. It is manifest, from the reason of the case, that in ordinary cases a council ought to be made up chiefly of churches in the near vicinity. But when a council is called to advise in some personal or parochial controversy, which involves strong interests and sympathies in the surrounding region, it may be expedient to ask counsel from more distant churches, rather than exclusively from those near at hand.

'4. A council is to be called only by a church, or by an aggrieved member, or members in a church which has unreasonably refused a council, and by a competent number of believers intending to be

gathered into a church. In a difficulty or controversy between the church and its elder or elders, or between the church and some other person or party in the church, if a council is desired, and the church consents, the churches to constitute the council are selected by agreement between the parties, and are invited by letters-missive from the church; and this is called a mutual council. If a church unreasonably refuses to call a mutual council, then an *ex parte* council may be invited by letters-missive from the aggrieved member or members.

'5. An *ex parte* council, properly called, has the same standing, and is entitled to the same respect, as a mutual council; for it were unreasonable that, in case of grievance, either party should be deprived, by the obstinacy of the other, of such relief as the neighbouring churches can give.'—*Official Record*, 45, 45.

When assembled, the *ex parte* council is to offer itself to the refusing party as a mutual Council, before proceeding to act for the one party alone. Among the particular occasions for Councils, the following are mentioned:—

'1. When a competent number of Christian brethren propose to unite in church covenant, and desire to be recognised as a church in the more intimate communion of the congregational churches, the orderly, and most orderly method of obtaining such recognition is by an ecclesiastical council, invited to that purpose by their letters-missive to a convenient number of churches, and especially of churches in the near vicinity. Having given to that council, when assembled, a satisfactory statement of their faith and order, and of their reasons for becoming a distinct church, together with sufficient evidence, not only of their Christian character, but also in respect of their gifts and numbers for performing the duties of a church, they receive as a church the right hand of fellowship extended to them by the council in behalf of all the churches.

'2. The induction of a pastor or teacher to his office in the church, or, on the other hand, the dismissal of such an officer from his place, concerns the communion of the churches. Therefore an ecclesiastical council is convened for the ordination or installation of a pastor, and, in like manner, for his dismissal at his own request. A due respect to the communion of the churches requires that no man assuming to be a pastor of a church shall be acknowledged as such by other churches, unless, at, or after, his entrance on the duties of his office, he has been publicly recognised by receiving the right-hand of fellowship from the neighbouring churches through a council convened for that purpose. The welfare of the churches in their intimate communication with each other, requires this safeguard. In like manner the communion of churches requires that no minister dismissed from his charge shall be regarded as having sufficient credentials of good standing unless he be duly commended by a council convened on the occasion of his dismissal.'—46, 47.

Usage a good deal to this effect obtains, as a rule, among English Congregationalists; but it is not sustained with all the form or the firmness which this document would lead us to suppose is prevalent in New England. Care is taken to state that 'the decision of a Council is only advisory;' but enough is done by the mode of procedure to impart to such decisions a great moral weight, and it is to be regretted, we think, that our own custom is not more strictly of the same type. The ease with which secession is resorted to, and with which it obtains direct or indirect recognition, is a great blemish in English Congregationalism. Schism is not a light matter. It is a great sin. And schism consists in the state of feeling which leads to unreasonable separations. The right of secession should, no doubt, be respected. But no man, no body of men, can have a right to do wrong; and if the churches and pastors of a district decide in any given case that separation is not just or not expedient, the presumption will be strong that they are right, and that deference should be shown to a general judgment so obtained. So in all matters relating to Christian order. The basis of all relationships between Christians should be Christian, and it cannot be that without some disposition towards mutual concession. Concerning Ordination the Platform under consideration speaks as follows:—

'Church officers are not only to be chosen by the church, but are also to be ordained by laying on of hands and prayer, with which, at the ordination of elders, fasting is to be joined. This ordination is the solemn and public induction of the chosen officer into his place and office, like the inauguration of a magistrate in the Commonwealth. Such ordination of a pastor or teacher is his induction into the work of ministering in the Word; and if he be afterwards dismissed from his eldership in that church, and be called to a like office in another church, it is not deemed necessary that his installation in his new place be with the laying-on of hands. Yet we protest against the superstitious notion, that consecration to the ministry by the imposition of hands introduces the person into a hierarchical or priestly order, and so may not be repeated.

'In a church which has elders (pastors) the laying-on of hands is to be performed by those elders. But if the church be destitute of elders, then other fit persons, elders of other churches, or ministering brethren not in office, or, if need be, brethren who have not been called and set apart to minister the Word of God, may be deputed by the church to perform that service; and the laying-on of their hands with prayer and fasting is a fit and sufficient induction of the chosen elders or bishops, no less than of deacons, into the office to which they have been designated.'—39, 40.

The ordination of a pastor by the laying-on of the hands of a

layman, has respect, we presume, to those extreme cases where there is a 'need be' for such a proceeding—where it must take place after that form or not at all. Practically and substantially the usage of Congregational churches in New England and Old England do not differ materially on this matter; and the rules concerning the use of councils are not, we suspect, strictly acted upon, except in towns or cities where the Congregational churches happen to be numerous.

On the whole, we fear the condition of Congregationalists in the United States is not quite so satisfactory as some popular references to it might lead us to suppose. In a paper presented to the Council at Boston by a responsible committee on 'the Education of Young Men for the Ministry,' we find the following passages:—

'There are to be found in New England itself, not a few towns and villages in which Congregational churches were once planted, and had full possession of the field, but in which such churches have become nearly or quite extinct, and the ground has been occupied by others, sometimes by unevangelical churches or congregations, and sometimes by churches whose ministry has been far inferior in educational culture than our own. While in the largeness of our liberality we have supplied to one branch of the Presbyterian church no inconsiderable portion of its clergy, and even a greater portion, probably, of its laymen; while we have sent forth multitudes of Christian missionaries, and of pioneers, who, in the newer parts of the country, have planted churches, established colleges, and laid the foundation of a Christian civilization, and have given our hearty support to all forms of Christian effort; we have yet, with all our advantages, failed to hold and to strengthen, in the interest of our Lord, positions that once were ours. We have lost them for want of care to sustain the weak, and of fidelity and zeal in relation to the unimposing details of Christian duty.

'In our statistical tables a great number of feeble churches are reported, which, for the larger part of the time, are without pastors, or any regular supplies, and so are becoming more and more feeble. *Less than one-third of our churches have pastors settled over them.* Something more than another third have only stated supplies; leaving something a little less than a third of the whole, with no steady supply at all. Most of these are unable to procure any, unless it be for brief and uncertain periods; and often, for years together, suffer a dearth of the Word of Life. They are in the sad condition of sheep without a shepherd.'

The italics in the above paragraph are not ours. We scarcely need say that the picture which the statement presents is very lamentable. The third of the Congregational ministers described as 'stated supplies,' are persons who engage to serve certain

churches for six months or twelve months—for a longer or shorter space as the case may be. The best men in the ministry deplore the prevalence of this custom, but know not how to put an end to it. Mr. Dexter, whose very able volume on Congregationalism we have placed at the head of this article, expresses himself as follows on this subject :—

‘ Churches being, perhaps, feeble and doubtful how long they may be able to maintain the ministry of the Word among them ; being, it may be, uncertain how great will be the success of that preacher whom they, on the whole, desire to undertake the work ; and being, not unlikely, frightened by the misfortunes of some neighbouring church with a bad pastor, who was unwilling to follow his departed usefulness—holding on to his legal settlement as a drowning man grips the rope which he took overboard with him in his fall—they think it may be a more excellent way to “ hire a stated supply ” for the pulpit, as they hire a stated supply for the farm-yard or the meadow ; both preacher and ploughman to go when wages are stopped, or when they can “ do better ” both elsewhere. This mercenary practice has, strangely enough, been favoured by some ministers, who think to make it convenient to leave when a “ broader field of usefulness ” opens elsewhere, and who esteem it a convenience to be hampered by no necessity for advice of council as to staying or going. All this is uncongregational and unscriptural, and—as facts abundantly are testifying—evil for the churches, and for the ministers.’—152.

In such cases the affections proper to the pastoral relation are unknown on either side ; and the vagrant orator, with his stock of ready made sermons, becomes an apt parallel to the rolling stone. Happily, we know nothing of this custom in England—may it never be seen among us. In brief, the only feature in American Congregationalism in which we see an improvement on our own, is in their more careful effort to perpetuate a real and visible relationship between their pastors and churches. In so far as this moral unity of churches with churches and ministers with ministers can be shown to be more realised with them than with us, consistently with the great principle of ecclesiastical independence, the advantage must be conceded to be with them. Long may they retain every wholesome element in their spirit and usage, soon may they learn to cast off whatever impedes their progress, and may their influence in the past, memorable as that has been, be only a faint prophecy of the influence awaiting them in the future.

ART. V.—*Report of the Association of the Chambers of Commerce presented to the Annual Meeting held in London, February 1866.*

THE sensible Report quoted at the head of this article, issued by a body of persons not inadequately representing the practical commerce of the country on such a topic, expresses the general conclusion to which the public are rapidly coming as regards the Bank Charter of 1844. That conclusion is, that the frequent, sudden, and extreme variations of the rates of discount at the Bank of England are a source of constant anxiety, loss, and suffering to all persons engaged in trade—that these variations have been far more frequent since than before 1844—that they become more frequent year by year—that the Bank of France does not find it necessary to impose upon the commerce of that country more than about a third as many changes of the rate of discount as occur at the Bank of England*—and, lastly, that whatever may be the theoretical ingenuity of the scheme of 1844, it is in practice a harsh, irritating, and oppressive law.

In the soundness of these conclusions we entirely agree; and the occurrence of another financial crisis, and the suspension or failure for the third time of the Bank Act, affords an opportunity of stating, with some chance of interesting a large circle, the arguments against the measure which twenty-two years ago were conclusive enough to a few minds, but are now becoming conclusive, by dint of practical demonstration, to a rapidly increasing majority of the country.

Let us at the outset, however, prevent misapprehension, and the imputation to the opponents of the Act of opinions which the other side have the fullest means of knowing have never been maintained by the party to which on this question we belong.

We assume, then, in the whole of our reasonings, that cash payments in all their integrity must be enforced and maintained; that Bank-notes and all other obligations must be paid in good and lawful coin, according to the terms of the several contracts. Our remedies for existing evils are in no sense or degree those of inconvertible paper, or the 'little shilling.' In the next place, we don't pretend for a moment that in this or any country—but least of all in this country—can there be either a fixed and uniform rate of interest and discount, or a rate which, from the necessity of the case, must not be subject to changes

* During the years 1858-65 there were 85 changes of rate at the Bank of England and 34 at the Bank of France.

from time to time. The capital employed in the money market is a commodity rising and falling in value in sensitive conformity to the variations of that market; and all usury laws and all legislative contrivances to restrain liberty of action between borrowers and lenders are exploded absurdities. The complaint against the Bank Act is not that it prevents the rate of discount from being uniform, but that it multiplies and aggravates needlessly and perniciously the changes which would naturally arise. In the third place, we do not accuse the Act of being the original cause either of the financial panic we have just seen or of the two former visitations of 1847 and 1857. These catastrophes had their origin in a variety of causes, and under any circumstances could not have been surmounted without great difficulty and suffering. But our complaint against the Act is not the less specific in each case. We say that, especially towards the closing stages of the financial distress, its operation has been not to assuage the disorder, but to embitter and aggravate it—to drive prudence into timidity, timidity into fear, and fear into an uncontrollable contagion of apprehension and alarm, before which confidence died away and reason became dumb.

The causes which prepared the way for the pressure of April, 1847, and for the crisis and suspension of the Act in October of the same year, are to be found in the extremely defective harvest of 1846, aggravated by the excessive expenditure on railways undertaken in the mania years 1844 and 1845. The principal causes which led to the suspension of November, 1857, were enormous overtrading and improvident advances by a few large banks during the previous year and a half or two years. The originating causes of the collapse of May, 1866, have been different from either of the preceding. The ultimate concession in 1862 of an effective Limited Liability Act, as the termination of discussions and hopes which had been protracted for years, led not unnaturally to a rebound proportional to the restraint at length removed. It is among the worst evils of bad repressive laws, that they cause almost as much mischief when they are first removed as when they were first inflicted. Schemes of all kinds which had been kept back awaiting the measure of 1862 at once saw the light; and found an audience not unwilling to listen to marvellous revelations of the wonders to be performed by the new law: and the new law inevitably became the innocent occasion of immense mischief—a good deal of it certainly the work of rogues, but by far the larger part the honest mistakes of misguided and ignorant adventurers.

But besides the effects of the Limited Liability Act there has

been in operation for the last two or three years another set of causes, which have had far more to do than it has in producing the crisis of May, 1866. The public have wondered for a long time where all the money came from to make the hundreds of miles of new railway sanctioned by say 300 Railway Acts per session of the last few years. These Acts have authorised about fifty millions sterling of capital per annum for one kind only of fixed expenditure; and as the old mode of issuing prospectuses of new lines, and inviting the public to subscribe, has for a long time been given up, it has not been easy to understand the resources of the railway projectors.

The following extract from the leading authority on financial questions in the newspaper press will remove this difficulty:—

‘Facts which have become public during the last few weeks explain a considerable number of the phenomena of the money market during the last two years or more. The lists of creditors of Mr. Savin, the great contractor for Welsh railways; of Mr. Watson, another contractor; of the Contract Corporation; of Smith, Knight, and Co. (Limited), also contractors; and of some others, show very clearly the sort of financial influence by which the hundreds of Railway Bills before every session of Parliament are suggested and sustained, and also the kind of financial devices by which the works themselves are started and carried forward.

‘Twenty years ago or less, when a railway was projected, on good or ill grounds does not now concern us, people of some sort were found to subscribe beforehand for the shares, and to bind themselves to pay future calls till the line was made. In other words, to some real extent the railway, to cost say a million sterling, was arranged beforehand to be made by a large number of persons out of their respective savings and overpluses of floating capital. We know quite well all the delusions and iniquities of subscription contracts. But not forgetting these delinquencies, it is substantially true that until within a late period the costly public works of this country were made by virtue of a previous agreement among a large number of *bond fide* subscribers, each prepared, or believing he was prepared, to find his quota, little or much, as the case might be. In the numerous cases where the adventure was a mistake, the loss and suffering were diffused and severe, and the unlucky contributors were driven to straits and economies painful to contemplate. We are not, however, considering the moral but the economical side of the problem, and economically it was true that the pressure of the period of excessive railway construction, from say 1845 to 1853, fell directly, as it ought to do, upon the savings of the country. The payments to the contractors were raised by calls from the shareholders, and the shareholders paid the calls by savings out of income, or by the sale of previous investments.

‘But this system was gradually exploded, and for the last few

years has been given up altogether. A project for a railway, dock, pier, or other public work requiring a large conversion of floating capital into fixed, is now concocted by a knot of four or five persons, consisting of a solicitor, an engineer, a parliamentary agent, a contractor, and a financier. Some of the party have the command of the few thousands necessary to pay for surveys and indispensable preliminaries. They have, in most cases, name and position enough to enable them to borrow as much money as carries them as far as the Royal assent. That once obtained, the Act becomes a lively instrument of credit. The directors issue Lloyd's bonds, debentures, stock, preference shares, and the like to the contractor, and he in his turn finds avenues in the money market where, for rates of interest and commission almost fabulous, cash is to be had on these securities. Now, these securities, let it be remembered, are a pure speculation on the future, and a speculation subject to one principal and many smaller casualties. In the first place, the line must be finished and placed in actual working before the obligations representing its cost can have any ascertained value at all. An unfinished railway or dock has no value whatever. In the second place, the line must not only be finished and actually worked, but in order to impart value to the bonds and shares there must be a positive profit surplus. The difference between securities such as these—wholly dependent on future and uncertain events to happen at distant and irregular dates, and liable to become worthless by the premature stoppage of the undertaking—and the class of securities which long experience has shown to be best suited to the requirements of bankers and money dealers—is not only marked in its character, but so wide and glaring as to prepare any prudent person to expect mischief, and mischief has certainly followed in no limited measure.

It is tolerably well ascertained that there has been in the money market for some time past a very large amount indeed of these "finance securities," to apply to them the fashionable description. What may be the exact amount it is not easy to say. We should think not less than five or six millions or more. Many of these securities have been pushed off among banks who ought to have known better than listen to the temptation of extravagant rates on the bills of persons whom they must have known were wholly engaged in contracts more or less hazardous. Of course there was the collateral security of bonds, debentures, or shares. But both the promissory note or acceptance of the borrower and the collateral security were alike beyond the range of prudent bankers or discount brokers. The Joint Stock Discount Company with its millions of liabilities on one side falling due day by day, and its millions of finance securities on the other falling due goodness knows when or where, is the most extreme and lamentable caricature of the folly and want of skill we are exposing.

The effect of the system has been to shift the burden of the largest part of the public works of the last few years from the savings in

detail of the investing classes of the country and fasten it upon the merchants and others legitimately resorting to the money market for the discount of their ordinary trade bills, and for advances required for short periods to meet the nature of their business. The contractor making a railway in Wales, or Somersetshire, or elsewhere, has appeared in London, or Liverpool, or smaller places where banks are to be found, and has got his bill at four or six months discounted at twice or thrice the current rate of the time, fortifying it of course by a deposit of collateral security. When the due date arrived the bill could not be paid. It must be renewed, and renewed it has been, not once but several times. Now and then the lender has been lucky enough to get repaid out of his securities, or out of the pocket of some new party discovered and cajoled by the assiduous exertions of the well-paid and plausible emissaries of the people wanting the cash. The end of the process has been a lock-up of funds in advances which are really and truly mortgages on unfinished public works, or on public works struggling into profitable existence.

‘During the last month or two it is probable that there has been some clearance of this finance paper. The borrowers upon it have been, in one way or another, enabled to offer securities to *bond fide* investors at prices which had led to a real distribution among the public—or, what is the same thing, a class of real shareholders has been found, not *before* the line was made or the calls required, but *after* both these things have been accomplished at a sacrifice about which prudence and pity alike counsel silence.

‘The Finance Companies were set up expressly to do this sort of intermediate work, but they have not done it at all well. It is a platitude to say that a finance company, like plain John or Joseph, can only lend safely that which they possess securely—and they only possess securely their own capital and the deposits lent to them for long periods expiring at various dates. But the manipulation of this real, but of course limited fund, was not equal to the pressure and temptation which beset them on all sides. They resorted to credit; they counted upon the facilities of the market; and when the market ceased to be facile, because contractors were found to miscalculate and to fail, then the finance companies had to turn round upon their shareholders and call up in a hurry and in the midst of panic the capital which they had been foolish enough to lend to others before they had it in hand themselves.

‘The kernel of all the whole case is that far too large a number of persons who ought to have known better have lent immense sums of money upon securities, some good and some bad, but nearly all of them utterly unsuitable to the portfolio of a dealer in money. A bill of exchange drawn against goods *bond fide* produced and sold is a security representing something which the ordinary consumption of the country will carry off and pay for, and is therefore a safe and proper instrument for circulation amongst bankers or bill brokers. A bill of exchange drawn in reality against an unfinished public work is a pure

speculation on the possibility of that public work yielding a dividend on its cost, and finding purchasers in detail for its bonds and shares, and is not therefore a proper instrument in any sense for Lombard-street purposes.

Lord Redesdale says that he can suggest some legislative checks on unsound and audacious railway schemes. We believe that he will find himself mistaken. We believe further, that all legislative attempts to save lenders from mistakes in dealing with railway companies are futile and erroneous. The lenders must inquire and judge for themselves or lose their money, always provided that fraud or misrepresentation shall be punished as a criminal offence; as, for example, by rendering personally liable the directors and officers actually signing any bond or security, which on the face of it implies any material circumstance at variance with the real facts of the case. The real corrective and remedy are the seasons of disagreeable experience such as the last three months. Depend upon it Parliament will hear much less of contractors' lines for some time to come, and by and by the money market will be gradually cleared of a mass of securities and "finance paper" which ought never to have been admitted into any prudent or respectable quarter. The rate of discount will then resume its former and proper function of indicating the relation between floating capital expressible only in terms of money on the one hand, and floating capital represented by merchantable bills and securities on the other.'—*Economist*, April 24, 1866.

The article just quoted explains accurately the fundamental causes of the late crisis. It was a crisis of credit or finance brought on by large numbers of persons, and by many banks and discount houses of position and repute having committed themselves to advances on securities impossible or difficult of realization. Early in the year the disgraceful failure of the Joint Stock Discount Company, after a career of less than three years, did much to arouse apprehension. It was shortly followed by the failure of one or two leading contractors, and the public learnt from the schedules of liabilities of these persons that they had been "financed," as it was called, to the extent of large sums by banks and money dealers. The doubtful position of the large concern of Overend, Gurney and Co. as respects both its old and new business, began to be freely spoken of, and the difficulties of two or three of the new finance companies became also obvious. To these disquietudes was added in March and April the probability of a Continental war, and a fall in the price of raw cotton, which in the course of three weeks represented a depreciation in the value of that commodity at Liverpool of about fifteen millions sterling.

The final blow came at length on Thursday the 10th May (1866), when it was announced late in the day that Overend,

Gurney and Co. had suspended payment. The telegraph and the cheap newspapers carried the news and all the alarming inferences founded upon it to every part of the country that same evening; and when business opened in London next morning it became manifest in the course of an hour that a blow had fallen on the credit system of the country, which, for a time, almost suspended its functions. It happened that the Bank return to the evening of Wednesday, the 9th May, also appeared on the Friday morning, and showed the condition of the Bank of England to be so unfavourable that there was less than six millions of reserve in the Banking department. There was an immediate rush to the Bank of England for advances and discounts. A sum of two millions or more was applied for and obtained by three or four of the joint stock banks in London; applications also came in from the country, and deputations arrived from numerous quarters. Of course the Bank Reserve was speedily run down to a small compass.

It is well known that the majority of the Bank Court are staunch adherents of the Act of 1844, and are not therefore favourable to suggestions for its suspension. In the course of Friday it was pointed out to them by several parties that it was incumbent upon them to inform the Government that the Banking reserve was practically exhausted, and that if further relief was to be given, the Act must be overridden. To all such suggestions it is believed that an unfavourable answer was returned, with the intimation that the parties suffering from the pressure were the right persons to approach the Government. This statement is borne out by the language of the letter addressed to Mr. Gladstone by the Bank Court at the close of business on Friday, the 11th May. The letter says that the Bank commenced the day with a reserve in London, *and at the Branches* of £5,727,000, and closed with less than £3,000,000, or about one-half, only a small portion of which (we believe about a million), was in London. The letter then adds, 'We have not refused any legitimate application for assistance, and unless the money taken from the Bank is entirely withdrawn from circulation, there is no reason to suppose that this reserve is insufficient.' The doubt here expressed as to whether the notes and gold were really withdrawn from circulation is exceedingly curious, in the face of the notorious fact that nine-tenths of the applications which came before the Bank on the Friday were applications stimulated by alarm, and were intended to give the applicants the means of hoarding coin and bank notes against the apprehended exhaustion of the Bank reserve. Moreover, the balances of the London bankers on

the Friday evening represented five or six times the amount of the Bank reserve actually in London, and if the Act had not been suspended before Saturday, it is certain that cheques would have been drawn against these balances to an extent which would have compelled the Banking Department to close its doors in the most literal sense.

Late on Friday night, and after greater delay than seems reasonably explicable, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Russell authorised the abrogation of the Act, and the effect, as in '47 and '57, was an immediate cessation of the paroxysm of terror and wild alarm.* The public knew that bank notes could now be obtained on good securities, and they regarded even the high rate of 10 per cent. per annum as comparative ease when contrasted with the utter refusals of the previous day. Another proof was added to the long previous catalogue that in this country we possess the inestimable facility and resource of a form of credit circulation in the notes of the Bank of England, which, in emergencies of internal panic, are accepted by the entire nation as an instantaneous solution of the difficulty. The want is then not for solid capital in commodities or coin, but for a kind of paper circulation in which everybody believes. The figures at the foot of the page show that the letter of the Act was not actually transgressed, inasmuch as the lowest amount of Banking reserve was £850,000. But this circumstance affords no comfort whatever to the ultra espousers of the measure and for two reasons—first, because any reserve so infinitesimal as this for London and the branches is a virtual breach of the statute; and second, because it is known that the Directors only escaped a larger violation of the law by inducing the London bankers to pay into the Bank every night all the small notes in their possession and withdraw them the following morning.

Practically, therefore, the mode in which the crisis was surmounted in May last was shortly this:—The *total* Bullion in

* The following figures present in abstract the Bank returns of the Panic weeks. The figure 22.81 means, of course, £22,810,000.

Date.	Circulation B. P. Bills.	Issue Reserve.	Banking Reserve.	Total Bullion.	Private Securities.	Deposits, Private.	Deposits, Public.
1866.	millions.	millions.	millions.	millions.	millions.	millions.	millions.
May 9..	22.81	7.34	5.81	13.16	21.29	13.51	5.78
„ 16..	26.65	11.12	1.20	12.32	31.40	18.62	5.94
„ 23..	26.02	10.48	1.38	11.86	31.50	18.79	5.99
„ 30..	26.56	11.03	0.85	11.88	33.90	20.47	6.19
June 6..	26.02	10.47	2.81	13.28	32.22	20.20	6.65
„ 13..	26.57	10.97	3.46	14.43	31.71	20.13	7.12

the Bank of England was at the outset $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and it fell about three quarters of a million or to $11\frac{1}{2}$ millions. On the 9th May, two days before the fatal Friday, the $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions of total bullion was divided between the two departments, in the proportion of $7\frac{1}{2}$ to the Issue and $5\frac{3}{4}$ to the Banking division. The panic arose from the haste of bankers and merchants to get their share of the Banking reserve of $5\frac{3}{4}$ millions; and so long as the separation between the two departments was kept up, the panic increased in violence. The Government then stepped in and simply said to the Directors: 'If the $5\frac{3}{4}$ millions will not suffice to meet the *bond fide* applications before you take some of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ millions out of the Issue department.' The panic then ceased, and, in point of fact, the Issue department was not actually drawn upon at all. *The mischief therefore was in the division of the bullion—the relief was in the permission to disregard that division.* In other words, the prediction of Mr. Tooke, in his pamphlet of May, 1844, was for the third time literally fulfilled. He then pointed out with a prescient sagacity to which it would not be easy to find a parallel, that cases would arise in which 'the Circulating department would have six millions of bullion, and the Deposit department have nevertheless no alternative but to stop payment—a most absurd, however disastrous state of things,' adding, 'But it would be too disastrous, and too absurd to be allowed to take its course. The Government would be called upon to interfere, and the only interference that could meet the emergency would be to authorise a temporary transfer of coin from the Issuing to the Banking department.'*

What then are the overpowering reasons, if any, which since 1844 have rendered it worth the while of this commercial country to separate the Bullion Reserve of the Central Bank into two parts, and in that and other particulars to maintain a system of banking legislation of which no example is to be found in France, Germany, America, or elsewhere?

Between 1835 and 1843 the Bullion Reserve of the Bank of England had on three or four occasions been reduced so low as to suggest the possibility that neither its notes nor deposits could be paid in specie for some interval longer or shorter. There was a powerful party in the country at that time who held most of the doctrines accepted in the days of the Bank Restriction as regards the paramount functions appertaining to bank notes as the real regulators of prices, foreign exchanges, and the rate of interest. These advocates of what Mr. Tooke

* Tooke, 'Currency Principle,' 1844, p. 109.

aptly called the Currency Principle, maintained implicitly that the quantity of bank notes in circulation at any time, even where the notes are legally and practically convertible into coin at the will of the holder, is determined not by the necessities of the public but by the views of the issuers—that is to say, that a lavish and improvident banker may and frequently does debase or depreciate the paper circulation by forcing out, through advances and discounts, an undue quantity of bank notes. Applying these principles to the facts of 1835-42,* the Currency Principle school succeeded in persuading Sir Robert Peel to pass the Act of 1844, which, in substance, directs—(1.) That the Bank of England shall be divided into an Issue and Banking department, wholly independent of each other. (2.) That for every bank note in the hands of the public beyond fifteen millions, the Issue department shall hold gold and silver, that is to say, that when the circulation is twenty-two millions for example the Issue department shall hold seven millions of gold. And (3) that the Banking department shall make the best it can of the remaining treasure possessed by the Bank; as, for example, if the total treasure be twelve millions, the Issue department would have seven, and the Banking department five millions. Shortly therefore the effect of the measure is to set apart about half the total bullion as a special reserve, or asset for the benefit of the holders of bank notes; and to leave the Directors to conduct the public business, receive deposits, open current accounts, discount bills, make advances, act as the central bank of all other banks, and as the only available reservoir of treasure out of which to meet foreign drains—entirely on the strength of the few remaining millions of the total metallic reserve. Or to put the facts in a still more concise form—The whole stress and pressure of the business of the country may and often has been thrown on the Banking department with a reserve of only five millions, while there has been seven millions lying idle in the Issue department as a

* It is now tolerably clear that the perils of the Bank of England in the years 1835-42 arose from three principal causes, viz.: (1) from a series of deficient harvests and from the operation of the vicious sliding scale of the then existing Corn Law; (2) from domestic distresses, caused in a large degree by the obsolete and obstructive fiscal system then in force, and also from some political distrust arising out of Chartism; and (3) from the circumstance that the commerce of the world had so increased in volume and activity as to require larger annual supplies of the precious metals in order to maintain the previous range of prices. These enlarged supplies were furnished in some measure by the produce of the Russian mines, which began to appear about 1840-41, and certainly contributed most distinctly to augment the bullion reserve of the Bank of England during the years 1843-46.

special reserve against the Bank notes, the fluctuations in which are comparatively trifling.

The practical defence of this system resolves itself into two positions, viz.—First, that the convertibility of the bank note is the primary and paramount object of all monetary legislation, and that under the Act this convertibility is, beyond controversy, secured; and, Second, that the Act protects the public from being exposed to the consequences of error or neglect on the part of the Directors of the Bank of England, inasmuch as the division of departments removes the function of Issue entirely out of their power, and leaves them only the business of banking as regards which it is desirable that the Banking Department should be reduced to the level of any ordinary bank.

To take these allegations in their order: We admit the extreme importance of protecting the convertibility of the bank note.* As we said at the outset, we yield to no one in our determination to uphold the Cash Payments Act of 1819. But the bank note becomes every day less and less the really important and operative part of our credit system. Forty, or thirty, or even twenty years ago, before the growing commerce of the country raised the purely banking business of the Bank of England to its present large dimensions, there was, perhaps, some colourable ground for believing that the Bank Note should alone be the object of legislative solicitude. But even then the views of the Currency Principle party were erroneous and distorted. They have never been able to see that the treasure required to meet a *foreign* drain is obtained from the Bank not by collecting and presenting for payment bank notes, but by withdrawing deposits, discounting bills, or obtaining advances from what is now the banking department—in other words, that the drain was met not by a diminution of the bank note circulation, but by increased activity of the purely banking business. Nor, further, have they ever been able to see the vital and radical difference between a demand for gold, to pay an adverse foreign balance, and a requirement of a million or two more bank notes or coin to accommodate the rigidly periodical fluctuations of the *internal* trade and transactions of the country. The internal demand is essentially and always a

* It is sometimes said that the clause in the Bank Charter Act of 1832, which renders Bank of England notes legal tender as between the public, is a material circumstance in support of the division of departments. But the answer is obvious, namely, that the legal tender clause is a mere arrangement of convenience, the importance of which, with increasing railways and telegraphs, is diminishing daily.

demand for the use of actual currency for a few weeks more or less; and the portion of that demand supplied in coin includes no more than the aggregate of those retail payments for wages and the like, too small, individually, to be met by Bank of England notes. The *External* demand for foreign remittance is a demand for capital, not for currency, and must be and is always met, out of reserves of capital, that is to say, out of the central hoard of treasure held by the Bank of England. These are the *facts* of the case, and it is because the Currency Theory fails to see or understand them that it falsely ascribes to the bank note a power it does not possess, and provides on its behalf (to the exclusion and prejudice of other and more important liabilities of the Bank) a special reserve, which it does not need.

Under the second head:—It is not true that the Act protects the public from the consequences of error or neglect on the part of the Bank Court. The whole of the banking business of the Bank is still and must remain under the absolute control of the Court, and it is upon that banking business, that is to say, upon the management of the deposits, discounts, advances, banking reserve, and rate of discount, that the real concern of the public depends. Whether the note circulation shall rise or fall a million, has been found by twenty-two years' experience to be of no more practical consequence to trade than a phase of one of the moons of Jupiter; but whether the Bank rate of discount shall rise to 7 or fall to 4 per cent. during the course of an adventure to America or India, or during the execution of an ordinary contract for goods required for consumption, has been found by very sharp experience to be a question of most pressing moment. And here is the great failure of the scheme of '44. It fixed upon the Note circulation as the vital and controlling force. It failed entirely to see that the real regulating power is the rate of Discount and the policy of the banking department. *Actually*, the process is this: the reserve of the banking department is increased or lessened by the demand for discounts and advances, by the action of the foreign exchanges, and by every variation of the internal circulation, and the Act compels the rate of discount to fall or rise in close sympathy with all these variations. *Theoretically*, the authors of the Act expected that all these functions would be accomplished through the agency of the Bank Note, and hence the boasts so loudly made at the outset that thenceforward the management of the Bank, and the prevention of inordinate speculation and panic was provided for on purely self-acting principles. We repeat that in this, and in any country, a

fixed rate of interest is neither desirable nor possible. Changes in the loanable value of capital are wholesome and inevitable; but frequent, violent, and sudden variations, produced, not by the unfettered action of demand and supply, but by the caprices of an artificial law, such as the Act of '44, are annoyances, evils, and perils, for which there is neither necessity nor justification.

These are the evils. Then what is the remedy?

Happily not uncertain, nor far to seek:—1. Repeal the Act of '44 altogether. 2. Restore to the Bank directors the command of all their assets as the provision for all their liabilities, including, of course, the note circulation. 3. Come to an understanding with the Bank that it shall regulate its policy on the basis of possessing, on the average of the year, a total bullion reserve of twelve or fourteen millions. 4. That as a means to this end, the Bank shall not follow a falling discount market below 4 per cent., that is to say, that the Bank rate shall not fall below 4 per cent.* 5. And lastly, introduce into the machinery of the Bank Court a few modifications of detail, with the object of avoiding some of the inconveniences arising from the present rules of seniority and rotation.

A reform of this kind would put an end to one of the most noxious fallacies propagated by the espousers of the Act, namely, that the Bank of England is in all respects on the same level as an ordinary bank. Both in theory and practice no doctrine can be more mischievously delusive. In eight respects at least the Bank of England differs widely from any other bank in London or the provinces. In the first place, for, approaching two hundred years, it has been the chief bank in the nation, and has acquired during that time a reputation and a hold on the public mind and sentiment, which alone raises it into a great national and moral power. 2. It is the banker of the State, and the receiver and disbursing officer of a public revenue of seventy millions sterling. 3. It is the greatest bullion dealer in existence. 4. It is the central bank with and through which all the other banks in the country finally adjust all balances arising among them. 5. It is the greatest and most powerful discount and banking institution in the country for merchants

* It would be quite consistent with the rule that the Bank minimum rate of discount should not fall below 4 per cent. to revive the arrangement which prevailed before 1844 as regards temporary advances by the Bank a few weeks before the close of each revenue quarter, such advances to be made at the market rate of the time. These advances would be a wholesome and special arrangement for giving the market the benefit of the Government balances during the few weeks prior to the payment of the dividends.

and others. 6. It is the central hoard of treasure, to which resort is always had for gold and silver required either to settle an adverse balance with the foreigner, or to provide for the occasional needs of the internal trade. 7. It is the issuer of a paper circulation of unquestioned credit in every part of the United Kingdom. 8. And with the growth of the commerce and wealth of the country, it becomes every year more and more an international centre towards which gravitates the adjustment of all large financial operations, wherever they may originate.

It is one of the most valuable practical advantages of this country to possess an institution of credit so powerful and so perfect as the Bank of England, and to be able to reconcile its supremacy and preservation with the existence around it of the utmost freedom in the practice of all other kinds of banking, private and joint-stock, for, happily, all the former monopolies possessed by the Bank of England have long since disappeared.*

Such a reform would also reunite the functions of Banking and Issue. Under the peculiar circumstances of the Bank of England, they are wholesome and convenient parts of the same business. Nobody in these days believes that the amount of outstanding circulation at any given time, can be determined by the will or desire of the issuer. The public take out and keep out just so many bank notes as their transactions require, and not a single note beyond, and for three obvious reasons, viz. (1.) Interest or expense of some kind is incurred by the retention of the note. (2.) It may be stolen, lost or burnt. (3.) Except for purely retail purposes, it is less convenient than a cheque, because it will not pay by one operation fractional sums. All the practical evidence collected by all the Currency Committees is consentaneous in declaring that no banker ever dreams of forcing out his notes so long as they are strictly convertible into gold on demand. And besides, if this testimony was not enough, we have the evidence of the public returns of the circulation, showing year by year the same cycle of elevations and depressions, and in the same months or weeks. That is to say, the circulation describes a curve of its own, so regular that its course can be accurately foretold—a result utterly at variance with any theory of irregular private action.

A restoration to the Bank of the function of issue would, moreover, get rid, *per saltum*, of the irritating and spasmodic jerks

* It is sometimes said, that the exclusive right to circulate notes in London and sixty-five miles round it, is a grievous monopoly. The answer is that no London bank would think it worth while to attempt a note circulation even if the law was altered.

which now constantly occur at the end of each revenue quarter. At these times the out-standing notes are generally increased for a few weeks by a million or two, and for purely internal purposes,—the payment of dividends, salaries, tradesmen's accounts, and the like. Under the present system this temporary and natural demand for bank notes can only be met by a transfer of gold from the banking to the issue department; and it occurs continually that the banking reserve is so ill prepared to bear the transfer that the directors feel themselves compelled to raise the rate of discount. For example, last autumn the Bank rate was raised in nine days (28th Sept. to 7 Oct., 1865) from 4 to 7 per cent., in consequence of a temporary increase of $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions in the circulation.

It will be said, we know very well, that if the functions of banking and issue were re-united, and the Directors placed in command of *all* the assets of the Bank, as their resource for all its liabilities (bank-notes included), two evils might arise. First, the reserve, as in 1835 and 42, might be run too low; and, second, that the Bank Court might be unskilful or negligent.

To take the second point first, the reply is, as we have shown above, that the Act of '44 leaves the really important functions of the Bank—namely, the banking business and the banking reserve—just as much or rather more at the discretion of the Directors than ever it was. The Directors are at perfect liberty, so far as the Act goes, to mismanage the Banking department up to the point of stopping payment, and on three occasions it has virtually and in point of fact stopped payment.

As regards the first point, we say with all the emphasis we can command, that the entire question of administering the monetary system of this country resolves itself into the magnitude of the Bullion Reserve of the Bank of England. The present system works badly, painfully, and dangerously, because it has at the bottom of it nothing more substantial than the five, six, or seven millions of reserve in the Banking department. But let the reserve be raised to such a point that on the average of the year, or some more convenient period, it shall be not less than say fourteen millions, and the whole complexion of the case would be changed. A transmission of three or four millions of bullion goes a long way in these rapid days in adjusting even a large foreign balance; and even four millions taken out of fourteen is a very different measure, and leaves behind it a very different residue compared with four millions taken out of eight or nine. Moreover, it might be a by-law of the Bank Court that for every fall of half a million in the treasure below say twelve millions, the official rate should be

raised a half per cent., or in some other proportion to be determined after due inquiry. It is pitiful and mean that a country like this, containing millions of people dependent on trade, cannot afford or manage to keep a Bullion Reserve so reasonably sufficient for the amount and uncertainties of the business carried on, that the arrival or departure of a few parcels of gold or silver produces commercial sunshine or storm. It is with a view of protecting this Reserve that the suggestion is made that the Bank should not go into the discount market when the rate falls below 4 per cent. The effect of such a plan would be that the Bank's securities would run off, and that its reserve would increase; and the reserve so increased would be found ready to meet the demands upon it which all periods of cheap money infallibly produce sooner or later. The Bank would sustain some loss by such a retirement for a time from the discount market, but not by any means so much loss as may at first sight appear. Whatever the loss might be, however, it must be made good to the Bank proprietors, and such an arrangement would not be practically difficult.

We have said nothing concerning the suggested remedy of what is called a suspending supplement to the Act of '44; that is to say, a clause providing for the suspension of the Act at the discretion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Prime Minister, acting with or without the concurrence of the Bank Court. Such a clause would manifestly reduce the whole measure to mere book-keeping, and would leave the country burdened with all the evils of the system under every set of circumstances except those of overpowering panic.

The practical steps to be now taken are not difficult of determination.

The chambers of commerce and the large mercantile towns should move the Government and the House of Commons for the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider the existing Acts relating to banking and currency in the United Kingdom. A royal commission fairly chosen would be a more efficient instrument than a committee of either House of Parliament. The commissioners should be instructed to report their recommendations and the evidence received on or before March in next year. The public and parliament would then possess materials on which further discussion could proceed and further legislation could be founded.

N. W.

ART. VI.—(1.) *Various Papers on Linear Transformations, Differential Equations, the Theory of Probabilities, and other Branches of the Higher Mathematics.* By GEORGE BOOLE.

(2.) *The Mathematical Analysis of Logic.* By the Same. Cambridge. 1847.

(3.) *An Investigation of the Laws of Thought.* By the Same. London: Walton & Maberly. 1854.

(4.) *A Treatise on Differential Equations.* By the Same. Cambridge. 1859. Second Edition, Revised by I. Todhunter. Macmillan & Co. 1865.

(5.) *A Treatise on the Calculus of Finite Differences.* By the Same. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1860.

(6.) *A Treatise on Differential Equations. Supplementary Volume.* By the late GEORGE BOOLE, F.R.S., Professor of Mathematics in the Queen's University, Ireland, etc. Edited by I. Todhunter, F.R.S. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1865.

WE believe that to the great body of the reading public the name of George Boole first became known, if indeed it has yet become known, through the announcement of his death; the announcement being accompanied in a few of the papers by a brief sketch of his life and works. Boole's researches were not of a nature to be appreciated by the multitude, and he never condescended to those arts by which less gifted men have won for themselves while living a more splendid reputation. When a great politician dies, or any man who has filled a large space in the public mind, and made a noise in the world, the newspapers long ring with the event. But it is otherwise with the great thinker, the mathematician or the philosopher, who has laboured silently and in comparative seclusion, to extend the boundaries of human knowledge. When such a man is removed by death there are public journals, even among those professedly devoted to literature and science, which can dismiss the event with a few faint and cold remarks.* But time rectifies all that. It is found sooner or later that no reputation, however brilliant, is permanent or durable which does not rest on useful discoveries and real contributions to our knowledge. The names that live in the annals of philosophy are not those of men who achieved

* The *Athenæum* for December 17, 1864, after noticing the death of an American writer, says, 'Nearer home, science has suffered some loss in the demise of Professor Boole, of Queen's College, Cork, in which institution he filled the mathematical chair. The Professor's principal works were, "An Investigation into the Laws of Thought," and "Differential Equations," books which sought a very limited audience, and we believe, found it. He died on Friday [Thursday], last week.'

immediate fame; they are rather the names of men who, not thinking of fame, betook themselves to the arduous path of original investigation, and succeeded in adding new truths to the existing stock. Their presence was perhaps unobserved by the throng, and comparatively few even heard of their genius, but their works live when they are gone, and their influence and fame are real and abiding. We propose to devote a few pages to an account of the life and writings of the remarkable man, a list of whose principal contributions to science we have placed at the head of this article.

George Boole was born in the city of Lincoln on the 2nd of November, 1815; he died at Ballintemple, near Cork, on the 8th of December, 1864. The facts of his personal history are few and simple, but they serve to illustrate how a man of humble origin, with very slender aids from without, may, by the force of genius and the labour of research, rise to a position of great eminence. We give the facts from documents in our possession, and other sources of information on which we can rely.

The life of Boole may be divided into two distinct periods, the leading events and features of which are soon described. The first, extending over four and thirty years, was, excepting only a short interval, spent wholly in his native county, and for the most part in his native city. This was the period in which he laid the foundation of his future greatness; his mind became furnished with rich and varied stores of information, and he acquired a mastery over processes of thought and methods of mathematical investigation that yielded the most valuable and important results in after years. The second and shorter period commenced with his appointment to the professorship of mathematics in the Queen's College, Cork, the duties of which he entered upon at the opening of that institution in the year 1849, and continued to discharge until his premature and unexpected death. It was during this latter period that he gave to the world those works on which his fame as a philosophical mathematician will principally rest. His father was a tradesman of very limited means, but held in high esteem by those who knew him. Having nothing to support his family but his daily toil, it was not to be expected that he could expend much on the education of his children; yet they were not neglected. Being himself a man of thoughtful and studious habits, possessed of an active and ingenious mind, and attached to the pursuit of science, particularly of mathematics, he sought to imbue his children with a love of learning, and employed his leisure hours in imparting to them the elements of education. The estimation in which his abilities were held by his wife will be learnt from

the following little incident, which was told to the writer of this article some years ago by an eminent mathematician, the present Chief Justice of Queensland. Our friend was then a barrister on the Midland circuit, and having read with deep interest some of Boole's earliest mathematical papers, he desired to make his acquaintance, and being in Lincoln, called at his residence. He was not at home at the time; but meeting with his mother our friend entered into a conversation with her, in the course of which he took occasion to congratulate her on having so talented a son. 'Yes,' said she, 'I dare say George is clever—very clever; but did you know his father, sir?' 'No,' replied he, 'I had not the pleasure.' 'Ah,' said the old lady with evident emotion, 'he was a philosopher!' And no doubt she thought there was not his equal in the world.

George received an ordinary school education, the best which the limited means of his parents could afford. He is described by an old fellow-pupil as being at this period of a shy and retiring disposition, a character which he retained to the end of his life, and as being fond of his books, but not averse to athletic sports. 'He was not of my class,' says our informant, 'or indeed of any class; for we had no boy in the school equal to him, and perhaps the master was not, though he professed to teach him. This George Boole was a sort of prodigy among us, and we looked up to him as a star of the first magnitude.' All which we can quite believe. It was from his father, for whose memory he ever cherished a most affectionate and reverential regard, that he received his principal, if not his only, instruction in the rudiments of that science to which he afterwards made such large and important contributions. From him also he inherited a taste for the construction and adaptation of optical instruments. 'It was not, however,' writes one who knew his history well, 'until a comparatively late period of his earlier studies that his special aptitude for mathematical investigations developed itself. His earlier ambition seems to have pointed to the attainment of proficiency in the ancient classical languages; but his father being unable to assist him in overcoming the first difficulties of this course of study, he was indebted to a neighbour for instruction in the elements of Latin grammar. This good neighbour was Mr. William Brooke, bookseller, a man of mental culture and an accomplished antiquary, with whom he kept up an uninterrupted correspondence throughout life, and who survives to mourn the loss of his friend and pupil. To the study of Latin he added that of Greek, we believe without any external assistance, and for some years he devoured every Greek and Latin author that

'came within his reach. At the age of fourteen he was the subject of a small literary controversy in his native town. He had produced a metrical version of an Ode to Spring, from the Greek of Meleager, which his father in the pride of his heart, had inserted in a local journal, stating the age of the translator. This drew forth a letter from a neighbouring schoolmaster, denying, from internal evidence, that the version could have been the work of one so young, and the result was a newspaper war of some continuance. Afterwards accident discovered to Boole certain defects in his method of classical study, inseparable from the want of proper early training; and it cost him two years of incessant labour to correct them. At the age of seventeen he first applied himself to the study of the higher mathematics, and simply with the aid of such books as he could procure. Without other assistance or guide he worked his way onward, and it was his own opinion that he had lost five years of educational progress by his imperfect method of study, and the want of a helping hand to get him over difficulties. This opinion may be doubted, as it does not take into account the invigorating effect on his mental powers of the successful struggles to surmount certain difficulties without external aid. And it is a fact that in his efforts to clear up points on which his books failed to satisfy him, he often lighted upon methods which afterwards proved to be original discoveries.'

The profession which he chose, that of a teacher of youth, was one for which he was eminently qualified, both by his character and attainments. When about sixteen years of age he sought and obtained an appointment as an assistant master in an educational establishment at Doncaster. Here, besides prosecuting his studies in the ancient classics and the higher mathematics, he cultivated an acquaintance with the best English authors, and began to read the German, French, and Italian languages, in all of which he ultimately attained singular proficiency. We next find him occupying a similar post in a boarding school at Waddington, a village about four miles from Lincoln. Mr. Hall, the proprietor of this establishment, was highly popular with the substantial farmers of the neighbourhood, and seems to have attached great value to the services of his assistant. The connection, however, was not of long continuance, for the age, growing infirmities, and straitened circumstances of his parents made Boole anxious to improve his position, so that he might be better able to discharge the duties of filial piety. He therefore seized the first favourable opportunity, to open on his own account, a day-school for the youth of both sexes in his native city. A fair measure of success attended his efforts, and the

experience which he gained in this humble sphere was no doubt of great advantage to him afterwards. On the death of Mr. Hall, his old employer, he returned to Waddington, accompanied by his parents and other members of his family, and succeeded to the school there, which he carried on for several years.

In this obscure place he commenced his career as a mathematical writer, and it is interesting to know that his earliest papers, written, as he himself incidentally mentions, towards the close of the year 1838, were prepared during his perusal of the *Mécanique Analytique*, in the form of 'Notes on Lagrange.' From these notes in the following year he made selections, and wrote out what appears to have been his first paper (though not the first published), entitled 'On Certain Theorems in the Calculus of Variations,' wherein he proposed various improvements on methods of investigation employed by the illustrious French analyst. About the same time his attention was attracted to the transformation of homogeneous functions by linear substitutions, a problem which occupies a very conspicuous place in the *Mécanique Analytique* of Lagrange, and which had also employed the powers of Laplace, Lebesgue, Jacobi, and other distinguished Continental mathematicians. The manner in which Boole dealt with this important problem showed him at once to be a man of most original and independent thought, and in the course of his investigations he was led to discoveries which may be regarded as the foundation of what Dr. Salmon calls the Modern Higher Algebra. His first published paper relates to this subject; and although he afterwards greatly improved and extended his method of analysis, yet his original memoir, entitled 'Researches on the Theory of 'Analytical Transformations, with a Special Application to the 'Reduction of the General Equation of the Second Order,' is interesting as showing how the subject first struck his mind. This memoir he communicated in the year 1839 to the *Cambridge Mathematical Journal*. In choosing that journal as the medium for the publication of his researches, he was singularly fortunate. It had not then been in existence for more than two years, and yet it already numbered among its contributors nearly all the leading Cambridge mathematicians. The object of its originators was set forth in their preface to the first number, which appeared in October, 1837. They had felt it to be matter of regret that no proper channel existed, either in Cambridge or elsewhere in the kingdom, for the publication of papers on mathematical subjects which might not be deemed of sufficient importance to be inserted in the transactions of any of

the learned societies. 'In this place in particular,' said they, meaning of course Cambridge, 'where the mathematics are so generally cultivated, it might be expected that there would be an opening for a work exclusively devoted to that science which does not command much interest in the world at large. We think that there can be no doubt that there are many persons here who are both able and willing to communicate much valuable matter to a mathematical periodical, while the very existence of such a work is likely to draw out others, and make them direct their attention in some degree to original research.' These expectations were fully realised. It is impossible to glance through the contents of the First Series without being struck with the richness and variety of its articles, most of which were supplied by Cambridge men,—D. F. Gregory, R. Leslie Ellis, A. De Morgan, W. Walton, S. S. Greatheed, A. Smith, W. Thomson, A. Cayley, J. J. Sylvester, G. G. Stokes, J. Cockle, and others scarcely less distinguished. The Second Series, called *The Cambridge and Dublin Mathematical Journal*, also abounds with most valuable matter. Among its contributors we find, in addition to most of the Cambridge men above-mentioned, some of the ablest Oxford and Dublin mathematicians, with others who, like Boole, belonged to no University; W. F. Donkin, W. Spottiswoode, Sir W. Rowan Hamilton, G. Salmon, R. Townsend, S. Hawton, T. P. Kirkman, T. S. Davies, T. Weddle, &c.

To this journal, so originated and so sustained, Boole sent his paper on Analytical Transformations, but it was not immediately inserted. A delay of some weeks occurred before it was even acknowledged, and perhaps the Waddington schoolmaster began to wonder what had become of it. At length he received a letter from the editor, Mr. D. F. Gregory, apologising for the delay, and explaining that he had been anxious to make himself thoroughly master of the contents of the paper before pronouncing an opinion upon it. He had now read it, was much pleased with it, and should be happy to give it a place in his journal; but before doing so he desired his correspondent to clear up one or two points which seemed to him to require elucidation. The corrections related chiefly to obscurities of style and expression, such as might naturally be expected in the first compositions of one not accustomed to write for the press. 'You spoke,' adds Mr. Gregory (we quote from a MS. letter dated from Trinity College, Cambridge, Nov. 4, 1839) 'when I saw you here of some investigations in the Calculus of Variations, which you were inclined to publish. If you still desire to do so I shall be happy to give them a place in the journal.' From

this it appears that our author had been to Cambridge some time before, probably to consult Mr. Gregory respecting the publication of his mathematical researches. The corrections so kindly suggested were made, and the paper was published in the number for February 1840. In the following number, issued three months later, his paper on the Calculus of Variations, occupies the place of honour, and a third paper from his pen, entitled 'On the Integration of Linear Differential Equations, with Constant Co-efficients,' is also inserted. Meanwhile he writes to a friend, 'You will feel interested to know the fate of my mathematical speculations in Cambridge. One of the papers is already printed in the *Mathematical Journal*. Another, which I sent a short time ago, has been very favourably received, and will shortly be printed together with one I had previously sent.' Altogether he contributed to that journal no fewer than twenty-four separate articles—namely, twelve to each series—some of them of very considerable length, and all of them dealing with questions of greater or less difficulty in mathematical analysis. Of these articles and of his other writings we shall give some account hereafter.

Mr. Boole derived great advantage in conducting his earlier researches from his correspondence with Mr. Gregory, and we have no doubt that the advantage was reciprocal. The Cambridge editor and his Waddington correspondent often compared their respective views on various points in analysis, particularly with reference to the symbolical solution of Differential Equations, a subject with the early history and development of which, the names of Gregory and Boole will be for ever associated. That the former, if he had lived,* would have achieved as much for

* Duncan Farquharson Gregory (who is not to be confounded with Olinthus Gregory, of Woolwich,) died in his thirty-first year. R. Leslie Ellis, who succeeded him as editor of the *Cambridge Mathematical Journal*, has given a brief but interesting memoir of him in the fourth volume of that work, pages 145—152. This memoir, along with Gregory's mathematical writings, has recently been republished, under the editorship of Mr. W. Walton. From these and other sources we collect the following facts and particulars:

D. F. Gregory was born at Edinburgh, in April, 1813. He was the youngest son of Dr. James Gregory, the distinguished Professor of Medicine, and was thus of the same family as the two celebrated mathematicians, James and David Gregory. After studying at the Edinburgh Academy, at a private school in Geneva, and at the University of Edinburgh, his name was entered in 1833 at Trinity College, Cambridge, and shortly afterwards he went to reside there. In 1837 he proceeded to the degree of B.A., and came out fifth wrangler of his year. 'More, however,' says Ellis, 'might, we may believe, have been effected in this respect, had his activity of mind permitted him to devote himself more exclusively to the prescribed course of study.' In 1840 he

science as did the latter, may perhaps be doubted; but there can be no question that he was a man of most varied attainments and of remarkable ability, and that what he did achieve is quite enough to entitle his name to a prominent place among the mathematicians of the present century. The interest which he showed, up to the period of his death, in Mr. Boole's researches, and the encouragement and aid which he afforded him in his earlier efforts, ought not to be passed over unnoticed. Even his occasional hints and suggestions proved a useful excitement to our author, who often and warmly acknowledged his great indebtedness to Mr. Gregory. The following letter, which we select from among several not less valuable, will be read with interest by mathematicians, and it will serve to convey, even to the non-mathematical reader, a general notion of the kind of assistance which Mr. Boole at this period received.

Mr. Gregory to Mr. Boole.

‘Trinity College, Feb. 16, 1840.

‘DEAR SIR,—Your method of simplifying the solution of Linear Differential Equations with constant co-efficients is exceedingly ingenious, and, I think, reduces the problem to the greatest degree of simplicity of which it admits. Every part of the process is now dependent solely on the ordinary theory of Algebra except the Theorem.

$$\left(\frac{d}{dx} - a\right)^n = e^{ax} \left(\frac{d}{dx}\right)^n e^{-ax}$$

This is all that can be desired, and I conceive that no farther improvement is likely to be made. I do not think that the non-insertion of your paper in the *Phil. Mag.* was due to any other cause than this: that the editor is ignorant of mathematics, and is very unwilling to risk the publication of any mathematical communication, unless a previous knowledge of the author gives him some security for the correctness of the paper. I shall be very happy to get your article inserted in the journal, but I have some doubts whether the paper, as you have sent it to me, is in the best form. You appear to me not to express sufficiently distinctly the points in which you have introduced the improvements, and I think that you have also sometimes made too great difficulty in points which would

was elected Fellow of Trinity College; in the following year he became Master of Arts, and was appointed to the office of moderator, that is, of principal mathematical examiner. About the close of the year 1841 he produced his *Collection of Examples of the Processes of the Differential and Integral Calculus*. He also wrote a *Treatise on the Application of Analysis to Solid Geometry*, which has been published since his death. Late in the autumn of 1842 he had an attack of illness, which was succeeded by others, and in the spring of the following year he left Cambridge, never to return again. He died on the 23rd Feb., 1844.

be very readily admitted by those who would read your paper. I allude, for instance, to your investigation of the form of the numerators for an equation of the third order, when the general method may be proved at once by the theory of the separation of the symbols combined with that of the decomposition of rational fractions. If it be agreeable to you I will draw up the paper in the way which I think is best fitted for publication, and will transmit [it] to you for your inspection.* I shall be glad to hear that you have made progress in the solution of equations, with variable co-efficients. The question is a very difficult one, and of the highest importance, as it is in that direction that we must look for some extension of our means of analysis.

‘I remain, your obedient servant,

‘D. F. GREGORY.’

Mr. Boole was now twenty-four years of age, and, considering the great power and capacity which he had shown, especially since he began the study of the higher mathematics, it is not to be wondered at that his friends should have urged him, as many of them at this period did, to enter himself at the University of Cambridge. There, no doubt, he would have taken a very high degree, and would have risen to distinctions which are wholly inaccessible to non-academic students; but, meanwhile, as Mr. Gregory explained to him, he must abandon everything in the shape of original research, and limit himself, like others, to the

* This proposal, which of course was gratefully accepted, serves to illustrate the generous character of the man. In an article in the first number of his journal, he had applied the method of the separation of symbols to the problem above referred to; and that he should now so heartily welcome a paper setting forth processes which, on account of their greater simplicity and directness, were evidently destined to supersede his own, and that, moreover, he should actually offer to re-write the paper, and present it to the mathematical world in a more attractive form, are facts which reflect on Mr. Gregory's character the highest honour. His biographer might well say of him that he was ‘singularly free from the least tinge of jealous or personal feeling. That which another had done or was about to do, seemed to give him as much pleasure as if he himself had been the author of it, and this even when it related to some subject which his own researches might seem to have appropriated.’ We ought to add that Mr. Boole, in his work on *Differential Equations* (p. 381, 1st Ed.; p. 391, 2nd Ed.) has distinctly recorded his obligations to Mr. Gregory in this matter. On reproducing the theorem which forms the principal feature of his method as distinguished from Gregory's, he there says, ‘This theorem was first published in the *Cambridge Mathematical Journal* (1st series, vol. ii. p. 114), in a memoir written by the late D. F. Gregory, then editor of the journal, from notes furnished by the author of this work, whose name the memoir bears. The illustrations were supplied by Mr. Gregory. In mentioning these circumstances the author recalls to memory a brief but valued friendship.’

prescribed course of study. This to a man of his originality and genius would have proved, we imagine, excessively irksome, and it is doubtful if the result would have rewarded the sacrifice. There was also the question of ways and means. Expenses at Cambridge were at that time enormous. Added to which, his aged parents were now largely dependent on him for their support, and he could not reconcile it with his duty to them to give up his school and so to cut off his only source of income. These considerations, and especially the last, decided his course; he did not go to Cambridge. We admire the way in which Mr. Gregory put the case before him.

Mr. Gregory to Mr. Boole.

‘DEAR SIR,—I have considered what you say in your last letter about your intention of coming up here—I suppose with the intention of reading for a fellowship, and do not see any objection to your doing so from your age. A very considerable number of men who have taken high degrees of late years must have entered the University quite as late in life. I may mention Earnshaw, Kelland, Green, Potter. If you do determine on entering the University with the intention of reading for a Fellowship, you must be prepared to undergo a great deal of mental discipline, which is not agreeable to a man who is accustomed to think for himself. A high degree here is due quite as much to diligent labour in certain appointed paths as to mathematical capacity. If a person cannot bring himself to devote his whole energies to the training for the degree examination, he is likely to find himself much thrown out at the end of the course. I mention this particularly, because when a person takes such an important step at a more advanced time of life—involving a sacrifice of three or four years—he should be fully prepared to submit to all that his younger rivals endure, otherwise he has little chance of success, and it is in this I think that such men are apt to fail. From what I have seen of your mathematical acquirements, I should certainly say that you might turn them to good account by trying your fortune: at the same time you must know that success here is a little like a lottery, and it is not always the best plan to stake everything on a single throw of the die. The expense of an University education depends almost entirely on the personal habits of the student, and it is a difficult thing to fix any precise amount for it. As far as my own experience goes few pensioners, even of those who live economically spend one way or another less than £250 a year, and I doubt whether any keep within £200. If a person come up as a Sizar, or receive assistance from the College as Scholar, of course his expenses will be less—how much so I could not well say. In this matter, however, I cannot pretend to be a very sure guide, as I know nothing of the habits of men in the other Colleges. In some at least I think the expenses must be considerably less than Trinity, as for instance in the rent of

rooms. You mention nothing as to the College which you thought of belonging to. Trinity offers great advantages to one who has talents and ambition, and for many reasons is the one which I would always recommend; at the same time you must be aware that it is much easier to get a fellowship at a small College than here, and that in them the degree is all that is required, whereas here you have to undergo another examination. If, however, you will specify the points on which you desire information, I shall be glad to give you as much as lies in my power. If you have any more communications for the journal we shall be glad to see them as soon as you find it convenient to prepare them. We like to have communications sent early, as we are then better able to judge how the number is to be made up.

‘I remain, yours truly,

‘D. F. GREGORY.’

‘Trin. Col. March 29th,’ [1840.]

In a letter written a few weeks later, Mr. Gregory repeated his offer to Mr. Boole to supply him with any further information he might desire, but the subject does not appear to have come up again in any future correspondence. Mr. Boole’s decision not to go to Cambridge may have been reached reluctantly, but it was maintained resolutely. By that decision science, we believe, suffered no loss: it probably gained much.

In the summer of the year 1840, Mr. Boole removed his boarding school from Waddington to Lincoln, taking with him his aged parents. The next nine years were years of unwearied industry in the prosecution of his mathematical researches; and yet all accounts agree in representing him as a most diligent, pains-taking, and conscientious teacher. He did not abstract time from his school for his favourite pursuits, but gave his best energies to promote the advancement of his pupils; and we learn from private sources that he was accustomed on the half holidays to take his boys out into the country for long and healthful rambles. We are interested to learn also, that while avoiding the agitations of political and public life, he was concerned for the welfare of his fellow-citizens, and gave valuable assistance to various philanthropic and benevolent institutions. His intense devotion to the exact sciences did not contract the affections of his heart, or damp the ardours of his devout and generous soul; the *man* was not lost in the *mathematician*.

In one of those wonderfully impassioned addresses with which the youthful and eloquent Chalmers was wont to stir up the enthusiasm of his mathematical class at St. Andrews, he attacks the notion that the effect of the study of mathematics is to divest the student of all that is human, and to congeal the

fervours of a pious and benevolent heart. 'Dr. Johnson,' says he, 'who possessed the power of genius without its liberality, and who appears to have cherished an immovable contempt for mathematics, has directed all the powers of his ridicule against the ludicrous peculiarities which he is pleased to ascribe to mathematicians. He conceives a fire raging in a neighbourhood, and spreading destruction among many families; while all the noise and consternation is unable to disturb the immovable composure of a mathematician, who sits engrossed with his diagrams, deaf to all the sounds of alarm and of distress. His servants rush into his room, and tell him that the fire is spreading all around the neighbourhood. He observes simply, that it is very natural, for fire always acts in a circle,—and resumes his speculations.' To show that the study of mathematics begets no such insensibility, Chalmers points his pupils to the example of the illustrious Newton, who, 'amid the splendours of his discoveries, and the proud elevation of his fame, rejoiced in all the endearments of friendship,' and who, 'in the spirit of a mild and gentle benevolence, maintained an inviolable serenity.' But a case still more to the point is supplied in the example before us. If Dr. Johnson's theory on this subject were true, we should expect that a man so devoted to the pursuit of mathematics as was George Boole during his life at Lincoln, would be wholly insensible to the great world around him with its ever-burning fires of trial and distress. Yet it was far otherwise. Step for a few moments into this Mechanics' Hall; there is a meeting here of young men, members of 'an association for obtaining an abridgment of the hours of business in all trades, with a view to the physical, mental, and moral improvement of those engaged therein.' They have just achieved the immediate object of their association, and are now assembled to listen to a lecture from a fellow-citizen, who has chosen as his topic—a most appropriate topic truly—*The Right Use of Leisure*. We have come in late: the lecturer, a man of middle-stature, light complexioned, slenderly built, with a countenance in which both genius and benignity are expressed, and a manner gentle and modest, almost to womanliness, has held the attention of his youthful auditors for upwards of an hour, while he has discoursed in a clear and forcible style, on the different ways in which they may advantageously employ the limited portion of leisure allotted to them. He has spoken of 'that wise arrangement of Providence, by which there exist at once so great a diversity in the human mind, and so wide a variety of objects, in which it may innocently seek for gratification.'

He has vindicated athletic sports and games as not merely conducive to health and recreation, but also as assisting to produce 'a vigorous and manly character of mind,' and to encourage 'a free, generous, and open disposition.' The education to be derived from books, from communion with nature, and from other sources, has been eloquently expatiated upon; and now the lecturer concludes with these weighty words:—

'The last subject to which I am desirous to direct your attention as to a means of self-improvement, is that of philanthropic exertion for the good of others. I allude here more particularly to the efforts which you may be able to make for the benefit of those whose social position is inferior to your own. It is my deliberate conviction, founded on long and anxious consideration of the subject, that not only might great positive good be effected by an association of earnest young men, working together under judicious arrangements for this common end, but that its reflected advantages would overpay the toil of effort, and more than indemnify the cost of personal sacrifice. And how wide a field is now open before you! It would be unjust to pass over unnoticed the shining examples of virtues, that are found among the poor and indigent. There are dwellings so consecrated by patience, by self-denial, by filial piety, that it is not in the power of any physical deprivation to render them otherwise than happy. But sometimes in close contiguity with these, what a deep contrast of guilt and woe! On the darker features of the prospect we would not dwell, and that they are less prominent here than in larger cities we would with gratitude acknowledge; but we cannot shut our eyes to their existence. We cannot put out of sight that improvidence that never looks beyond the present hour; that insensibility that deadens the heart to the claims of duty and affection; or that recklessness which in the pursuit of some short-lived gratification, sets all regard for consequences aside. Evils such as these, although they may present themselves in any class of society, and under every variety of circumstances, are undoubtedly fostered by that ignorance to which the condition of poverty is most exposed; and of which it has been truly said, that it is the night of the spirit,—and a night without moon and without stars. It is to associated efforts for its removal, and for the raising of the physical condition of its subjects, that philanthropy must henceforth direct her regards. And is not such an object great? Are not such efforts personally elevating and ennobling? Would that some part of the youthful energy of this present assembly might thus expend itself in labours of benevolence! Would that we could all feel the deep weight and truth of the Divine sentiment that "No man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."

The man who spoke thus was surely no misanthrope; yet he was a mathematician, and one who moved amid the most recondite

paths of mathematical research. It was George Boole. When we think of the daily demands upon his time at this period in connexion with his school, and the absorbing nature of his mental pursuits, we are certainly amazed to find how abundant were his labours in behalf of philanthropic movements, particularly of the Mechanics' Institute. He was one of its directors; he helped to form its library and museum; he afforded gratuitous instruction to the members in classics and mathematics; and he gave in its hall occasional lectures, always of a solid and instructive character, two of which were published at the time,—one, 'On the Genius and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton,'* called forth by the presentation of a marble bust of that philosopher by the Right Honourable Lord (afterwards Earl) Yarborough; and one, from which we have given an extract above, 'On the Right Use of Leisure.' He was also a vice-president of the Early Closing Association, and a trustee of the Female Penitents' Home, an institution in the establishment and success of which he felt a deep interest.

All this time he was busily engaged in extending his mathematical researches. Paper after paper, in rapid succession, proceeded from his pen, and appeared in the pages of the *Cambridge Mathematical Journal*, each succeeding paper serving to raise still higher the reputation of its author. Some of these communications run to a great length. We may mention one of them in particular; it is entitled, 'Exposition of a General Theory of Linear Transformations.' This Paper, as originally prepared, threatened to occupy a whole number of the *Journal*, and it became necessary, therefore, to have it divided and published in separate parts. The editor always endeavoured to keep the articles within the limits of eight pages, so as to secure as much variety as possible in each number. But both parts of

* Since the above was written we have discovered that the lecture on Newton, a copy of which now lies before us, was delivered on the 5th of February, 1835. Boole was then only nineteen years of age; he had not yet left Waddington, but was still an assistant-master there. His father, however, was at this time the curator, and he himself a member of the institution in which the lecture was delivered. We learn from the printed copy which has come into our possession, that the noble donor of the bust presided on the occasion. The address is dedicated to him in the following terms :—'To the right honourable Lord Yarborough, 'as a testimony of esteem for his active and enlightened philanthropy, 'this address, the chief recommendation of which is the event with 'which it was associated, is, by permission, most respectfully inscribed 'by the author.' Considered as the production of one so young, and whose educational advantages had been so limited, it is a very remarkable address. We regret that we cannot afford space for some extracts from it.

Mr. Boole's paper greatly exceed these limits: the first extends over no fewer than twenty (octavo) pages, while the second, which the author condensed by omitting demonstrations and confining himself chiefly to an exhibition of results, fills thirteen pages, that is, more than one-third of the number.

In following out his researches on differential equations, Mr. Boole was led to the discovery of a *general method in analysis*. The work was too elaborate and weighty for the *Mathematical Journal*; and he seems at first to have hesitated whether he should print it separately, at his own expense, or send it to the Royal Society, with a view to its publication in the 'Transactions' of that learned body. On writing to his friend, Mr. Gregory, for advice on the subject, he received the following reply:—

Mr. Gregory to Mr. Boole.

' 5, Manchester Square, London, June 19, 1843.

' DEAR SIR,—I have been prevented from answering your letter by a severe attack of illness, from which I have not yet recovered. My advice certainly is, that you should endeavour to get your paper printed by the Royal Society, both because you will thereby avoid a considerable expense, and, because a paper in the "Philosophical Transactions" is more likely to be known and read than one printed separately. If you know any member of the Society, you may ask him to communicate it to the Society, but in the event of your not knowing any such person, I can ask Mr. Airy to do so. Of course he cannot be in any way answerable for getting it printed; that must depend on the report of those to whom the paper will be referred. I may just remark that a paper for the "Transactions" ought to contain fewer illustrations and examples than one which you might print yourself. My own solution of the equation of differences in my problem paper is much simpler than that which you propose: but I am not in a fit state to enter on the subject at present.

' Yours truly, ' D. F. GREGORY.'

This seems to have been the last letter which Mr. Gregory wrote to Mr. Boole. The advice which it contains was acted upon; the paper was drawn up in proper form, and in January 1844 it was communicated to the Royal Society by S. Hunter Christie, Esq., one of the secretaries. According to the usual rule, the Council referred the paper to two of the Fellows of the Society, to report upon its merits. One of them, it is said, reported unfavourably; he could see in the paper nothing worthy of note, and he therefore recommended its rejection. But fortunately, for the interests of science, the other referee was a more competent judge, and his opinion had greater weight with the members of the Council, who, influenced by his strong representations of the value of the paper, ordered it to be

printed in the 'Transactions.'* Nor was this all: they resolved to bestow on it a special mark of approbation. Some time before, they had announced their intention to give one of the Society's gold medals in the year 1844, for the most important unpublished paper in Mathematics that should be communicated to the Society for insertion in their 'Transactions,' after the termination of the session in June 1841, and prior to the termination of the session, in June 1844. Mr. Boole's paper was now selected for this distinguished honour; and in setting forth the grounds of the award, the Council describe it as a paper 'containing matter as useful as it is original and classifying, and 'comprehending analytical operations.' And they add, 'anticipating that Mr. Boole's method will find a permanent place 'in the science, the Council have not hesitated to award to 'him a Royal Medal.' Accordingly, at the anniversary meeting of the Society in November 1844, the Marquis of Northampton, President, in the chair, Mr. Boole received the Royal Medal in the department of Mathematics, for 'his important paper on a General Method in Analysis.'

In the course of these speculations, and others of a like nature which grew out of them, Mr. Boole was led to consider the possibility of constructing a calculus of deductive reasoning. The severe discipline of his efforts to extend the powers of the analysis had given him not only a complete mastery over its mechanical processes, but also, what was of far greater advantage, a profound insight into its logical principles. In tracing out those principles he discovered that they admitted of an application to other objects of thought than number and quantity; he found, in fact, that logical symbols in general conform to the same fundamental laws which govern the symbols of algebra in particular, while they are subject also to a certain

* Another version of the story is, that the Council of the Royal Society, consisting of fifteen Fellows, had nearly rejected the paper without examination, but that one of their number stood up and maintained that the fact of the author being poor and unknown, was no reason why the paper should be so summarily dismissed; it might contain valuable matter, and in any case it ought to be referred to competent judges, just as if it were the production of a known man. He had some difficulty in carrying his point, but at last the paper *was* referred, and with the result stated in the text. Whichever version be adopted, the essential part of the story remains, that Boole's first communication to the Royal Society, and that for which he shortly afterwards received the Royal Medal, had nearly been denied insertion in the 'Philosophical Transactions.' The circumstance has not been without its influence; and no man, however obscure, who now sends a really valuable communication to the Royal Society, need fear that it will receive other than fair and honourable treatment.

special law. This discovery suggested a variety of inquiries which he seems at different periods to have pursued, but without any intention of publishing his views on the subject. In the spring of the year 1847; however, his attention was drawn to the question then moved between Sir W. Hamilton and Professor De Morgan, and he 'was induced by the interest which it inspired, to resume the almost-forgotten thread of former inquiries.' It appeared to him that, 'although logic might be viewed with reference to the idea of quantity, it had also another and a deeper system of relations. If it was lawful to regard it from *without*, as connecting itself through the medium of number with the intuitions of space and time, it was lawful also to regard it from *within*, as based upon facts of another order, which have their abode in the constitution of the mind.' The results of this view, and of the inquiries which it suggested, he embodied in a remarkable essay, entitled, 'The Mathematical Analysis of Logic.' This Essay, in the autumn of the year was put on sale in Cambridge and London, and by a curious coincidence it made its appearance in the same month, if not on the same day, as Professor De Morgan's 'Formal Logic.*' Early in the following year (1848) Mr. Boole communicated to the *Cambridge and Dublin Mathematical Journal*, a Paper entitled, 'The Calculus of Logic,' in which, after premising the notation and the fundamental positions of his Essay, he gives some further developments of his system, especially that portion of it relating to categorical propositions.

From this time forward he applied himself diligently to a course of study and reflection on psychological subjects, with a view to the production of a much more elaborate and exhaustive work than either of those above named. He felt that the inquiry on which he had entered was worthy of his best powers; and that in seeking to perfect his theory of deductive reasoning, he was rendering an important service to science. He meditated deeply on the nature and constitution of the human intellect. The most eminent authorities, both ancient and modern, were consulted; opinions differing widely from each other, and often wholly opposed to his own, were carefully considered; and whatever was likely to help him in the great work which he had undertaken, was eagerly sought. Mental science became his study; mathematics were his recreation. So we have heard him say; and yet it is a remarkable fact, and one which serves to show the great power and genius of the man, that his most valuable and important mathematical works were produced after he had commenced his psychological investigations.

* De Morgan's preface is dated October 14; Boole's, Oct. 29, 1847.

During the years 1847 and 1848 (that is, while he was engaged on his earliest logical essays), Mr. Boole wrote a series of short but suggestive articles on Differential Equations, and some Notes on Quaternions, which were printed in the *Philosophical Magazine*. He contributed also two profound Papers, one on Discontinuous Functions, and another on Definite Integrals, to the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy. Other Papers from his pen appeared at this period, in the *Cambridge and Dublin Mathematical Journal*. One of these, 'On a General Transformation of any Quantitative Function,' is deserving of special notice; for therein the author announces and demonstrates a theorem, of which the celebrated theorems of Lagrange and Laplace are only particular forms.

In the year 1849, Mr. Boole was selected from among several candidates to fill the office of professor of mathematics in the newly-formed Queen's College, in Cork. The emolument connected with the office was not large, and the number of pupils was, for some time, very limited; yet, in this new and honourable sphere, he found occupations more worthy of his powers, and greater leisure for the prosecution of original research, than he had hitherto enjoyed. His father was now dead, and his aged mother, for whom he always evinced the greatest tenderness and respect, could not be prevailed upon to cross the Irish channel. He, therefore, made provision for her maintenance and comfort during the remainder of her days. On leaving Lincoln he received many tokens of the high esteem in which he was held by his fellow-citizens. At a public supper, over which Dr. Snow, the chief magistrate of the city, presided, he was presented with a handsome silver inkstand, and a valuable collection of books. The members of the Mechanics' Institute also, anxious to show their appreciation of his services, raised a subscription, with a view to a testimonial. On hearing of this, the Professor, with his characteristic generosity, attempted to have the gift applied for the good of the Institute; he proposed that they should either add to their apparatus a larger astronomical telescope, or enrich their library with a complete copy of Newton's works. Finding, however, that they were inflexible in their purpose, he, at length, accepted their contribution in the form of Johnston's Atlas of Physical Geography, a work which is one of the most costly and valuable of its kind. These testimonials, and others less publicly presented, were as honourable to those who gave them, as they were grateful to the feelings of him by whom they were received.

For some months after his settlement at Cork, Professor

Boole was much occupied in arranging his classes, receiving students, and attending to other preparatory work, which is always most heavy at the commencement of a new institution. It was a principle with him, throughout life, to do well whatever he undertook to do at all. He permitted no side pursuits to divert his strength from the performance of present duty. The way in which he applied himself to his new avocation, and the rare abilities which he brought to his task, soon made it evident that, though not a university man, he was yet eminently fitted for the post to which he had been appointed. His teaching in the class-room was thorough and efficient. He possessed, in a remarkable degree, the power of communicating knowledge; he condescended to the meanest capacity, waiting even on dulness, and adapting his instructions to the average intellect of his pupils. The affectionate interest which he showed in their welfare, endeared him to their hearts, and in a very short time, he had become an immense favourite among them. By his colleagues also he was esteemed and beloved; they recognised his merits, and felt that he was a man with whom it was an honour to be associated.

At the opening of the third session of the College, it fell to his lot, as Dean of the Faculty of Sciences, to deliver the Introductory Lecture. He chose for his theme 'The Claims of Science, especially as founded in its relations to Human Nature.' This subject, it will be observed, was at once appropriate to the occasion, and in accordance with a congenial train of thought, on which his attention had been long employed. He first examines the sources, both external and internal, from which scientific knowledge is derived. He next considers the conclusion, with reference to the constitution of the material universe to which the generalisations of science point; after discussing which he enters on the inquiry with which the main body of his discourse is occupied, viz., 'Does the dominion of science terminate with the world of matter, or is there held out to us the promise of something like exact acquaintance, however less in extent, with the interior and nobler province of the mind?' In pursuing this inquiry, he first establishes the position that the mind is a proper object of science, and then discusses the nature of the relation which the mind sustains to the scientific laws of its constitution. As confirmatory of his views of the claims of science, the Professor, towards the close of his lecture, makes a felicitous reference to the testimonies and indications, bearing upon the subject, which have been left by antiquity. He says:—

'The instinctive thirst for knowledge, its disinterested character,

its beneficial tendencies, are among the most favoured topics of ancient writers. Cicero dwelt upon them with a peculiar delight, and he has invested them with more than the common charm of his eloquence. Plato made them a chief ground of his speculations concerning the just man and the well ordered state. Aristotle gave to them the testimony of one of the most laborious of human lives. Virgil devoted the fairest passage of his best poem to the delights of a calm and meditative life, occupied in the quest of truth. Lucretius drew from philosophical speculations the matter of what some have regarded as the noblest production of the Latin muse. Sophocles made knowledge, in its aspect of power, the theme of incomparably the finest of his choral odes. Æschylus made knowledge, in its other aspect of patience and martyrdom, the nobler burden of his Prometheus. And there is ground for the conjecture that such influences were not unfelt by those older poets and seers with whom our own Milton felt the sympathy of a common fate, and desired to share the glory of a common renown. The early dawn, too, of philosophy, not to speak of its subsequent and higher development in the schools of Athens and Alexandria, is full of suggestive indications. Some records, scattered indeed, and dim, and fragmentary, still exist of the successive attempts which were made in Ionia, in the cities of Southern Italy, in Greece, to penetrate the mystery of the universe, to declare what it is, and whence it came. In those speculations, vague as they are, we discern the irresistible longings of the human mind for some constructive and general scheme of truth, its inability to rest satisfied with the details of a merely empirical knowledge, its desire to escape into some less confined sphere of thought, and, if it might be, "to hold converse with absolute perfection." Nor are the efforts to which such feelings gave birth to be regarded as accidental or unmeaning. They had a prospective significance in relation to the science that was yet to appear. They were like the prelusive touches of some great master of harmony, which serve to awaken the feeling of expectancy and preparation. I affirm, and upon deliberate examination, that the peculiar order of the development of human thought which preceded the rise and growth of modern science, was not an arbitrary thing, but is in its main features susceptible of explanation. Though for any elucidation of the phenomena of nature it is utterly worthless, upon the human faculties it throws a light of illustration which can scarcely be valued too highly.

Notwithstanding the length of the preceding extract, we cannot refrain from presenting to our readers a portion of the Note which Professor Boole appended to his Essay. It will be found to contain not only a vindication of his views, with reference to the relation of the logical or pre-inductive stage of science to 'the science that was yet to appear,' but also a clear statement of the most general conclusions to which his logical investigations had already conducted him, some of which are hinted at in the closing sentences of the above passage.

'The constant effort of philosophy in her earlier stages was to establish a basis for a purely deductive system of knowledge. This, which is the final result of united experience and science, was the first aim of speculative thought, antecedent to all true science and to all exact experience. Destitute of these aids, there seems to have been but one mode in which the human mind could proceed in its quest of philosophy, viz., by projecting its own laws and conditions upon the universe, and viewing them as external realities. Such appears to me to be the true ground upon which the earlier phases of the Greek philosophy are to be explained.

'The prominent idea of the earliest schools, the Ionic, the Eleatic, &c., was that the universe was a unity. They differed in their account of this unity, variously explaining it by water, air, fire, intelligence, &c.; but the existence of some fundamental unity, comprising the whole of phenomena, was, in perhaps all of them, an agreed point. The terms unity and universe seem to have been almost regarded as convertible. The pantheistic language of Xenophanes, who, "casting up his eyes to the whole expanse of heaven, declared that the One was God," is a type of their most prevalent cast of thought.—*Aristotle, Metaphysics*, i. 5.

'In a subsequent stage of philosophy—subsequent in the order of thought, and for the most part in that of time also—there was super-added to the above conception of unity as a ground of phenomena, that of a fundamental dualism in Nature. Existence was viewed as derived from the blending or the strife of opposing elements—good and evil, light and darkness, being and non-being, matter and form, &c. To the latest periods of speculation in the ancient world, these modes of thought, of which the Manichean doctrine was but the most eminent and most practical instance, prevailed; and in those modern schemes of philosophy, "falsely so called," which attempt to deduce the knowledge of Nature, *a priori*, from some purely metaphysical principle, the same influence is apparent. Now, so wide an agreement, even in what is false, must have some foundation in reality, and ought to be regarded as a misapplication of truth rather than as a fortuitous coincidence of errors. The foundation must be sought for in the ultimate laws of thought, and the positive conclusions of science serve to show its real nature.

'All correct reasoning consists of mental processes conducted by laws which are partly dependent upon the nature of the subject of thought. Of that species of reasoning which is exemplified in Algebra, the *subject* is *quantity*, the *laws* are those of the elementary conceptions of quantity and of its implied operations. Of Logic, the *subject* is our conceptions of *classes* of things, represented by general names; the ultimate *laws* are those of the above conceptions and of the operations connected therewith. Let these two systems of thought be placed side by side, expressed, as they admit of being, in the common symbolical language of mathematics, but each with its own interpretations—each with its own laws; and together with much

that is obviously common—so much, indeed, as to have fostered the idea that Algebra is merely an application of Logic, there will be seen to exist real differences and agreements hitherto unnoticed, but not without influence on the course of human thought. The conception of the universe in the one system will occupy the place of that of unity in the other, not through any likeness of nature, as was once supposed, but through subjection to the same formal laws. Moreover, at the root of the logical system there will be found to exist a law, founded in the nature of the conception of “class,” to which the conceptions of quantity, as such, are not subject, and which explains the origin, though it does not furnish the justification of the dualistic tendency above adverted to. I conceive it unnecessary to show that a law of the mind may produce its effect upon thought and speculation, without its presence being perceived. Whatever, too, may be the weight of authority to the contrary, it is simply a fact that the ultimate laws of Logic—those alone upon which it is possible to construct a science of Logic—are mathematical in their form and expression, although not belonging to the mathematics of quantity.’

Throughout the whole of the year 1851, the year in which this Lecture was produced, Professor Boole’s pen was actively employed. In the *Cambridge and Dublin Mathematical Journal*, the *Philosophical Magazine*, and other periodicals for that year, we find numerous papers bearing his name. One of these relates to the theory of linear transformations, a branch of analysis which had begun to attract much attention among both English and Continental mathematicians. The theory had been greatly extended, both by his own labours and by those of others, more particularly by the researches of Messrs. Cayley and Sylvester, two men of high analytical power and of transcendent genius. He deemed it desirable, therefore, to pause in the prosecution of the subject, and ‘endeavour to take a connected view of the methods and results already attained;’ he considered that such a retrospect would ‘serve both to afford an estimate of its actual state of progress, and to indicate the direction in which future effort might be most usefully engaged.’ With a view to the accomplishment of this important object, as well as to supply some additions to the theory, he drew up the elaborate memoir which we have cited above, and which will be found in the sixth volume of the second series of the *Mathematical Journal*. Dr. Salmon, in his admirable work on the Higher Algebra, states that it was from this memoir that he derived his ‘first clear ideas of the nature and objects of the theory of linear transformations;’ and we believe there are other mathematicians who look back to their first perusal of that paper with equal interest for similar reasons.

Mitchell's problem of the distribution of the fixed stars* was at this time creating considerable discussion among mathematicians and astronomers. Professor Boole felt much interest in it, both because of its intrinsic importance, and because of its close connection with a class of speculations in the pursuit of which he had long been engaged. His views on the theory of probabilities seem to have been first publicly announced in a paper on this problem which was printed in the *Philosophical Magazine* for June, 1851. Two months later he communicated to the same periodical some 'further observations' on the subject. The original and comprehensive manner in which he treated the question may be inferred from what the author says towards the close of his second paper. 'The theory of probabilities has, in the view which I have been led to take of it, two distinct but accordant sources. From whichever of these it may be derived, it will be found to involve the idea of numerical magnitude; but in the one case that idea will have reference simply to the relative frequency of the occurrence of events, being in fact the received ground of the theory; in the other, to the persistency of certain forms of thought, which are manifested equally in the operations of the science of number, and in the reasonings and discourses of common life. Setting out from either of these grounds, we may, I conceive, without difficulty attain to a knowledge of the other. Now, it appears to me to be perfectly in accordance with the nature of probability that this should be the case; for its relation to number is not more essential than its relation to the manner in which events are combined. But while the expression of the former relation belongs to arithmetic, or more generally to algebra, that of the latter belongs to logic.' These views he afterwards developed more fully in his great work on the 'Laws of Thought,' which was now rapidly approaching completion.

In February, 1852, the University of Dublin conferred on Professor Boole the honorary title of LL.D., in consideration of his eminent services in the advancement of mathematical science. Great credit is due to that distinguished body for having, so early after his appointment to the chair at Cork, recognised his high scientific merits.

Late in the year 1853, our author brought to its close a labour on which he had bestowed a vast amount of profound and

* 'An Inquiry into the probable Magnitude and Parallax of the Fixed Stars, from the quantity of light which they afford to us, and the particular circumstances of their situation.' By the Rev. J. Mitchell, *Philosophical Transactions* for 1767.

patient thought. His 'Mathematical Analysis of Logic' was written hastily, and on this account he afterwards regretted its publication; but the work which he now gave to the world must be regarded as the most carefully matured of all his productions. It is entitled, 'An Investigation of the Laws of Thought, on which are founded the Mathematical Theories of Logic and Probabilities.' The principle on which the investigation proceeds is essentially the same as that enunciated by the author in his earlier logical essays; but, as he himself remarks, 'its methods are more general, and its range of applications far wider.' We shall speak of this work again, and endeavour to give some account (brief and imperfect it must necessarily be) of the system of fundamental laws on which it is based.

Among other institutions in the city of Cork with which Dr. Boole became connected was the Cuvierian Society. This society, as its name indicates, was originally established for the prosecution of the study of natural history, but its field of inquiry was subsequently enlarged so as to embrace various departments of art, science, and antiquity. Dr. Boole, besides attending its meetings, and taking a prominent part in its discussions, read before the members several papers, relating chiefly to archæological subjects. In the year 1854, he was chosen president, and on the occasion of a soirée, held at the close of the session, in the Cork Athenæum, he delivered an address, which was afterwards published, on 'The Social Aspect of Intellectual Culture.' This is an admirable specimen of what such an address should be; it is full of fine genial feeling, and shows its author to have been in thorough sympathy with those who desired to devote to mirth and friendship a brief season 'snatched from the dust and toil of life, from studies and cares, and political anxieties.' It is pitched, indeed, in a very elevated strain, but then, it is to be remembered that, though spoken on a convivial occasion, it was addressed to the ear of the educated and the refined. Many of the topics touched upon are of enduring interest. This is especially the case in the latter portion of the address, where the author ascends from the particular circumstances of the hour to the general principle on which such meetings rest, viz.:—'That within proper limits, and under proper conditions, intellectual tastes are not only compatible with social enjoyment, but tend to refine and enlarge that enjoyment; that an interest in the progress of the arts and sciences, and in the researches of the antiquary and the scholar is calculated not to destroy but to deepen our interest in humanity.' After intimating his dissent from the

opinion entertained by some that there is nothing higher and greater than humanity, he proceeds thus:—

‘Perhaps it is in the thought that there does exist an Intelligence and Will superior to our own, — that the evolution of the destinies of our species is not solely the product either of human waywardness or of human wisdom; perhaps, I say, it is in this thought, that the conception of humanity attains its truest dignity. When, therefore, I use this term, I would be understood to mean by it the human race, viewed in that mutual connexion and dependence which has been established, as I firmly believe, for the accomplishment of a purpose of the Divine mind. . . . One eminent instance of that connexion and dependence to which I have referred is to be seen in the progression of the arts and sciences. Each generation as it passes away bequeaths to its successor not only its material works in stone and marble, in brass and iron, but also the truths which it has won, and the ideas which it has learned to conceive; its art, literature, science, and, to some extent, its spirit and morality. This perpetual transmission of the light of knowledge and civilisation has been compared to those torch-races of antiquity in which a lighted brand was transmitted from one runner to another until it reached the final goal. Thus, it has been said, do generations succeed each other, borrowing and conveying light, receiving the principles of knowledge, testing their truth, enlarging their application, adding to their number, and then transmitting them forward to coming generations—

‘Et quasi cursores vitæ lampada tradunt.’

‘Now, this connexion between intellectual discovery and the progressive history of our race, gives to every stage of the former a deep human interest. Each new revelation, whether of the laws of the physical universe, of the principles of art, or of the great truths of morals and of politics, is a step not only in the progress of knowledge, but also in the history of our species.’

This short extract will serve to show that when the nature of the subject admitted of such treatment, our author could adorn his thoughts with all the higher graces of composition. We have seldom met with a more beautiful illustration, or one more aptly introduced, than that which is here drawn from Lucretius.

In 1855, Dr. Boole was married to Miss Mary Everest, daughter of the late Rev. T. R. Everest, rector of Wickwar, in the county of Gloucester, and niece of Colonel Everest,* of the Indian Survey, as also of Dr. Ryall, the vice-president and professor of Greek in Queen’s College, Cork. In her he found a true helpmeet, a woman, who, by high mental culture and natural

* Mount Everest, the highest peak of the Himalayas, was named after this distinguished officer.

endowments, was well qualified to sympathise with him in his pursuits. It is in our own knowledge that Mrs. Boole rendered essential service to her husband by copying papers, correcting sheets for the press, and doing other similar work, which a thoroughly educated woman knows so well how to execute. Five daughters were the fruit of this happy union.

The Keith Prize, consisting of a gold medal and from £40 to £50 in money, is awarded once in every two years by the Royal Society of Edinburgh, 'for the best communication on a scientific subject, communicated, in the first instance, to the Society.' Preference is given to a paper containing an original discovery. The prize is not awarded unless a paper of sufficient merit has been received within the biennial period. Now, it so happened that Professor Boole, early in the year 1857, communicated to the Edinburgh Society a paper entitled 'On the Application of the Theory of Probabilities to the Question of the Combination of Testimonies or Judgments.' This paper was read in his absence by the Right Rev. Bishop Terrot, who himself a short time before, had communicated to the Society a memoir* on a similar subject. The merits of the paper were at once perceived, and it was ordered to be printed in the 'Transactions.' It is a very elaborate investigation, occupying 56 quarto pages. For this paper the Keith medal (biennial period 1855-1857), the highest honour in the shape of prize which the Edinburgh Society has at its disposal, was awarded to Dr. Boole. The formal presentation took place on the 1st March, 1858, Professor Kelland, V.P.R.S.E., in the chair, when Bishop Terrot was requested by the Council to take charge of the prize for Professor Boole, and to express to him their 'wishes for his future success in the career to which he had devoted himself.' Professor Kelland's address on the occasion will be found in the Society's 'Proceedings,' vol. iv. 1857—1862, p. 84. The first part of this address is devoted to an account of Professor Boole's personal history. The sketch is brief and not wholly accurate; but it states one fact which deserves to be generally known. It appears that Boole's paper 'On a General Method in Analysis,' for which he received the royal medal in the department of Mathematics in 1844, was referred by the Council of the Royal Society to Professor Kelland, and that it was he (Professor Kelland) who recommended that the paper should be printed, and that some special mark of approbation should be bestowed on

* Bishop Terrot 'On the Possibility of combining two or more Probabilities of the same Event, so as to form one Definite Probability.' *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*. Vol. xxi. part 1, 1853-1854.

its author. The remaining portion of Professor Kelland's address is occupied with an account of the paper for which the Keith prize was then being awarded.

At a meeting of the Royal Society, in June 1857, Dr. Boole was elected a Fellow of that distinguished body. We wonder that he was not elected earlier; but probably the expense had hitherto hindered him from applying. There are cases in which such a hindrance should not be permitted to exist, and this was certainly one of them. A few months before his election he had communicated to the Society a memoir, entitled 'On the comparison of Transcendents, with certain applications to the theory of Definite Integrals,' which was afterwards printed in the 'Philosophical Transactions.' This memoir, it will be observed, though written in the same year as his paper on probabilities, for which he received the Keith prize, relates to an entirely distinct class of speculations. Dr. Boole seems to have always had two or three principal subjects before him, so that by turning from one to another he might diversify his intellectual life. But when once he had taken hold of a problem, and satisfied himself that its solution was practicable, though he might often have to lay it aside, yet he never wholly abandoned it; on the contrary, he returned to it again and again, constantly varying the form of attack, until he had completely mastered the difficulties that encircled it. Thus it was with the method which he had proposed for the solution of questions in the theory of probabilities. The application of that method to particular problems he had illustrated in his treatise on the 'Laws of Thought;' and yet more fully in his Edinburgh memoir. Some observations, too, on the general character of the solutions to which the method leads, founded upon induction from particular cases, were contained in the original treatise, and the outlines, still in some measure conjectural, of their general theory, were given in an appendix to the 'Memoir.' But the development of that theory was still incomplete, and so long as this was the case, he could not think of leaving it where it was. At length, after years of persistent effort, he succeeded in overcoming the analytical difficulties of the question, and in obtaining what he considered a complete development of the theory. The results of this protracted investigation he embodied in a memoir, 'On the Theory of Probabilities,' and forwarded along with a paper on a question in pure analysis, to the Royal Society. Both these memoirs were 'read' on the same day on which they were 'received,' June 19, 1862, and were printed forthwith in the Society's 'Transactions.' The latter memoir is entitled, 'On Simultaneous

'Differential Equations of the First Order in which the Number of the Variables exceeds by more than one the Number of the Equations.' To this paper, a few months later, he wrote a sequel, entitled, 'On the Differential Equations of Dynamics,' which was published in the 'Philosophical Transactions' for the following year. His last communication* to the Royal Society was being printed in the 'Transactions' at the time of his death, and it is an interesting fact that it contains a generalization of an important theorem established in his first communication to the same Society just twenty years before.

Early in the year 1858, Professor Boole was elected an Honorary Member of the Cambridge Philosophical Society. At the Oxford Commemoration in the following year he received the honorary degree of D.C.L. Among the distinguished men who were associated with him on the latter occasion were Sir John Lawrence, the present Governor-General of India, Sir A. Wilson, and Colonel Greathead. The three Indian heroes were received by the Undergraduates with great cheering.

'Their names shone bright through blood and pain,
Their swords flashed back their praise again.'

But a different reception was awarded to the man who wielded only the 'calm sceptre of his pen,' and who, in the face of poverty and great external disadvantages, had fought his way up to a commanding position in the scientific world. The Undergraduates knew nothing whatever of Boole, and indeed how could it be otherwise? His works had in them none of that kind of demonstrativeness which is so fascinating to the youthful mind.

When the Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Galway and Cork, were united so as to form the Queen's University of Ireland, Professor Boole was appointed one of the public examiners for degrees. This office he filled with the highest reputation. In 1859 he produced his 'Differential Equations,' and in the following year his 'Finite Differences,'—two works which display a vast amount of original research as well as an extensive acquaintance with the mathematical writings of others. These have become class-books at Cambridge. The circumstance is worthy of special notice; it is, we believe, unexampled, that works written by a self-taught man should attain to such a position in a university distinguished in the particular department of science to which they relate.

* The title of this paper is—'On the Differential Equations which determine the form of the Roots of Algebraic Equations.'—*Philosophical Transactions* for 1864.

In the *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, Vol. IV., 1862, there is an article, entitled 'Considérations sur la recherche des intégrales premières des équations différentielles partielles du second ordre, par G. Boldt (Lu le 7 Juin, 1861).' Respecting this article, Mr. Todhunter remarks: 'Although the name does not quite correspond, I consider that to be a misprint, and I attribute the article to Professor Boole, partly from the nature of the contents, and partly because it is known by his friends that he was engaged at a time corresponding to the date here given in the preparation of a mathematical article in French.*' He also wrote about the same time a mathematical memoir in German; it is entitled 'Ueber die partielle Differentialgleichung zweiter Ordnung $Rr + Ss + Tt + U(s^2 - rt) = V$,' and will be found in volume 61 of 'Crelle's Journal.' These seem to have been the only papers which he contributed to Continental journals.

Soon after the publication of his Treatise on Differential Equations, Professor Boole resolved that if a new edition of the work should be called for he would reconstruct it on a more extended scale. For several succeeding years his studies and researches were largely inspired and directed by this object, which, however, he did not live to accomplish. The Treatise had been for some time out of print, and he was engaged in preparing a new and enlarged edition when he was suddenly struck by the hand of death. About three weeks before this sad event the writer received from him a letter, written in evident haste, in the close of which he thus refers to his projected work:—

'I have been working, not hard, but pretty steadily (and at times hard), at my 'Differential Equations,' not yet in the press, since I last saw you. In the early summer I went to London to consult the great original memoirs on the subject (Lagrange, Euler, Legendre, &c., &c.), in the Library of the Royal Society, and remained in London nearly two months. I cannot be too thankful that I did this. When the work will actually go to the press I cannot say, I hope before long; but I have now delayed so long that it seems to me best to aim at making it as perfect as I can, regardless of time. But whether, indeed, it is a disposition to procrastinate, or a desire for an ideal excellence, or something of both, that makes me so slow in the accomplishment of what I undertake, I cannot tell. I have almost ceased to be ashamed of my neglects, and that is *not* good. Give my very kind regards to Mrs. —, and remember me to the little ones.'

* See p. 143 of 'Boole's Differential Equations.' Supplementary volume. Edited by I. Todhunter, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow and Principal Mathematical Lecturer of St. John's College, Cambridge.

This letter bears date Nov. 14, 1864. Ten or twelve days later he walked from his residence at Ballintemple to the College in Cork, a distance of little more than two miles, in a drenching rain, and lectured in his wet clothes. The result was a feverish cold, which soon fell upon his lungs and terminated fatally. Thus passed away, in the full maturity of his faculties and in the midst of intellectual labours, the fruits of which were looked forward to by scientific men with interest and expectancy, one of the deepest thinkers which this age has produced.

Dr. Boole was a man of great goodness of heart. By those who knew him intimately he was regarded with a feeling 'akin to reverence.' 'Apart from his intellectual superiority,' says one of his colleagues, 'there was shed around him an atmosphere of purity and moral elevation, which was felt by all who were admitted within its influence. And over all his gifts and graces there was thrown the charm of a true humility, and an apparent total unconsciousness of his own worth and wisdom. His intercourse with his pupils was of the most affectionate character. It was his delight to assemble those of whose conduct he approved in his own house and in association with his family; and this valuable privilege was accorded not to those who exhibited remarkable ability, but rather to those whose moral qualities had won his regard. He visited them in sickness, and where their means were limited, supplied them with those little luxuries which their cases required, but which their own resources failed to supply. The hold he had obtained on their affection was apparent in their demeanour as they followed his remains to the grave. It was evident to those friends who were admitted to his closer intimacy that higher interests than the claims of human science were gradually asserting their supremacy over his inner life. This deepening tone of religious thought and feeling did not manifest itself in any neglect of those claims; but it could not fail to be observed that the desire of earthly fame, which may have stimulated his earlier efforts, had lost its hold upon him, and that he continued his labours from a solemn sense of duty and the simple love of truth. Nor did it lead to any disregard of the common interests of life, but rather to an enlarged sympathy in the joys and sorrows of others, to a tenderness to their faults and a ready recognition of any redeeming quality in the very worst of men. You could see by the expression of his countenance that it was absolutely painful to him to hear the shortcomings of others dwelt upon in his presence.'

* From an article accompanying a portrait of Professor Boole, in the

Like many other great men, Dr. Boole was very fond of children. His playfulness with them, and his readiness to enter into their little world of thought and action, brought out very beautifully the simplicity and tenderness of his nature. In closing his letters to the writer, most of which related almost exclusively to mathematical investigations, he never failed to say, 'Remember me to the little ones;' and the little ones loved to remember him and to be remembered by him. There was no relaxation in which he so much delighted as a romp with young people; and an invitation which he once received from a party of them to come out of his study and 'roar' for them, for that he would make 'a capital lion' (!), was accepted by him as a great compliment. He thoroughly believed in the cultivation of the child element in the heart of the grown man.

In his family and among his immediate friends he was looked up to as a religious teacher and guide rather than as an author and a man of science. His piety was warm and devotional, while it was at the farthest remove from superstition and fanaticism. In short, what Mr. Lewis in his 'History of Philosophy' says of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, may be affirmed with equal truth of George Boole, Professor at Cork,—'There are few men of whom England has better reason to be proud, for to extraordinary merits as a writer and thinker, he united the most exquisite purity and generosity of character; and it is still a moot point,' among his friends, 'whether he was greater in head or heart.'

The foregoing sketch is far from being complete. When the biography of Boole is written, the materials of which we are glad to learn are being collected, many illustrations will doubtless be given of the versatility of his talent, his love of poetry and music, his fine appreciation of the beauties of external nature, his profound reverence for truth, especially religious truth,* and many other qualities of his intellect and heart which we have not so much as touched upon.

Illustrated London News for January 21, 1865. We are permitted to mention that the article was written by Dr. Ryall, of Queen's College, Cork.

* A few short passages, which we extract from letters written by Boole when he was in London in June and July, 1864, will throw some light on his theological leanings, and on one or two other related questions:—'Heard your friend in Vere Street twice yesterday. The morning sermon, such as he only of living men can preach. * * * I had a little discussion with — this morning about preaching. He said preaching was all the same thing over again—that there was no new knowledge to be got, only different ways of stating what was known or thought before. I remarked that the same words, preached with equal sincerity of conviction and feeling by two different persons,

Boole's mathematical researches have exercised a very considerable influence upon the study of the higher branches of the analysis, especially in this country. They have stimulated and directed the efforts of other investigators to an extent that is not, we think, generally known. Out of his theory of linear transformations, has grown the more general theory of co-variants,* with all its important geometrical and other applications. By his invention of an algebra of non-commutative symbols a great impulse has been given to the cultivation of the calculus of operations. His general method in analysis is the most powerful instrument which we possess for the integration of differential equations, whether total or partial. To Sir John Herschel is due the high praise of having first applied the method of the separation of symbols to the solution of linear differential equations with constant co-efficients.† But it was reserved for Gregory and Boole to set the logical principles of that method in a clear and satisfactory light; and to Boole alone belongs the honour of having extended the theory to the solution of equations with variable coefficients. His principal discoveries in this department will be found in his 'Differential Equations' and the Supplementary Volume,‡ works which,

would produce very different effects; that the personal element—the wonderful influence of man over man, must be taken into account—that it always existed, and always would exist, &c. But though he admitted, or rather did not openly dissent from this, he seemed to think, "more the pity that it is so." He would have everything like Euclid.' * * * I have just returned from hearing Maurice. To say that I was pleased is to say nothing, or what is better left unsaid. To say that I was deeply impressed is only what you would expect. But I should not express my real feeling if I said less than that I listened to him with a sense of awe. The congregation was small, but it seemed to me as if this was the feeling among them. I sat almost immediately under the pulpit, and lost no single word. We shall, I have no doubt, sometime read the sermon. The text was "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." I should exceedingly like to read the sermon carefully. The idea even crossed my mind of applying anonymously for it, but I felt that I had no right to take up the time of a man who works not for us, but for a generation, and as I think for generations to come. * * * I feel with you that I should not like to leave the Church while Maurice is in it.'

* The theory of co-variants is due to Professor Cayley. Dr. Salmon's 'Lessons introductory to the Modern Higher Algebra,' is a useful elementary guide to this important branch of mathematics. The reader will find in the preface to Dr. Salmon's work a brief historical sketch of the progress of the theory.

† *Philosophical Transactions* for 1814. 'Consideration of various Points in Analysis.' See § iv. 'On Equations of the First Degree.'

‡ This volume contains all the unpublished matter relating to differential equations which was found among Professor Boole's papers after

though primarily intended for elementary instruction, may be read with advantage by the advanced mathematical student. Other original investigations will be found in the same volumes, and more especially in those parts which relate to Riccati's equation, to integrating factors, to singular solutions, to the inverse problems of geometry and optics, to partial differential equations, and to the projection of a surface on a plane.

The calculus of logic, upon the invention of which Boole's fame may be permitted to rest, is most fully developed in his 'Investigation of the Laws of Thought.' The design of this work is—to use the author's own words—'to investigate the fundamental laws of those operations of the mind by which reasoning is performed; to give expression to them in the symbolical language of a calculus, and upon this foundation, to establish the science of logic, and construct its method; to make that method itself, the basis of a general method for the application of the mathematical doctrine of probabilities; and, finally, to collect from the various elements of truth, brought to light in the course of these inquiries, some probable intimations concerning the nature and constitution of the human mind.' Accordingly, in Boole's system, the fundamental laws of thought are deduced, not, as has sometimes been represented, from the science of Number, but from the nature of the subject itself. Those laws are indeed expressed by the aid of algebraical symbols, but the several forms of expression are determined on other grounds than those which fix the rules of arithmetic, or, more generally, of algebra; they are determined, in fact, by a consideration of those intellectual operations which are implied in the strict use of language as an instrument of reasoning. The interpretation of the symbols, and of the laws, is not mathematical but logical.

In algebra, letters of the alphabet are used to represent numbers, and signs connecting those letters, represent either the fundamental operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication, &c., or (as in the case of the sign of equality) a relation among the numbers involved in the inquiry. In Boole's calculus of logic, literal symbols are used to represent things as subjects of the faculty of conception, and other symbols are used to represent the operations of that faculty, the laws of the latter being the expressed laws of the operations signified. The canonical forms of the Aristotelian syllogism, are really symbolical; but the symbols are less perfect of their kind, than those which are employed by Boole. His adoption of algebraic symbols, and the manner in which he has applied them, is a great addition to the science of logic. Mr. Todhunter has executed his task as editor with great skill and ability.

braical signs of operation, as well as of literal symbols, and the mathematical sign of equality, enables him to give a complete expression to the fundamental laws of reasoning, and to construct a logical method, which is by far the most complete and comprehensive of any hitherto proposed.

In borrowing the notation of algebra, Boole does not assume that, in its new application, the laws by which its use is governed, will remain unchanged; such an assumption would be 'mere hypothesis.' He shows, indeed, that the ultimate laws of logic can be expressed in the symbolical language of mathematics, and that, moreover, 'those laws are such as to suggest 'this mode of expression, and to give to it a peculiar and exclusive fitness for the ends in view.' But logic is never identified or confounded with mathematics; the two systems of thought are kept perfectly distinct, each being subject to its own laws and conditions. The symbols are the same for both systems, but they have not the same interpretation; they represent in the one, objects of thought and operations of the mind, which are wholly different from the objects and operations represented by them in the other. Each set of symbols has a definite interpretation, and is subject to laws founded upon that interpretation alone. That there is, to some extent, a formal agreement between the laws in the two cases, is a discovery made *a posteriori* by actual comparison. But it is simply a mistake to regard Boole's calculus as an attempt to reduce the ideas of logic under the dominion of number.*

There are three laws to which all the symbols of algebra, which represent numbers,† are subject, viz., *the law of commutation*, expressed by $x \times y = y \times x$, or more simply, $xy = yx$; *the law of the convertibility of terms*, expressed by $x + y = y + x$, $x - y = -y + x$; and *the law of distribution*, expressed by

* This is the error which pervades the stictures on Boole's method contained in the article on Logic, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, eighth edition, p. 578. The *Investigation of the Laws of Thought* is there characterised as an 'exceedingly subtle and able work,' but the critic does not seem to have read the book with any degree of care or attention. Certainly nothing can be more unfair than his representation of Boole's calculus as an attempt 'to incorporate into the universal theory of thought a 'special and systematic development of relations of number and quantity.' If there be those who, as this writer says, 'endeavour to theorise all 'thinking by examining thought only as exerted on one kind of objects,' and who 'allege, as bearing on thought universally, laws which rule it 'only in certain cases,' Boole must not be classed among them.'

† In the higher branches of the analysis literal symbols are often used to represent not numbers, but operations, as, for instance, *differentiation*. In these cases the symbols do not always obey the laws indicated in the text.

$x(y + z) = xy + xz$, $x(y - z) = xy - xz$. In these equations, the letters x , y , z , represent any numbers whatever, the sign $=$ indicates the relation of equality, and the signs $+$, $-$, $\times$, stand for the respective operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication. These laws are fundamental; the science of algebra is built upon them. And they are axiomatic; we do not derive them by induction from many instances, but they become apparent in all their generality the moment we clearly apprehend a single instance. Thus to exemplify the first law, let it be required to multiply together the numbers 4 and 5. Any one can see that, whether we multiply 4 by 5 or 5 by 4, the result will be the same: 4 into 5 equals 5 into 4. So, in like manner, if we take any two numbers and call them 1st No. and 2nd No., we shall have 1st No. $\times$ 2nd No. = 2nd No. $\times$ 1st No., which makes evident the law of commutation. And the other laws may be exemplified in a similar manner.

Now let the notion of number be dismissed from the mind, and let the literal symbols x , y , &c., each represent a class of individuals to which a particular name or description is applicable. Further, let the combination xy represent that class of things to which the names or descriptions, denoted by x and y , are simultaneously applicable. For instance, if x alone stand for 'all men,' or the class 'men,' and y stand for the adjective 'good,' or what, for logical purposes is equivalent, all things to which the description 'good' is applicable, then, according to the proposed notation, xy will stand for 'men that are good,' or 'all good men.' The order in which the symbols are written, is indifferent; for xy and yx equally represent that class of things to the several members of which the names or descriptions x and y are together applicable. Hence we have $xy = yx$, a law which 'may be characterised by saying that the literal symbols x , y , z , are commutative, like the symbols of algebra.' In saying this, remarks Boole, 'it is not affirmed that the process of multiplication in algebra, of which the fundamental law is expressed by the equation $xy = yx$, possesses in itself any analogy with that process of logical combination which xy has been made to represent above; but only that if the arithmetical and the logical process are expressed in the same manner, their symbolical expressions will be subject to the same formal law. The evidence of that subjection is in the two cases quite distinct.'

Again, let $x + y$ represent the aggregation of the classes x and y , and let $x - y$ represent what is left, when from the class x the class y is withdrawn. For instance, if x stand for 'men,' and y for 'women,' $x + y$ will stand for 'men and

women.' If x represent 'all forms of government,' and y 'republican,' $x - y$ will represent 'all forms of government except republican.' This notation being premised, it is at once seen that in logic, as in algebra, $x + y = y + x$, $x - y = -y + x$. That is to say, *the terms are convertible.*

In the same way, it may be shown that logical symbols are *distributive*. Let x stand for the adjective 'good,' y for the class 'boys,' and z for the class 'girls;' then since it is in effect the same thing to apply the adjective 'good' to 'boys and girls' both, as to say 'good boys and good girls,' we have $x(y + z) = xy + xz$. In like manner, to apply the adjective 'tame' to such a group of animals as is expressed by the phrase 'All quadrupeds except dogs,' is the same as to say 'All tame quadrupeds except tame dogs.' So that, writing x for 'tame,' y for 'quadrupeds,' and z for 'dogs,' we have $x(y - z) = xy - xz$.

So far forth the laws of logic are seen to be identical in form with the laws which govern the general symbols of algebra. But Boole has brought to light another law of thought, and it is one to which the symbols of quantity, as such, are not subject. The combination xy represents 'the whole of that class of objects to which the names or qualities represented by x and y , are together applicable.' It follows, therefore, that if the two symbols have exactly the same signification, their combination will express no more than either of them taken alone would do. Hence, $xx = x$, $yy = y$; or, adopting the notation of algebra, $x^2 = x$, $y^2 = y$. 'This law,' remarks Boole, 'is practically exemplified in language. To say, "good, good," in relation to any subject, though a cumbrous and useless pleonasm, is the same as to say "good." Thus "good, good" men is equivalent to "good" men. Such repetitions of words are, indeed, sometimes employed to heighten a quality or strengthen an affirmation. But this effect is merely secondary and conventional; it is not founded in the intrinsic relations of language and thought.'

Now, there are only two numbers which conform to the law $x^2 = x$, viz., 0 and 1; $0^2 = 0$, and $1^2 = 1$. Instead, therefore, of seeking to determine 'the measure of formal agreement of the symbols of logic with those of number generally,' Boole compares them with the symbols of quantity, admitting only of the values 0 and 1. He virtually constructs an algebra in which the symbols x , y , z , &c., admit indifferently of these particular values, and of these alone; and he shows that 'the laws, the axioms, and the processes of such an algebra are identical in their whole extent with the laws, the axioms, and the processes of an algebra of logic.' Difference of interpretation

alone divides them. Upon this principle his logical method is founded.

The preceding general laws, deduced immediately from the constitution of language, which is 'the instrument and product 'of thought,' are confirmed by the study of those intellectual operations by which the mind combines or modifies the ideas or qualities of things. Thus, in illustration of the law $xy = yx$, Boole says,—

'Let us suppose that the universe of our discourse is the actual universe, so that words are to be used in the full extent of their meaning, and let us consider the two mental operations implied by the words "white" and "men." The word "men," implies the operation of selecting in thought from its subject, the universe, all men; and the resulting conception "men" becomes the subject of the next operation. The operation implied by the word "white" is that of selecting from its subject, "men," all of that class which are "white." The final resulting conception is, that of "white men." Now, it is perfectly apparent that if the operations above described had been performed in a converse order, the result would have been the same. Whether we begin by forming the conception of "men," and then by a second intellectual act limit that conception to "white men," or whether we begin by forming the conception of "white objects," and then limit it to such of that class as are "men," is perfectly indifferent, so far as the result is concerned. It is obvious that the order of the mental processes would be equally indifferent if for the words "white" and "men" we substituted any other descriptive or appellative terms whatever, provided only that their meaning was fixed and absolute. And thus the indifference of the order of two successive acts of the faculty of conception, the one of which furnishes the subject upon which the other is supposed to operate, is a general condition of the exercise of that faculty. It is a law of the mind, and it is the real origin of that law of the literal symbols of logic which constitutes its formal expression, $xy = yx$. The other laws admit of being illustrated in a similar manner.

In reasoning by the aid of symbols we may put out of thought the meaning of the symbols, and attend only to the laws of their combination. So long as those laws are not transgressed, we are at liberty to combine the symbols anyhow that may serve our purpose, without regard to the meaning of the symbols, or even to the question of the interpretability of intermediate results. The final result must, of course, be in an interpretable form, otherwise we should fail to attain the end for which we reason, 'the knowledge of some intelligible fact or truth.' Little progress would have been made in the higher departments of mathematical analysis if this principle had not been distinctly recognised and fearlessly applied. We owe to it our knowledge

of some of the most important theorems in the Differential Calculus and in Finite Differences. Boole's application of this principle to Formal Logic was bold and original in the highest degree. Having shown that any system of propositions may be represented by equations involving symbols, x , y , &c., which, whenever interpretation is possible, are subject to laws identical in form with the laws of a system of quantitative symbols, susceptible only of the values 0 and 1, he proceeds:—

‘But as the formal processes of reasoning depend only upon the laws of the symbols, and not upon the nature of their interpretation, we are permitted to treat the above symbols, x , y , z , as if they were quantitative symbols of the kind above described. *We may, in fact, lay aside the logical interpretation of the symbols in the given equation; convert them into quantitative symbols, susceptible only of the values 0 and 1; perform upon them, as such, all the requisite processes of solution; and, finally, restore to them their logical interpretation.* [And this is the mode of procedure which Boole actually adopts.] The processes to which the symbols x , y , z , regarded as quantitative, and of the species above described, are subject, are not limited by those conditions of thought to which they would, if performed upon purely logical symbols, be subject, and a freedom of operation is given to us in the use of them without which the inquiry after a general method in logic would be a hopeless quest.’

Numerous applications of his method are given by Boole in the ‘Laws of Thought.’ That method ‘has for its object the ‘determination of any element in any proposition, however ‘complex, as a logical function of the remaining elements. ‘Instead of confining our attention to the “subject,” and “predicate,” regarded as simple terms, we can take any ‘element, or any combination of elements entering into either ‘of them; make that element, or that combination, the “subject” of a new proposition; and determine what its “predicate” shall be, in accordance with the data afforded to us.’ In this way, also, any system of equations whatever, by which propositions or combinations of propositions, can be represented, may be analysed, and all the ‘conclusion’ which those propositions involve, be deduced from them. In the light of this method, Boole examines the Aristotelian logic and some of its modern extensions. He shows that conversion, syllogism, &c., are not the ultimate processes of logic, but themselves rest upon and are resolvable into, ulterior and more elementary processes. And the conclusion at which he arrives with respect to the nature and extent of the scholastic logic is, ‘that it is not a ‘science, but a collection of scientific truths, too incomplete to

'form a system of themselves, and not sufficiently fundamental
'to serve as the foundation upon which a perfect system may
'rest.'

It ought perhaps to be distinctly stated here that Boole did not propose his calculus of 0 and 1 as a substitute for common reasoning. He was well aware that any, the most perfect, system of formal logic must possess a theoretical rather than a practical importance. 'The perfection of the method of logic,' he says, 'may be chiefly valuable as an evidence of the speculative truth of its principles. To supersede the employment of common reasoning, or to subject it to the rigour of technical forms, would be the last desire of one who knows the value of that intellectual toil and warfare which imparts to the mind an athletic vigour, and teaches it to contend with difficulties, and to rely upon itself in emergencies. Nevertheless,' he adds, 'cases may arise in which the value of a scientific procedure, even in those things which fall confessedly under the ordinary dominion of the reason, may be felt and acknowledged.'

The power of the method is most strikingly exemplified in its application to the theory of probabilities, but that is a branch of the subject on which it is impossible here to enter. We could not exhibit the formulæ for the expansion, elimination, &c., of logical functions, or show how such formulæ may be applied to the analysis of propositions, without covering our pages with symbols that would render them as unintelligible and uninviting to the general reader as a work written in Arabic. We must therefore content ourselves with having briefly stated the axiomatic laws on which Boole's system is based, and pointed out their formal connection with the fundamental laws of Algebra. 'Mr. Boole's generalisation of the forms of logic,' says Professor De Morgan, 'cannot be separated from mathematics, since it not only demands Algebra, but such taste for thought about the notation of Algebra as is rarely acquired without much and deep practice. When the ideas thrown out by Mr. Boole shall have borne their full fruit, Algebra, although only founded on ideas of number in the first instance, will appear like a sectional model of the whole form of thought. Its forms considered apart from their matter, will be seen to contain all the forms of thought in general. The anti-mathematical logician says that it makes thought a branch of Algebra, instead of Algebra a branch of thought. It *makes* nothing; it *finds*; and it finds the laws of thought symbolised in the forms of Algebra.'—*English Cyclopædia, Art. Logic.*

In a very ingenious little work, entitled 'Pure Logic, or the Logic of Quality apart from Quantity,' Mr. W. Stanley Jevons has lately developed a system of deductive reasoning closely analogous to, and in some respects identical with, that given by Boole. Of the merits or defects of Mr. Jevons' system we shall not now speak, but we cannot close this article without saying a word or two touching his objections to Boole's method. Those objections are entitled to attention if for no other reason than this, that they evidently proceed from one who has made a careful study of the work which he undertakes to criticise. Yet we are far from being satisfied that they are well founded. His first objection is, that 'Boole's symbols are essentially different from the names or symbols of common discourse.' Here the question turns wholly upon the office assigned in the *Laws of Thought* to the symbol +, which is there used to connect terms which are mutually exclusive. It is objected that in common discourse the conjunctions 'and,' 'or,' are not invariably so used. This, however, is distinctly admitted by Boole (chap. IV., § 6), who nevertheless vindicates his mode of using the symbol +, and, as it appears to us, upon good and sufficient grounds. Mr. Jevons' second objection, viz., that 'there are no such operations as addition and subtraction in pure logic,' is founded upon a misapprehension. The mental operation indicated in Boole's system by the sign +, is that by which from the conception of two distinct classes of things, we form the conception of that group or collection of things which those classes taken together compose. Now this, as a mental operation, is wholly different from that process of the mind by which we pass from the arithmetical notion of one object to that of two, three, or more of the same. In like manner logical subtraction, expressed by the sign —, and which is the opposite or negative of logical addition, is entirely distinct as a mental operation from arithmetical subtraction. Yet Mr. Jevons enters into a somewhat elaborate argument to prove that arithmetical addition and subtraction have no place in pure logic! Another objection, viz., that Boole's system is 'inconsistent with the self-evident law of thought, the law of unity ($A + A = A$),' is equally unfounded. Mr. Jevons attaches his own meaning to the symbol +, and this is essentially distinct and different from that assigned to the symbol + by Boole. These, therefore, in the two systems, are not one and the same symbol; they are two, and any argument built upon their assumed identity must of course be fallacious. In Boole's system, the expression $A + A$, is not equivalent to A , neither does this expression in general admit of interpretation. We cannot conceive of the addition of a class A to itself.

Mr. Jevons' fourth and last objection relates to Boole's interpretations of the numerical symbols 0, 1, &c. Those interpretations are necessitated by the nature of the notation adopted. In every symbolical system there are concessions which must be made to notation.

Mr. Jevons rejects the calculus of 0 and 1, and proposes in its place a method which he thinks is equally powerful, and at the same time more simple, intelligible, and purely logical. His little book may be read with advantage in connection with the 'Laws of Thought.' In his general estimate of Boole's system we entirely concur. 'It is not to be denied,' he says, 'that Boole's system is complete and perfect within itself. It is, perhaps, one of the most marvellous and admirable pieces of reasoning ever put together. Indeed, if Professor Ferrier, in his "Institutes of Metaphysics," is right in holding that the chief excellence of a system is in being *reasoned* and consistent within itself, then Professor Boole's is nearly or quite the most perfect system ever struck out by a single writer.'

We understand that Boole has left behind him a considerable quantity of logical manuscripts, and that these are to be published either in a separate form, or in a new edition of the 'Laws of Thought.' His works are his noblest monument, but his friends and admirers are raising other memorials. Of these we may mention in particular, a memorial window in the cathedral at Lincoln, and another in the College Hall at Cork, the glass alone of the latter window is to cost £350. His widow has placed a mural tablet to his memory in the church of Ballintemple, the inscription on which is as follows:—'To the memory of George Boole, D.C.L., F.R.S., First Professor of Mathematics in the Queen's College, Cork, in whom the highest order of Intellect, cultivated by unwearied Industry, produced the Fruits of deep Humility and Child-like Trust. He was born in Lincoln, on the 2nd November, 1815. And died at Ballintemple on the 8th December, 1864. "For ever, O Lord, thy Word is settled in Heaven."'

There are some men whose office gives them celebrity; there are other men who give celebrity to their office. Boole was one of the latter: The Chair of Mathematics which he filled at Cork would not have made his name illustrious; but that chair has, through the genius and labours of its first occupant, acquired a reputation which only powers of the highest order in his successors can sustain and perpetuate.

R. H.

ART. VII.—(1.) *A Bill to amend the Representation of the People in Parliament in England and Wales.* 6th June, 1866.

(2.) *Electoral Returns*, 1865-1866.

(3.) *The New Reform Bill.* By R. DUDLEY BAXTER, M.A.

(4.) *The History of the Reform Bill.* By the Rev. W. N. MOLESWORTH, M.A.

A veteran politician discoursing lately on Reform, drew attention to the great difference between the year 1832 and the year 1866. 'In 1832,' he said, 'all was feeling, and passion, and declamation. In 1866, all is argument and calculation.'

At first sight this may seem a doubtful aphorism. The late debates in the House of Commons have not been so very calm. Argument there has been, and calculation in abundance,—but still more feeling, quite as much passion, and not a little declamation. No one listening to the organized clamour of the Tory Mountain, no one who heard the well-concerted laughter of the young Tory roughs below the gangway, or witnessed their persistent and passionate intemperance as the discussion rose in importance, would at the time be disposed to think that passion had forsaken the question of Reform. As for declamation, the parliamentary hero of the hour, the member for Calne himself, has proved himself to be, not indeed the first statesman, but beyond all competition, the first declaimer of the day. From first to last his speeches on the subject of Reform, plausible in the abstract, brilliant beyond eulogy as epideictic displays, have only served to betray a long fit of intellectual passion. If judged by the standard of practical statesmanship, Mr. Lowe's speeches must be deemed very inapplicable to the actual facts and premises of the problem, peculiarly local and English, with which, as an English statesman, he pretended to deal, while, in reality, he was dissecting an ideal problem, from the point of view of a French fanatic and political idealist. There is hardly a fallacy, hardly a vaticination of ills to arise from Reform uttered thirty years ago during the great Reform debates of 1832, which, in some form or other, Mr. Lowe has not recast and employed against the Reform Bill of 1866. And yet, as we must admit, so many men inside the House, and even outside, were found to sympathise with his passionate and intemperate prejudices, that Mr. Lowe's reputation at this moment in Parliament as an orator and statesman is probably second to that of no other man in the kingdom. So far then it would seem as if the anti-reform passions of 1866 were not very far behind those of 1832.

But although this may be true of the House of Commons,

in a certain modified sense, it is certainly not true of the public out of doors. If we look abroad, it is impossible not to be struck with the comparatively calm and exhaustive treatment, the rational, minute, and painstaking study which the many intricate questions connected with Reform have received from the country at large, both in the press and elsewhere. A man must be blind indeed who does not feel the gulf which separates him from the virulence of 1832.

It has been well said, that men are chiefly irritated by their impotencies, and the impotence of uncertainty is not the least element in political irritation. Even in the present day many politicians, otherwise honest and high minded, are tormented by their feeble grasp of the true conditions, in this country, of representative government, and fall into vacillation, inconsistency and anger, from the dread, still powerful after thirty years of contrary experience, lest we should run into the jaws of the Englishman's national bugbear,—democracy. But in 1832 the problem of Reform was a virgin problem—not, as now, a very simple corollary. Farsighted statesmen, the wisest and boldest politicians, might reasonably hesitate before they touched a system of government, the slow growth of more than half one thousand years, a system not merely venerable but complicated beyond any system of government on historical record. On one side was arrayed the veneration for a pile which, after ages of duration, had withstood convulsions under which neighbouring edifices had crumbled to their base. On the other, the sense of unendurable ills and a blind instinct striving passionately for their removal, but without any precedent on which to found any confident conclusion. It is difficult for those of us who are not old enough to remember that period, to form any adequate conception of the intensity of the agitation which led to the Reform Bill of 1832, and the mingled suffering, ignorance, and simplicity, of the large mass of the people who engaged in that agitation so fervently. A London meeting on Primrose Hill in the present day is a matter of some importance and respectability. If sneered at by foes, it is simply noted by friends. But there is something touching and idyllic, something which lifts the curtain of another age and introduces us into a different period, when we read of the colliers of Bilston, who travelled to London with two cartloads of coal to ask the Regent to cure all their distress, or of the intended pilgrimage of the blanketeers in 1817, who, each with his blanket, was to have walked up to London, and to have asked for Reform as the great remedy for his own wretchedness and all the evils of his country. Still more curious is it to read of the anger and alarm awakened in

the upper classes by these innocent proceedings, of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, and the imprisonment of the leaders.

But the feelings of the people ran higher. At Blackburn, in 1819, a female Reform Society issued circulars, calling upon the wives and daughters of the workmen to help to instil into the minds of the rising generation a 'deep-rooted hatred of our tyrannical rulers,' while on their side the Government, instead of inquiring into the causes of the disaffection, called upon the yeomanry of the 'disturbed counties' to hold themselves in readiness to put down disaffection by the sword. At Birmingham, a meeting of 15,000 men elected 'two legislative attorneys and 'representatives of Birmingham,' one of whom, Sir Charles Wolseley, was forthwith arrested by the Government. At Manchester, a monster meeting of 80,000 people, peaceably assembled from all the neighbouring towns, was brutally, and without provocation, attacked by the yeomanry, who wantonly sabred some three or four hundred persons, outrages followed up by enactments directing the seizure of arms, the suppression of drilling, and the punishment of seditious libels. These repressive measures were followed by a lull of something like ten years, the circumstances of which cannot be too maturely studied by the modern opponents of Reform. The Government had been victorious, the people had seemingly acquiesced in their defeat, their defenders in the House were few, and the name of Reform had become so odious to the immense majority of members, that any further struggle appeared visionary and impracticable. It might well have been thought on any superficial survey that the question was finally set at rest. But it was characteristic of the political wisdom of the great body of the English people, that while they retreated from their ends under the slightest pressure of the law, opinion was slowly but irresistibly maturing the change of the law itself. We shall not here enter into the detail of the parliamentary events between 1819 and the eve of the great Reform Bill. No doubt the oppressive legislation in favour of the landed interest which followed the great wars with Napoleon, no doubt the Catholic agitation and Emancipation, the election of Daniel O'Connell, the accession of William IV. and the French Revolution of 1830—all worked together in favour of the cause of Reform in Parliament. But the point to observe is, how the latent popular instinct in favour of Reform ultimately moulded these events and each separate parliamentary combination to its own ends, absorbing every separate stream into its own hidden channel, until the full flood broke above ground and carried everything before it. The corn laws were oppressive, and people cried for Reform. The introduction of machinery

was odious to the masses. They broke the machinery, and asked for Reform. The Orange Tory party hated Catholic Emancipation, and their champion, Lord Blandford, embodied their hatred in repeated demands for Reform. The election of Mr. O'Connell led to the disfranchisement of the Irish forty shilling freeholders who had elected him. But Mr. O'Connell, elected, asked leave to bring in a Reform Bill, embracing triennial parliaments, universal suffrage, and the ballot. In the meantime the people had suffered cruelly. Agricultural labourers were found starved to death, while landlords dropped their rents in vain, and clergymen in vain abated their tithes. Through twenty-six counties, night after night the sky was a-blaze with stacks on fire, while the peasantry, in the irony of their despair, cut the hose of the fire-engines, and resisted the firemen. Farmers were frightened out of their wits, agitators were violent, Conservatives reckless, calmer politicians were awe-struck and perplexed, judges published stories of mysterious foreigners, with whom our prisons were supposed to be filled, and peers wrote letters to substantiate the legends set afloat and believed in by an Eldon.

If from the agitation out of doors we turn to the arguments employed inside the House, we find raging round the calmer sense of the great leaders, the same intensity of feeling, the same passionate appeals to everything relevant or irrelevant that could be dragged into the service of one side or the other, and the same heaping up of sense and nonsense, fallacies and truths, peculiar to every large assembly in times of great political agitation. Much has been said of late respecting the coldness and want of sympathy, the narrowness and even hardness of Earl Russell. And, no doubt, we are apt to forget that Earl Russell has passed through many vicissitudes. But in the midst of the extraordinary heat of the Reform period, the attitude and the language of Lord John Russell were singularly striking. The iced and self-contained but not by any means arrogant brevity of his demonstration in a house breathless with excitement, and the curt, quiet, and condensed but marvellous transparency of his exposition, offer an artistic and rhetorical contrast to the temper of his audience not below the most studied and splendid efforts of the greatest orators. His introductory speech on the celebrated 1st of March, 1831, contains so many curious points of interest in relation to his last Reform Bill, now before the country, that we cannot forbear quoting from it. The House was so crowded, that somebody got up to ask if a member had a right to the seat he had labelled with his name. To which the Speaker answered, that he had that right by courtesy, pro-

vided he came to prayers, but took the opportunity to hint the sarcasm, that members who were so very anxious to hear the debate might as well have kept their seats. The confusion had been intense. The lobbies and staircases were crowded. The doors by which the public were admitted were not opened, owing to the pressure of business, until nearly five o'clock. The violence of the struggle to gain admission was so great that the Speaker had threatened to order the galleries to be cleared. Lord J. Russell, then Paymaster of the Forces, entered the House on the stroke of six, and was received with a burst of prolonged cheering. After explaining the part which he had taken in the preparation of the Bill, answering those who asked 'whether he could pretend to satisfy the public mind without endangering the settled institutions of the country?' He said:—'Sir,—We are of opinion that to attempt to satisfy the public mind will not endanger the settled institutions of the country; but not to satisfy that, will endanger them. We are of opinion that these institutions, resting as they have ever done on the confidence and love of Englishmen, must continue to rest on the same foundation. . . . We wish to place ourselves between the two hostile parties, and fix ourselves on what is, I hope, firm and steadfast ground, between the abuses we wish to amend, and the convulsions we hope to avert.' He then stated concisely the arguments in favour of Reform, looked at as a question of right, as a question of reason, and as a question of policy and expediency. Treating of right, 'The ancient constitution of your country declares that no man should be taxed for the support of the State, who has not consented, by himself or his representative, to the imposition of these taxes. The well-known statute—*de tallagio non concedendo*—repeats the same language, and although some historical doubts have been thrown upon it, its legal meaning has never been disputed. It included "all the freemen of the land," and provided that each county should send to the Commons of the realm two knights, each city two burgesses, and each borough two members. Thus, no doubt, at that early period, the House of Commons did represent the people of England. No man of common sense pretends that this Assembly now represents the commonalty or people of England. If it be a question of right, therefore, right is in favour of Reform.' The passage which follows is almost classical for simplicity and beauty. 'Let us now look at the question as one of reason. Allow me to imagine, for a moment, a stranger from some distant country, who should arrive in England to examine our institutions. All the information he had collected would have told

‘ him that this country was singular for the degree which it had attained in wealth, in science, and in civilization. He would have learned that in no country have the arts of life been carried further, nowhere the inventions of mechanical skill been rendered more conducive to the comfort and prosperity of mankind. He would have made himself acquainted with all its fame in history, and, above all, he would have been told that the proudest boast of this celebrated country was its political freedom. If, in addition to this, he had heard that once in six years this country, so wise, so renowned, so free, chose its representatives to sit in the great council where all the ministerial affairs were discussed and determined, he would not be a little curious to see the process by which so important and solemn an operation was effected. What then would be his surprise if he were taken by his guide whom he had asked to conduct him to one of the places of election, to a green mound, and told that this green mound sent two members to Parliament, or to be taken to a stone wall with three niches in it, and told that these three niches sent two members to Parliament, or if he were shown a green park with many signs of flourishing vegetable life, but none of human habitation, and told that this green park sent two members to Parliament ! But his surprise would increase to astonishment if he were carried into the north of England, where he would see large flourishing towns, full of trade activity, containing vast magazines of wealth and manufactures, and were told that these places had no representatives in the Assembly, which was said to represent the people. Suppose him after all—for I will not disguise any part of the case—suppose him to ask for a specimen of popular election, and to be carried for that purpose to Liverpool, his surprise would be turned into disgust at the gross venality and corruption which he would find to pervade the electors. After seeing all this would he not wonder that a nation which had made such progress in every kind of knowledge, and which valued itself for its freedom, should permit so absurd and defective a system of representation any longer to prevail ? But whenever arguments of this kind have been urged, it has been replied, and Mr. Canning placed his opposition to Reform on this ground : “ We agree that the House of Commons is not in fact sent here by the people ; we agree that in point of reason the system by which it is sent is full of anomaly and absurdity ; but Government is a matter of experience, and so long as the people are satisfied with the actual working of the House of Commons, it would be unwise to embark in theoretical changes.” Of this argument I confess

'I always felt the weight, and so long as the people did not answer the appeals of the friends of Reform, it was indeed an argument not to be resisted. But what is the case at this moment? *The whole people call loudly for Reform.** That confidence, whatever it was, which formerly existed in the constitution of this House, exists no longer; it is completely at an end. Whatever may be thought of the particular acts of the House of Commons, I repeat that the confidence of the country in the construction and constitution of the House of Commons is gone, and gone for ever. I would say more—I would say that it would be easier to transfer the flourishing manufactories of Leeds and Manchester to Gatton and Old Sarum than to re-establish the confidence and sympathy between this House and those whom it calls its constituents. I end this argument, therefore, by saying that if the question be one of right, right is in favour of Reform; if it be a question of reason, reason is in favour of Reform; if it be a question of policy and expediency, policy and expediency speak loudly for Reform.'

Lord John Russell proceeded to unfold the Government measure into which we need not follow him, but it is curious in the course of his argument, to find him quoting Sir Robert Peel's aphorism, that 'the franchise is a trust,' (and could therefore be taken away,) a doctrine which has played such a part in the late discussions. Then we find that at first in their difficulty to discover on what principle the franchise should be bestowed, the framers of the Reform Bill at one time bethought themselves of adopting the qualification of juries, which cropped up again the other day, but abandoned it as too large and exclusive. Having gone through all the details of the Bill, he wound up by answering the various objections in detail.

'Our opponents say our ancestors gave old Sarum representatives, and therefore we should give Old Sarum representatives. *We say our ancestors gave Old Sarum representatives because it was a large town; therefore we give representatives to Manchester which is a large town.* I think we are acting more as our ancestors would have acted, by letting in representatives for our great commercial and manufacturing towns than by excluding such representatives. I may be told that the proposed reform is contrary to the principle of Parliament as

* It is said, that the absence of the same agitation now, is an argument against Reform. The answer is that owing to the success of the first Reform Bill, the question of Reform has necessarily become a question more of reason than of passion. In proportion to the spirit of the times, the demand for Reform now is probably as earnest as it was in 1832.

settled at the time of the Revolution, and Mr. Burke may be quoted in support of the proposition that as the same places continue to send representatives, the principle of the constitution must be the same. But whilst I acknowledge Mr. Burke's transcendent abilities and unequalled powers of reasoning, I cannot approve of his mode of arguing this question. He might as well have held that the principles of the Roman empire in the time of Augustus were the same as the principles of the Roman republic in the days of the first Brutus, as to say that because Old Sarum, from its size and importance in the time of Edward III., sent representatives to Parliament it should continue to send those representatives, or else we should no longer follow up the principle of our ancestors in forming the constitution of this House. It has been asserted also if a reform were to be effected, that many men of great talents, who now get into this House for close boroughs would not be able to procure seats. I have never entertained any apprehensions of the sort, for I believe that no reform that can be introduced will have the effect of preventing wealth, probity, learning and wit from having their proper influence upon elections. My learned and honourable friend near me, his Majesty's Attorney General, is an illustrious instance that in large and populous boroughs lawyers of eminence and gentlemen of great talents and public spirit will be spontaneously chosen. It may be said too, that one great and injurious effect of the measures I propose, will be to destroy the power and privileges of the aristocracy. This I deny. I utterly deny that this plan can have any such effect. Wherever the aristocracy reside, receiving large incomes, performing important duties, relieving the poor by charity, and evincing private worth and public virtue, it is not in human nature that they should not possess a great influence upon public opinion, and have an equal weight in electing persons to serve their country in Parliament. Though such persons may not have the direct nomination of members under this Bill, I contend that they will have as much influence as they ought to have. But if by aristocracy those persons are meant who do not live among the people, who know nothing of the people, and who care nothing for them, who seek honours without merit, places without duty, and pensions without service, for such an aristocracy I have no sympathy; and I think the sooner its influence is carried away with the corruption on which it has thriven, the better for the country in which it has repressed so long every wholesome and invigorating influence. Language has been held on this subject, which I hope will not be heard

'in future. A call has been made upon the aristocracy—all who are connected with it have been summoned to make a stand against the people. Some persons have even ventured to say, that they by their numerical strength, could put down what they call sedition.* But the question at issue does not respect the putting down of sedition. The real question is, whether, without some large measure of Reform, the business of the country can be carried on with the confidence and support of the people? I shall not ask whether you can resist Reform, but I say that it has become a question whether or not the constitution would perish if Reform be deferred. This House, in its unreformed state, has nothing to look to but the sympathy, confidence, and support of the nation. If it now refuses Reform, that sympathy will be withheld—that support will be denied. I ask you, then, whether, when his Majesty's Ministers are convinced that Reform is necessary, and when they have the approbation of their gracious Sovereign for bringing this proposition before the House; when they declare that Reform is indispensable; when multitudes of petitions pour upon your table, and myriads of voices out of doors put forth a just request for Reform—will this House say, "We are judges of our own honesty, we despise the advice of the Crown, and the demands of the people, whom we profess to represent?" Will this House say, "We will keep our power, keep it how we may; we regard not the petitions of the people, and are ready to abide by all the consequences of our refusal?" I appeal Sir, in my turn, to the aristocracy. The gentlemen of

* This is an extremely curious passage read in the light of subsequent events. No doubt the Duke of Wellington thought a little grape-shot would do more good than all the Reform in the world. But it is important to note, what too many politicians are in the habit of forgetting—that in this country the centre of resistance is above and not below the line of numbers, and that, too, owing to the relative balance of wealth, numbers and traditionary influence, apart from legislative enactments. The Chartist riots of 1848 proved, what any man looking about him with his eyes open needs no proof to see, that if it came to a struggle *en masse* between work below and wealth above, wealth would carry the day. A *Jacquerie* in England, so long as the middle class is satisfied and convinced, is an impossibility. Men who hold up the fear of revolution in this country to our eyes sacrifice their reputation for insight into their own institutions. In the days of the Reform Bill our fathers had not the same experience, and Lord John Russell's words were all the nobler for their political faith and elevation. In the present day the cry of revolution and democracy is a mere tactical feint, unworthy of the attention of real politicians. The conditions of the problem are changed. We have not now to guard against democracy or revolution. We have to consult political justice to all parties, and political justice alone.

‘England have never been found wanting in any great crisis. When the country was engaged in war against the national enemy—when its honour and security were assailed—they were ever foremost. When burdens were to be borne, they were ever as ready to bear their share as any other class of the community. I ask them now, when a great sacrifice is to be made, to show their generosity—to convince the people of their public spirit—and to identify themselves for the future with the people. Upon the gentlemen of England then, I call. I ask them to come forward, and, by their conduct on this occasion to give security to the Throne, stability to Parliament and the Constitution, and strength and peace to the country.’ A noble appeal which he concluded by words which stand in a fine contrast of generous sagacity with the hard and brilliant selfishness of Mr. Lowe’s political creed on Reform. ‘We have a right to be believed* when we assert that it is not for any sinister end of our own we bring forward the present measure, but because we are interested in the future welfare of this country, which welfare we conceive to be best consulted by the adoption of a timely and an effective Reform—because we think, that, by such a course alone we shall be enabled to give permanency to that constitution which has been so long the admiration of nations, on account of its popular spirit, but which cannot exist much longer, unless strengthened by an additional infusion of popular spirit, commensurate with the progress of knowledge and the increased intelligence of the age. To establish the constitution on a firm basis, you must show that you are determined not to be the representatives of a small class, or of a particular interest; but to form a body who, representing the people, springing from the people, and sympathising with the people, can fairly call on the people to support the future burdens of the country, and to struggle with the future difficulties which it may have to encounter; confident that those who call upon them are ready to join them heart and hand: and are only looking, like themselves, to the glory and welfare of England.’ This is a long quotation. But its bearing upon the subject of the day is close enough to serve as an apology.

* Lord John Russell had just appealed to the firmness with which ‘a system of agitation, which had commenced in the sister kingdom,’ had been put down by the Ministers, as a proof of their disinterestedness. The parallel between the circumstances he alludes to as having preceded the Reform Bill and the suppression of Fenianism, is curious. A still more curious parallel will be found by those who care for such coincidences, between the appearance of the cholera at that time and the present cattle plague.

Sir Robert Inglis' speech, which followed after Lord Russell's motion had been seconded, contains the undiluted creed of the anti-reformers which in more modern debates have only been diluted and re-adapted to the newer state of things. 'He approached the discussion of this question with a sensation of awe at the contemplation of an abyss.' 'The House was called upon to declare that it is incompetent to the just discharge of its functions.' 'His Majesty's advisers for the first time in nearly fifty years, were pledging themselves and trying to pledge the king to the doctrine "that the House of Commons is unworthy of the confidence of the people."' 'Those who talked of the people demanding their rights were using threats at the House.' 'Their deliberative character was going to be annihilated.' 'He denied the fact that the people of England did demand reform.' 'The year 1831 was just like former years, and the people cared no more in 1831 for Reform than in 1731.' He quoted Burke in 1770 to show that the picture of distress was just as black then as in 1831. 'Yet, by God's blessing, we survived the crisis.' (It is wonderful how a comfortable squire will bless God that the wretched are wretched still, as they have been even heretofore, he and his family having been comfortable for a whole pride of generations.) 'A Reform Bill in 1782 was introduced, and they were told they would be ruined if they did not pass it.' 'They resisted the cry, and (by God's blessing again) they were safe.' 'Look at 1792; look at 1819, the Manchester riots and the London Press; look at 1823, and you had instances enough to show that *clamour could be silenced without concession.*' 'The distress was not general, the agitation not spontaneous.' 'The number of the petitions was small compared with that on the occasion of the Catholic emancipation.' 'Petitions for change should not be treated with the same respect as petitions for the *conservation of the blessings they enjoy.*' (!) 'This House was not to be a collection of Deputies, as in Holland.' [Lege, America, Australia.] 'Our constitution is not the work of a code-maker —not a building but a tree.' 'Who could *prove* that Old Sarum or Gatton were ever bigger than they are?' 'It was a question of *communities* not of numbers.' 'Population had never been a constitutional test of representation.' 'This measure was founded on a *rash and untried theory, a vain and unsubstantial speculation.*' 'It was founded on no precedent.' 'Many boroughs had been small towns from the beginning.' 'No town could have been a big town that never had a market.' 'Old Sarum was a green mound! What then? It was always for representative purposes a green mound.' 'Such a place

'proved that the intention of the constitution was that certain great families should be represented.'*

'The object of the Bill was revolution: revolution overturning at once the existing influences of property and of rank, leading ultimately to the destruction of the other orders of the State.' 'The constitution of England was fixed at the Revolution, and at the Revolution only.' 'At any rate,' and 'here we quote verbatim words which recal Mr. Lowe's splendid vaticinations, 'at any rate, and in the first instance, as the noble lord will himself admit, his measure completely overturns that system of representation under which, whatever may be its faults in the eye of theory, this country has practically enjoyed blessings above those of any other nation; that system, under which those walls have received, for successive generations, bodies of men, who, whether elected with more or less of the influence of the crown, of the aristocracy, or of the people, have here displayed more integrity, more talent, more capacity to serve their country, and more zeal to serve it, than have ever been combined in any other assembly, in any other country, in any period of history.' One might almost fancy oneself listening to Mr. Lowe.

We appreciate Mr. Lowe's talents and the marvellous brilliancy and condensed energy of his oratory too sincerely; we admire the amazing vigour of his rhetorical artillery far too cordially to do him the injustice of comparing him for one moment with the somewhat heavy parts of Sir Robert Inglis. But if we put genius aside, and look to political argumentation alone, surely the foundation of Mr. Lowe's chief arguments, the red cloth from which he cuts out his most elaborate democratical bugbears, are all to be found in Sir Robert Inglis's speeches, without any resort to Canning. Mr. Lowe tells us that 'we are about to barter maxims and traditions, that have never failed, for theories and doctrines that never have been tried.' Such an assertion is one of those splendid feats of acrobaticism which none but a cool-headed and consummate artist knows how to play over the heads of an audience at once prejudiced and amazed, but spell-bound and enthusiastic. 'Theories,' 'Doctrines,' 'never tried!' In Mr. Lowe's opinion, it would seem that the experience of the last thirty-four years, a period probably equal for impetus and rapidity of

* His words are curious. 'The castle remained, and it was probably invested with the elective franchise, in order that the holder of that castle, the Earl of Salisbury of that day, might place his Representatives in this House.'

combination to any three hundred years recorded in history,—is not the experience on which we can found a Reform Bill ! But, moreover, according to Mr. Lowe, we should consider that 1832 was the year in which our constitution, which is a growth, a tree, not a building, (a metaphor we cordially accept, repudiating the corollaries grafted upon it) was fixed. It was fixed in 1832, since which time everything has worked so well, that it would be madness to touch the machinery again. But according to Sir Robert Inglis, this glorious growth was 'fixed' in 1688 at our glorious Revolution. What in the eyes of Sir Robert Inglis were the glories of the Revolution of 1688—that in the speeches of Mr. Lowe were the glories of Reform in 1832. Mr. Lowe has not the same excuse as Sir Robert Inglis. Mr. Gladstone said with fine discrimination that the Reformers of 1832 are not to be judged by the standard of 1866. The Reformers of 1832 were comparatively without experience; the Reformers of 1866 have the direct experience of one full third of a century—years full of European vicissitudes, during which England has grown more and more calm, prosperous and strong. In a speech, which received very much less attention than it deserved, Sir Edward Manningham Buller drew a most pregnant and instructive parallel between the prediction of the great Sir Robert Peel before the Reform Bill of the evils which would probably follow its enactment, and the actual course of events. Sir Robert Peel said, that a £10 franchise would, he feared, throw the power of election almost entirely into the hands of that class which must necessarily be the least competent to form a sound opinion on political questions. These people, he said, would abolish taxes on industry and the necessaries of life, they would break up the East India Company's monopoly, they would repeal the corn laws. So they did, and Sir Robert Peel, to his immortal honour, helped them to do it, and was followed to a premature grave by the blessings of a united country. But, moreover, they would vote for triennial parliaments and ballot. They have almost forgotten the idea of triennial parliaments, and the ballot is not in greater favour now than it was then. Again, Sir Robert Peel feared that they would require the abolition of the traffic in the flesh and blood of the negro, and under the wing of some democratic Chancellor of the Exchequer, would shake the credit of the country, paralyze commerce, derange industry, and imperil the high position which England held among nations. The traffic in the flesh and blood of the negro has been abolished, and had the wisdom of the revolutionary ten-pounders been followed by the aristocratic politicians of the Slave States of America, who,

until the secession, were politically supreme, the greatest calamity in history would have been averted. Our credit is more astounding, our commerce more gigantic, the bases of England's position more deeply settled, than they ever were, and if there is any fear lest our industry should be deranged, it is that by the exclusion of labour from its proper share in the representation of the country, class hatreds and class fallacies should be allowed to fester and rankle in the dark, instead of being dealt with, as they ought to be dealt with, on the floor of the House of Commons, and in the face of the country. The parallel, recalled by Sir E. M. Buller, is one of the most felicitous which the late debates have disclosed. He might have clenched it still further by pointing out, that the constitutional innovations which Sir Robert Peel dreaded—triennial parliaments, annual parliaments, universal suffrage, vote by ballot, are precisely those results which the Reform Bill has not produced, and from which we are receding; whereas, those changes in our social condition and legislation which were prophesied as desperate evils, have actually turned out to be the best political fruits of the Reform Bill, and acknowledged as such by a recalcitrant opposition. Not only then have we experience of the effects of the extension of the suffrage, but that experience points in the most conclusive way to the expediency of extending Reform. To say that different opinions still exist as to the best Reform Bill, to say that of the different parties in the state, each wished to extend the building rather in their own direction, to say that it was a political problem, how to satisfy all parties—all this would have been legitimate. But to say that we have no experience, that we are legislating on theory in the dark, is a piece of recklessness which exceeds even the traditional recklessness of Mr. Lowe.

But recklessness need not exclude legerdemain. It was a masterpiece of legerdemain to paint sincere and moderate reformers as visionary theorists and mere speculators, while the very foundation of the orator's arguments, as was said in the course of the debate, was itself a hypothetical theory, namely, that similar institutions in dissimilar countries would produce similar results. This is a theory false on the face of it. But it involves an additional fallacy which runs through all Mr. Lowe's late speeches—a fallacy the transparency of which was only masked by the brilliancy of his fireworks. 'The British Constitution is unique,' he said, 'it is like nothing else, 'it is 'fearfully and wonderfully grown—don't speculate about any-thing so unlike anything else—don't theorise, above all, for 'God's sake do not touch it, for nobody knows what one touch

'may do.' And in the same breath, Mr. Lowe drew illustrations from France, from America, and from Australia, to prove that if you lower the franchise to £7, you will have—what? some extraordinary complication, some incalculable combination, which no man can foresee? No, but a French, American, or Australian democracy. The mountain of the British constitution was to be dissolved by magic at a touch, and nothing remain but the level plain of an American or Australian democracy. We admit that the British Constitution is absolutely unique. But, because it is unique, it is not to be judged by a French, an American, or an Australian standard. The records of our own legislation are our only standard, and judged by this standard all the fallacies and bugbears of democracy and book-theories drawn from other countries vanish in mid air. If we had universal suffrage to-morrow, we should not, in this country, have a democracy. The character of the British nation is formed, its temper settled, and you might as well hope to change the brain of the Chancellor on the woolsack by changing the colour of his silk stockings or stuffing his woolsack with cotton instead of wool, as hope to change the general temper of the country and the traditional tendency of our institutions by any extension of the suffrage whatever.

But Mr. Lowe was too deft a tactician not to know how to turn the prosperity consequent on the Reform Bill to his own uses. 'What more would you have?' he asks. 'Who but madmen want more reform, when there is nothing left to reform? Are you not rich, are you not prosperous, are you not free, are not your freedom, your prosperity, your riches, greater than in any other country in the world? Is not your legislation almost perfect, and have you any abuses left to speak of? If you have, where are they, show them to me, let me look at them, and if you have not, then in heaven's name have you not good government, and is not good government the ultimate end of any system of government whatever?'

This argument had an immense effect at the time on a large minority in the House of Commons and throughout the country. But after an interval of reflection, even those who were most fascinated by it, began to see that under a representative system it is not possible in this country to separate the idea of good government from that of free representation. Accordingly, in his last and greatest speech, Mr. Lowe changed his base of operations again, and fell back upon his anti-democratic line of argument, combining it cleverly with the cause of freedom against the rule of numbers. He admitted that democracies might be prosperous, but he touched a deeper string, and wound up with

British freedom. His wonderful peroration, so selfishly brilliant, is likely to remain a classical monument in our literature. 'To our hands,' he said, after a speech almost equally marvellous, 'is entrusted the noble and sacred future, *free self-government all over the world.*'* We are about to exchange certain good 'for more than doubtful change—we are about to barter maxims and traditions which have never failed, for theories and doctrines which have never succeeded. Democracy you may have at any time. Night and day the gate is open that leads to that bare and level plain, where every ant's nest is a mountain and every thistle a forest tree. But a Government such as that of England is the work of no human hand. It has grown up imperceptibly. It is a creation of centuries. *It is a thing which we only enjoy, we cannot impart to other countries, and which we could not recover for ourselves.* Because you have contrived to be at once dilatory and hasty heretofore, it is no reason for pressing forward rashly and improvidently. To precipitate a decision even in the case of a single human life would be cruel. It is more than cruel, it is parricide in the case of a constitution which is the life and soul of this great nation. If it is to perish—as all mortal things must perish—give it at any rate time to gather its robe around it, that it may fall with decency and deliberation.'

'To-morrow! That is sudden.

O, spare it! spare it. It ought not so to die!'

How, if 'we alone enjoy free self-government, if we cannot impart it, and could not recover it if we lost it,' how, if all this is true, the cause of such freedom *all over the world* is bound up with its fate at home, we cannot quite see. But let us waive that point. By first playing upon the natural prepossession of every assembly in favour of its own perfections, and then with consummate ability embroidering the background, so skilfully laid, with democratic horrors, with the superadded ridicule of assumed flesh-and-blood arguments, and the industriously paraded haste and immaturity of the Government Bill, Mr. Lowe had contrived to catch Parliament in its most secret prepossessions. The enthusiasm of Conservatives knew no bounds when they found their very hearts translated in the unequalled language of an ardent and reckless liberal.

* 'All over the world!' In Australia, in America, in France, therefore? But how? Are they going to retrace their steps? Are they under the benign influence of our example, about to reascend from 'the plain in which every ant's nest is a mountain and every thistle a forest tree,' to those regions where thistles are thistles and insects are insects?

The time we have devoted to Mr. Lowe will not, we trust, be thought out of proportion to the sensation his speeches have created. Nor need we grudge him the compliment of admitting, that many articles might be written if we were to discuss all the views touched upon by him in the course of his already famous disputations. But, for practical purposes, the really important part of his argument may be reduced under two heads: one, the celebrated maxim of Sir Robert Walpole, *Quæta non movere*; the other, that good government is the sole end of legislation. It is true Mr. Lowe did talk of the sacred cause of free self-government. But on this point we are all agreed. And that which leads Mr. Lowe to abandon his party on the best means of securing that sacred cause is, in fact, the difference between us on the other two points. Mr. Lowe says, 'Let well alone.' We say, 'Certainly. Let well alone. Provided it be well.' But is it well? So long as pauperism lies like a dark shadow across the country, so long as whole sections of our working classes live the lives of animal drudges, with animal instincts, and scarcely the mind and soul of human beings, so long as shoals of children are permitted to remain without the common rudiments of morality and civilization, so long it is not *well*, and to say that it is well, is cynical, selfish, and unstatesmanlike.

If we are told, that admitting these evils, it does not follow that they are capable of cure, but if capable of cure, that our present Parliament, constituted as it is, is more likely to remedy them and to deal paternally with "the oppressed" than the Parliament we propose, our answer is twofold.

We answer, first, that the experience of the legislation which followed the Reform Bill of 1832 teaches us, if it teaches anything, that under a representative system, class evils must be dealt with by the representatives of that class. True, the gentlemen of England have always been very patriotic; take them all in all, a noble race of men. We admit it. We admit it cheerfully. But that did not prevent this noble race of men from indulging in class legislation; and grinding down the middle classes below them, until the middle classes rebelled much to their own benefit, and quite as much to the benefit of the patriotic gentry and nobility themselves whom they no longer permitted to oppress them. How emancipation was eventually to help them, nobody at the time exactly saw. The Conservatives stoutly denied that anything would come of it but evil. How the admission of the working classes into Parliament now, is eventually to remove the evils under which they labour—evils quite as grievous in proportion so far as they are concerned, quite as dangerous so far

as those above them are concerned, as were the grievances of the middle classes and the dangers threatening the aristocracy in 1832—it may be equally difficult to see. But it requires little confidence to say, that we in our generation have a much clearer idea, in the main, of the general course of legislation required to raise the working classes out of the mire than our fathers had. We may not know beforehand what will be the exact steps which a Reformed Parliament will take. Sir Robert Peel prophesied the repeal of the Corn Laws. How they would be repealed he probably did not see. But this we take to be certain; in order that the working classes may help themselves now, as the middle classes helped themselves then, the working classes must be admitted to Parliament now, as the middle classes were admitted to Parliament then—that is to say, in sufficient force to carry weight and authority into deliberation. In other words, we believe that a Reformed Parliament in which the true working classes will have an authoritative share, will legislate better than the present Parliament, not only for themselves, but for the country at large. And this is our first answer.

Our second answer is: if the present Parliament were capable of legislating for the working classes as it ought, which we deny, such legislation would be paternal legislation, not representative legislation; and the first postulate of English legislation is, that to be good, it must be representative. A is not to legislate for B, nor B for A; but A and B together are to legislate for A and B together. Under our present system, A and B together legislate for A and B together. But they legislate for C into the bargain. Our representation is, therefore, defective, and our Government, whether it happens to legislate wrong, or to legislate right, is not and cannot be good government in the representative sense, exactly in proportion as it is paternal and not representative government.

If it is objected, that the plea for the representation of the working classes points to one inevitable conclusion, the rule of numbers, and the ascendancy of one class over all others, we deny it emphatically. We deny that the introduction of Commerce into Parliament has annihilated the representation of Land. Even now, if a question such as the cattle plague arises which happens to touch the landed interests collectively, Land can ride across Parliament like a regiment of dragoons. And we hold it ridiculous, if Commerce has not swamped Land, to suppose it even within the bounds of possibility that Labour should ever be able to swamp both, especially in a country where the roots both of commerce and of the landed interest have grown undisturbed for centuries, where labour is dependent upon both, and where, even

apart from any laws of population and political economy, the thoughts, sympathies and relations, the whole traditional associations of the different classes, are intertwined in an unparalleled degree. A couple of years ago a liberal organ using the language we now do, would have been read by liberals with surprise. We should have been asked, what liberal need be told such truisms. Mr. Lowe will probably be remembered in connection with reform as having discussed, not the merits of a possible Reform Bill, but as having called upon the liberal party to which he belonged to re-open the whole controversy from the beginning.

Nor can it be denied, that he found a remarkably favourable opportunity for doing so. The first Reform Bill had been carried on the wings of passion, and the result had been so successful that henceforward the grounds for any reform, however desirable, were certain to be intellectual, and founded in reason rather than in feeling. But intellectual grounds for change are always sure to be weak when brought to bear against the retention of power. Far from being revolutionary, the ten pounder when admitted into the constitution, justified the adage, that Englishmen are remarkable for slamming the door of a room in the face of all comers as soon as they are safely inside themselves. The ten pounder is as superior to his aristocratic predecessor in power of resistance as a sand-bank to a stone wall. To suppose that £7 would be more, rather than less, likely to part with its own than £10, appears to us a very strange fallacy indeed. The result has been, that while experience, and the lessons of experience, were strong in favour of extending reform to its legitimate conclusion, the desire to do so and the electoral apathy in the matter grew fainter and fainter. Again we remind our opponents that by 'legitimate conclusion' we mean, not the ultimate predominance of numbers, but the perfecting of the representation of the country. In this, it is impossible that any misunderstanding can exist between us. We uphold 'Representation,' and it is impossible for those who uphold 'Representation' to uphold the 'Rule of Numbers.' If any one class has the absolute rule over all others, there is an end of representation. To accuse us of defending the Rule of Numbers because we advocate the representative claims of unrepresented labour is to repeat a time-worn trick—a trick, it must be confessed, practised by Mr. Lowe with all the charms of absolute novelty.

How he was able to practise the trick, after the first emotions of surprise had subsided, became intelligible enough. Mr. Bright, in his earnest zeal, had given some colour to

the unfounded accusation, that reform meant in his mouth and therefore in the mouth of all reformers, the downfall of our hereditary institutions and the establishment of a democracy. The so-called 'Manchester school' creed had become the synonym for everything anti-national and subversive. Whether Lord Palmerston was in his heart hostile to all reform, we cannot say. The testimony of his colleagues to the contrary has of late been emphatic, in spite of amateur revelations upon his hidden sentiments. But there is little doubt that he was not friendly to the Manchester politicians, and was determined in his broad, genial way, to resist them. And in this he was supported by the country. Resistance to all reform, and resistance to the interpretation of reform put upon Mr. Bright's utterances, became, for a time, almost synonymous. And so it happened that when, on the death of Lord Palmerston, the question returned into the hands of Earl Russell, opinion, instead of having advanced, seemed to have receded to a point at which the whole question could be re-opened and argued anew. In the meantime, moreover, a new school of liberals, called by their friends 'intellectual liberals,'—by their enemies 'kid-glove liberals'—gave a completely new turn to the controversy. Instead of reviling Mr. Bright as the arch-enemy of his country, as an incendiary, a demagogue, a political paricide, they cordially acknowledged the sincerity of his aims, and the greatness of his genius. It may be doubted whether their balanced admiration, and the searching analysis with which they discussed his views, were not more odious to the great orator than the most hostile defamation. Besides this, their views of reform were distasteful to him in a double aspect as being at once too aristocratic and too impartial. He resented their assumption of impartiality, and called it lukewarmness; he charged them with the affectation of profound culture, and with treachery to the bluff and honest liberalism of genuine John Bullism. They retorted by extolling his powers as an orator at the expense of his intellect as a statesman. At the same time, while earnestly pleading the cause of reform, they advocated a system of checks with a view to the preservation of the balance of constitutional power. In this they were opposed, not only by the Manchester school politicians, strictly so called, but by a section of liberals as broad, whose antipathy to expedients and whose belief in the irresistible advance of the masses in political power, whether they liked it or not, led them to despise what seemed to them the trundling of Mrs. Partington's mop.

Mr. Lowe cleverly placed himself between the contending factions. To the Tories he said, 'No reform.' To the liberals,

scared by the bugbear of democracy, he said, 'No reform.' To the liberals who wished for a different Reform Bill, he said, 'This is an absurd bill.' On the other hand, the difficulty of the task of the Government was exactly equal in proportion to the facilities for Mr. Lowe's attack. They had to produce a Bill at once unassailable by the Tories, satisfactory to the old Whigs and intellectual liberals, and acceptable to the radicals. If they appealed to the Tories and Whigs alone, as Lord Palmerston had done, then experience had proved that no reform at all was possible. If they consulted the gentlemen below the gangway alone, the task was equally impossible. If they adopted the plans for the representation of minorities, and the balance of power advocated by Mr. Hare and the 'intellectual liberals,' they would unite against themselves all the open and secret enemies of reform under the cry of 'No unconstitutional devices.' The Government were evidently inspired by one leading motive. They 'meant business,' and were determined to carry a Reform Bill if they could. Meaning business, they applied themselves not to frame a Bill, which to any one section of the country might seem to be theoretically perfect, but a Bill, while it satisfied each so far as could be done without alienating the rest, which might be at once possible and substantial. So with regard to the tactics by which they endeavoured to carry their Bill. They were guided by the experience of former Reform Bills, and they knew that, however desirable reform might be in itself, the *vis inertiae* inside the House would adapt itself to resist any tactics they might adopt, and it became a question, not of honesty or intrigue, as it has dishonestly been represented, but what course of action would secure them best against a combination of adverse minorities. It was clear that there was a very large body of men in the House who were averse to any lowering of the franchise whatever, but who, having pledged themselves on the hustings to lower the franchise, would snatch at any side issue to evade their obligations without openly violating their pledges.

These men would vote against the best redistribution bill in the world, not to avoid redistribution, but to avoid lowering the franchise. And *vice versa*. We cannot understand why the Government should be accused of dishonesty or intrigue for having resolved to compel honest and distinct votes on honest and distinct issues. It is a strange '*tu quoque*' for a dishonest man to call an honest man dishonest and underhand for having compelled *him* to be honest. The result showed a narrow majority for the Government, and the narrowness of the

majority has been taken to prove the folly of the Government choice. We cannot see the proof, inasmuch as if the whole of the Government scheme had been brought forward at once, the probability is that there would have been no majority at all. A majority of five was a small majority, but it was a fighting majority, upon a great subject which the Ministry thought vital, and upon which they staked their existence. No man in his senses can expect to see a large reform majority now-a-days in an assembly, necessarily averse, in the absence of the battering-ram at the door, to operate upon itself. And, as Lord Melbourne once said of a majority of one, 'the opposition have not even that.' But it is said the Government tactics by which they hoped to evade the combination of minorities conspicuously failed, for they had to encounter the most determined and influential combination backed by the strongest arguments, and that they were foolish because they failed. To this we reply, that it would be true enough had the question been between a large majority and a small majority; but the question really was between a majority and no majority at all. The whole irritation of the House against the Government on the question of reform (for on other questions the Government was certainly popular), has arisen solely and simply from the fact that the House, with the inevitable selfishness of every governing body, was determined to keep its power, its whole power, and nothing but its whole power. But they wished to do so secretly. Their hustings pledges had become an organized hypocrisy, which they hoped would in time lay Reform decently in the grave. But when on the death of Lord Palmerston a Reform Cabinet brought them resolutely to vote 'yea or nay,' on the distinct issue of lowering the franchise, and on a distinct figure, their irritation broke out into every species of opposition, and the Government was even accused out of doors of ungentlemanly action and a recourse to dodging, which of course, as usual, was all fathered on the back of Mr. Gladstone's subtlety, astuteness, craft, and his undying enmity to the rural interest, while in the House the expression, "shuffling the cards under the table," was actually assented to. The argument, that to lower the franchise alone without any counterbalancing operation, was wrong in principle, and that therefore the Government ought to produce a complete Bill, is a respectable argument. But in the first place, the Government were evidently of opinion that the lowering of the franchise is a principle distinct from the redistribution of power, and they supported that principle, as one upon which the breadth of the basis of the constitution depends. In other words, they held that the foundations of

the building could be advantageously deepened, and ought to be deepened from every motive of expediency, and that, too, apart from any plans for the redistribution of the upper rooms in the edifice. This was an honest opinion, and they acted upon it. But having taken the sense of the House, they bowed to the large minority, and consented to bring in a complete Bill. It is untrue, therefore, that they have not compelled their opponents to show their colours. The House has been compelled to affirm both the reduction of the franchise and the figure of the reduction.

But it is said that the Government, having gone so far, and fought so long and so hard, threw up the game without compelling the House to decide, by an avowed and direct vote for or against the £7 borough franchise. This opinion, however, is evidently founded on a misapprehension of the question between Rental and Rating. The vote on that question simply undid by a side wind what the House had felt itself compelled to do directly. To have accepted the defeat there would secretly have undone what had been openly achieved, since a £7 rating franchise is practically an £8, £9, and £10 rental franchise, according as the case may be. But it is said, why not have made a counter-move, and compelled a vote on a £5 rating, or have accepted a £6 rating? The acceptance of a £6 rating would have lessened the amount of enfranchisement by thirty or forty thousand, and this diminution would have taken place exactly where, according to the professions, at all events, of most political sections, it is chiefly needed. Besides this, it would have been in direct violation of the announcement of the Government, that, whatever concessions might be made on other points, the amount of enfranchisement to be conferred could not be diminished. The members below the gangway might justly have complained, that after having supported the second reading of the Bill, and secured a majority for the Government, notwithstanding that the figure had been raised from the original £6, to which the majority of the House was committed, to £7, they were now to be thrown over, and asked to support a further amount of disfranchisement. The proposal of a £5 rating, on the other hand, would have courted another certain defeat, and alienated many moderate Liberals, who up to that point had, possibly somewhat reluctantly, given the Bill their support. Moreover, it would have practically been a proposal further to enlarge the franchise by sixty thousand, made to a House which was perfectly conscious of having chosen rating instead of rental in order to lessen the amount of enfranchisement. A £6 rating franchise would intro-

duce about forty thousand electors less, and a £5 rating franchise about sixty thousand electors more, than a £7 rental franchise. To adopt the former would thus have involved the abandonment of one of the ~~most vital objects of the~~ Bill, to have carried the latter would have been absolutely impossible; and the certain increase in the adverse majority might have damaged the future prospects of Reform. Thus, setting aside the merits of the rating principle itself—a principle which Mr. Gladstone proved to be demonstrably vicious, and not by any means doubtful, the conclusion is, not that the Government, after fighting hard, suddenly gave up the battle, but that there were certain difficulties which no fighting could overcome.

We shall not undertake to defend the Government for having brought in a Reform Bill at all this session. Perhaps a little solemnity of delay, a certain apparatus of profound study and reflection, and a session of loud whispers and asides on the Treasury Bench, with a view to raise public expectation, might have been more prudent, even although the question had been debated for fifteen years. But when it is said, as it is so constantly said, that it was a mistake on the part of the Government to take counsel only of one section of the House—meaning the party of Mr. Bright—it seems to us that the accusation is founded on a very great assumption. If any one will turn to the Reform Bill which Mr. Bright wanted to bring in in 1859, and which there is no reason to suppose that he has since abandoned, they will find how little the Government can have consulted him, beyond what Earl Russell, at a great meeting of his liberal supporters, himself openly avowed. In 1859, Mr. Bright proposed a £5 borough and a £10 county franchise. He disfranchised absolutely fifty-six English and Welsh boroughs returning eighty-seven members, nine Irish boroughs returning nine members, and twenty-one Scotch boroughs. He partially disfranchised sixty-nine more boroughs. He gave four new members apiece to five great boroughs, nine new members to seven new boroughs. He gave eighteen new members to English counties, and eight to Irish counties, besides further changes in Scotland.

It appears to us, therefore, to be unjust to say that the Cabinet consulted Mr. Bright and Mr. Bright's party alone in the composition of their Reform Bill. In politics plausibilities stand for truths. It was plausible to accuse a Government recruited from below the gangway, and more especially under Mr. Gladstone's leadership in the House of Commons, of walking arm in arm with Mr. Bright, who was only treated with respect. It was doubly plausible, immediately after Lord Palmerston's death—

an event which had long been described as destined to be the knell of whig-conservatism. But plausibilities are not facts. As a matter of fact, it is on the face of it simply untrue, that a £7 borough and a £14 county franchise, that the allotment of twenty-six members to counties, that the absence of all absolute disfranchisement, and the lenient grouping of all boroughs below the 8,000 population line—it is simply untrue that all this is carrying out the views of Mr. Bright. If it were so, Philip being no longer Philip, and Mr. Bright having ceased to be Mr. Bright, where would be the gravamen of the charge?

And here we cannot help observing how differently Conservatives behave under similar circumstances. Many Tories feel towards Mr. Disraeli and towards Lord Stanley as the old whigs feel towards Mr. Bright. Are they so foolish as to hound them down, and refuse all co-operation because they are aware of a difference on many substantial points? And is the Conservative party robbed of its coherency because Mr. Disraeli, and Lord John Manners, and Sir William Heathcote, and Sir Stafford Northcote, and Lord Cranbourne, and Lord Stanley, represent shades of Conservatism more distinct and more antagonistic than any differences on Liberal benches? What is Lord Stanley but the John Bright, deodorised and in ice, of the Tory party? Did the Tories fret and fume with jealousy and secret rage when Lord Stanley moved an amendment against a Liberal Government? Did they say to Mr. Disraeli, 'you have taken counsel with our John Bright,' and we will betray you with a kiss? Yet this is what the Adullamites did, without the same foundation or excuse, to their own Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone. The *landed Whigs* were right in watching over their own interests, and they were powerful enough to resist injury. Was it necessary that they should be jealous without a cause, and not only cry out, but stab in the dark before they were hurt? We do not for a moment assume that they were bound to like or bound to defend any Bill the Government chose to put forward. We do not for a moment assume that they were not rather bound to love their country before their party. But we do deliberately and on conviction accuse them of unfairness and blind hostility to Mr. Gladstone. We do accuse a very large party on both sides of the House of treating the foremost statesman in the House of Commons with marked discourtesy, suspicion, ill-will, and a studied disrespect. We do accuse them of trading with malice aforethought upon his small peculiarities, goading him in trifles, magnifying little defects, exulting over petty mistakes. With persistent industry they detracted from his genius

and allowed his industry, his zeal, his versatility, his elevation, his marvellous and never-failing eloquence, to go for nothing while their whole attention is engrossed by a few defects in the complexion of his temper. And the very men who would cry 'shame' and 'tailor' if they saw a man worrying the best horse in his stable, and persecuting mettle for temper, are the men who do not scruple to behave in precisely the same way to their own best horse in Parliament. We admit the ardour of Mr. Gladstone's temperament—we admit that in the ardour of that temperament he is guilty of many sins, but they are sins which in a higher view might almost be called sins of generosity, when compared with Mr. Disraeli's past career. Do the Tories see nothing to condone in their own leader? Is an occasionally intemperate expression escaping from an ardent statesman eager to get through his work to mar his usefulness and devotion to his party? And on the other hand, is a long career of organized masquerade to be deemed worthy of parliamentary deference and parliamentary awe? Mr. Disraeli's scenic popularity, and the unpopularity of Mr. Gladstone's sincerity are a strange comment on the relative views of the Conservative and Liberal sides of the House. If this comparison of Mr. Gladstone with Mr. Disraeli should seem an episode, it is vital to our subject. Unquestionably the hostility of the House to Reform in general found a vent in hostility to Mr. Gladstone in particular. Many accusations were fathered on the Bill which were founded in dislike to Mr. Gladstone, and no accusation savoured more of hostility to both than the charge of complicity with Mr. Bright. It is true that Lord Cranbourne took care to purge the figure £7 of Mr. Bright's authorship, but he did so only to charge him with having suggested the separation of the Bills. It is also true that Mr. Bright recommended the separation of the Bills in order to obtain a leverage by means of the first over the second.* The Government, however, pledged itself that no dissolution between the two should take place. To this it was answered that it was a pledge they might not be able to carry out—a reasonable objection. But when both Bills were united, surely hostility should have ceased, and it might have been allowed that Mr. Bright did not pull the strings of the Cabinet. Yet the accusation was repeated and never withdrawn.

We have not intended in the present article to enter upon a methodical analysis of the Reform Bill of 1866, the debates which led up to it, or those to which it gave rise. To have done so would have entailed an octavo volume like Mr. Molesworth's *History of the Reform Bill of 1832*, to which

we here beg to express our acknowledgments. But even his volume is a very condensed abridgment of the materials at his disposal. An octavo volume which professed to give a true and particular account of the Reform Bill of 1866 would require little less condensation. Nevertheless, there are some observations on certain leading features in the Bill which at the present moment it may be useful to make. We shall touch briefly: (1.) On the Government statistics; (2.) On the £7 borough franchise; (3.) On the lodger franchise; (4.) On the £14 county franchise; (5.) On the question of Rental *v.* Rating; (6.) On the question of redistribution.

The Electoral Returns of 1865-1866 have played so singular a part in the late Reform debates, that they deserve special notice. They took both sides of the House by surprise—the Government who prepared them, and the Opposition, for whom they were prepared. Generally speaking, a subject which engages the attention of the country, receives so much study over so large a surface, and all the main facts connected with it become so well known in the course of public discussion, that when, in the last resort, Government calls for statistics, it is rather by way of giving a solemn and authoritative seal for purposes of parliamentary discussion to knowledge already afloat, than to elicit new facts. The interval between the official call for statistics and their publication, is rather an interval of contemptuous depreciation and self-satisfied knowledge, than of anxiety or expectation. 'We knew "all that" already,' is generally the political frame of mind of the expectant audience. But when the electoral statistics of 1866 appeared, there was first a puzzled silence, then a murmur of surprise, on all sides, and then a shout of exultation on the part of the Opposition. 'The working classes unrepresented!' That had been their bugbear, that had been the war-cry of the enemy, that had been the one formula, which they hated because it was unanswerable. And now the liberals were confuted out of their own mouths by the returns of their own Government. There it stood recorded in black and white in their own book:—The working man had twenty-five per cent. of the votes in the country. It is impossible to over-estimate the effect which this marvellous discovery has had on the whole course of the debate. It enabled the Opposition to tax the Government scheme with haste and immaturity. It enabled the Opposition to convert a defensive into an offensive attitude. True, the Government could retort that the Opposition had been as much at sea as themselves. But the retort was a weak one, because the facts were *primæ facie* on the Opposition side. It was of no avail to say, that

they had taken the new facts into consideration and changed £6 to £7 in consequence. The Opposition were conveniently blind to the apology, and virtually denied the right of the Government to make up their minds upon a fact so transcendental without another decade of discussion. To meet the sudden extraordinary and most unexpected revelation of twenty-five per cent. of working men in the register by a change of £6 to £7 was a piece of political tinkering of the most indecent and ludicrous description.

Now this was a very telling attack. But the retort which it was in the power of the Government to make was certainly not less obvious, nor less solid. £6 was the accepted limit of the Reform Bill of 1860. At that time it was not thought on either side of the House that the working men had 25 per cent. of the electoral votes. That discovery was made in 1866. In other words, it was discovered that the working men, in the strict sense of the word, numbered about 100,000 votes over the country. The Government, simply changed the figure of the franchise from £6 to £7, a change corresponding to a difference of about 100,000 voters, which, on the principle of the Opposition, namely, the principle of '*counting heads*,' was exactly what they ought to have done. This is unanswerable. Upon their own principle, the tories are precluded from calling the change a piece of tinkering. And in fact, the whole argument, based upon the alleged possession of one-fourth of the representation of the country by the working men is a patent fallacy and a mare's nest from beginning to end. It is utterly untrue to say that the working classes have one-fourth of the borough representation of the country. They have not 25 per cent., but in reality one twenty-fifth, or 4 per cent. They have a majority only in eight large boroughs. We cannot lay too much stress on this fallacy. Supposing, for instance, that there were twenty large towns with 5,000 working-men electors a-piece, these twenty large towns would absorb the whole 100,000 of working-men electors on the register. They would in that case have no voice whatever in 180 out of the 200 boroughs in England and Wales, and yet it would be true to say, in the same sense as the assertion is now constantly made, that the working-men numbered one-fourth or one-fifth of the borough electors. In the supposed case they might return 40 members to Parliament, but having no influence in any other election whatever, it would be a patent fallacy to say that they possessed 25 per cent. of the representation. As a matter of fact, they are distributed over all the boroughs, but generally in such small numbers, that they have as little effect upon an

election as if there were no working-men in the constituency at all. And the only result of the Government statistics with regard to this particular point is the discovery that only in 8 boroughs have the working classes a majority. The question is not whether the working classes have such and such a per centage of votes at the polling-booth, but how is that per centage distributed, and what is the result? The result was known long before any statistics were called for, namely, that the working classes are not directly represented in the House of Commons. The talismanic 25 per cent.,* so far from showing that the working classes are represented, showed only this—that it is possible for the largest class in the country to hold one quarter of the electoral roll and yet be practically unrepresented in Parliament. Such is the preponderance of land and commerce in this country, combined with all the traditions of their political supremacy and a start of six hundred years, that labour is denied the full use even of the electoral power which it possesses.

That the Bill was a substantial Bill, one which made an important change in the representation of the country, and, on the whole, a change for the better, and at the same time that it was in no sense a democratic or levelling Bill, we think admits of little doubt. A perfect and a possible Bill, are two very different things. A Bill would be perfect which made the representation of the country perfect, and the representation of the country would be perfect if every class, every interest, every opinion was represented in exact proportion to its weight and worth. That is the ideal of representation, but it is utopian. What, then, is the next best thing? A Bill remedying with a broad hand and without fine-drawn expedients any gaps which seriously affect the representation of the country. Such a gap exists in the representation of the country, owing to the fact that the working classes, although they number 25 per cent. at the polling booth, are still not directly represented in the House. We admit that class representation may be carried too far. It will not bear much extension. But unquestionably it is of the last importance in a representative government that the third great interest in the country, after land and commerce, namely, labour, should have a fair and equal representation. Did the Government Bill provide for the representation of the working classes? Unquestionably it did, for it gave them a clear majority of working men electors in the election of somewhat less than one hundred members. From this particular

* We use '25 per cent.,' because it has become a watchword. It is really 26 per cent.

point of view it is not necessary to consider what addition is made to the total constituency of the country by the Government Bill. It is laid at 200,000—a most material consideration from the point of view that breadth of foundation is, constitutionally speaking, in itself an advantage, and that the extension of the franchise, even apart from the question of the representation of labour, a good in itself, with the proviso that we adhere to the idea of representation, and not the rule of numbers. But we are here dealing not with the addition to the suffrage of the country, but with the representation of labour in Parliament. At the present moment railways, beer, sugar, insurance offices, are all more effectively represented in the House than labour. Mr. Dudley Baxter tells us, that the working classes now possess absolute majorities in the election of fourteen members. Well, but they have not *fourteen members in the House*. And if not, what becomes of the 'nearly majorities' in other boroughs? The problem is, to introduce a distinct working-class element into the House in order to represent working-class thought and feeling *there* and not merely at the polling-booth. Absolute majorities in fourteen boroughs have failed to do so. Therefore we must extend the suffrage so as to increase their chances, always smaller in proportion than they seem, owing to the overwhelming preponderance in this country of the traditional influence and power of land and trade. It is almost certain that the ninety-five members whom, under the present Bill, the working classes might, according to Mr. Baxter, be able to return, would not all be members representing working-class ideas, except in times of class agitation, and it is in times of class agitation that the safety of the country requires all classes to be heard in Parliament. So far then as the lowering of the franchise to £7 is considered as a means of securing a representation to the working classes, the Government Bill seems to us to have been at once substantial, effectual, moderate, and safe. The relative rental and relative incomes of the working classes, upon which Mr. Baxter lays so much stress, furnish no constitutional argument at all. If our criminal laws are to be the same for rich and poor, if questions of pauperism and settlement, of public health, of the improvements of towns, questions of debtor and creditor, of national education, of the legislation regarding husband and wife, of the treatment of soldiers and sailors, affect the working classes as well as those above them, and affect them man for man, then, whether their rental is only seven millions as compared with the thirty-three millions of those above them, or whether their incomes are only forty-four millions as compared with 202 millions is nothing to the pur-

pose. Nor do we ask to let 44 swallow up 202. We only wish to ensure such fair treatment to those who have 44 from those who have 202, that they may not seem to lose even that they have.

The £10 lodger franchise was one of the most important features of the Government Bill, but there is not so much to be said about it, inasmuch as it is one which the Tories must admit and the Liberals cannot rebut. It is confessedly more a middle class franchise than a working man's franchise, more a lateral than a vertical franchise, and as such it could not well be opposed by any section of the House, except upon the ground of convenience. It must be evident, on the smallest reflection, that the presumption in favour of the fitness of two men to vote who both pay £10 for their residence, but one for a whole house, while the other pays the same sum for a room, is in favour of the latter. If you pay £10 for a room, while I pay £10 for a whole house, the probability is that my status and education are not above, but probably below yours. It can only, therefore, be by an anomaly, that I should have a vote in the conduct of the affairs of the country, while you have not. So of two working men, one of whom occupies a house worth £7, and the other a room worth £7. The chances are that the latter is better off and in a higher calling than the former. A lodger franchise is, therefore, essentially a conservative franchise, on *à priori* grounds. In order to clear up the subject a little further, it may be observed that the figure of the lodger franchise ought, in justice, not to be higher, as it was left by the Government Bill, but to be lower than the entire house franchise, and reduced to that point where the lower lodger figure would ensure identity of class with the higher household figure. Thus a man aged sixty may be paying £500 a-year for his house in Belgravia. His son, aged thirty, may be paying £100 for apartments. Who can doubt that both are equally entitled, in the abstract, to a vote. Yet the difference between £500 and £100 is the difference between £10 and £2. These are purely theoretical considerations. But they go to prove that the fear expressed lest a £10 lodger franchise should let in a host of unknown voters 'below the line' is purely illusory, and rests on a confusion of thought. It appears to us that the Government has fallen into this confusion, for otherwise we cannot understand how the Government can have drawn the line at £7 for householders and £10 for lodgers. Unfortunately the debates never reached this clause, and no light was thrown upon the subject. Possibly it may have been in the mind of the Government, that a bachelor elector ought to be handicapped with a

pound or two of rental in order to make up in electoral solidity for the weight, which the £7 householder is supposed to derive from the possession of a wife and family. Or the Government may have overlooked ~~Bachelors~~ altogether, and have simply compared the higher expenses of a householder with those of a lodger, upon the principle that the "capacity to pay as a test of electoral fitness" in the householder at £7 would be roughly equal to the capacity to pay of the lodger at £10, which would only show their confusion of thought more clearly. A third hypothesis would be, that the Government being in possession of no statistics as to lodgers, considered it hopeless to propose to the House a lodger franchise at £7, which would have given the opportunity to all the opponents of Reform to strengthen their vague declamations about swamping the present constituencies without the possibility of rebutting the charge.

The county franchise of £14 was the subject of some merriment when first announced, and it was suggested by a wit that 7 and 7 make 14, and that this must have been the rationale of the Government choice. The debate revealed the reasons for the adoption of that figure to have been two, viz. (1), that a £14 rental corresponds generally with the £12 rating franchise, which is the Irish figure, and (2), that a £14 rental limits with tolerable accuracy the inferior boundary of the lower county middle class. County members were much exercised in their minds on the question of the £14 county franchise, and their perplexity was not unintelligible. On the one hand, they were opposed to any lowering of the county suffrage, both because of the expense entailed upon them by the extended canvass and conveyance of voters, and because, generally speaking, whether liberals or not, they are against all lowering *per se* of the county franchise. On the other hand, they had voted for a £10 county franchise under the leadership of Mr. Disraeli in 1859, and between the old £10 to which they had assented and the new £14 against which they rebelled they were like birds caught in the fowler's snare. £10 they would have submitted to in the hope that the margin of squeezable agricultural voters between £10 and £14 would neutralise the county shopocracy between £14 and £50. It was an act of faith, with a bribe, to go down to £10. To stop at £14 was to exercise faith, and give up the bribe. It may be asked, then why did they wish to substitute £20 for £14? The answer is easy. Because of two evils they chose the least. It was an evil to go down at all. It was an evil to go down to £10 (but an evil with a compensation). To go down to £20 or £14 was, in both cases, an uncompensated evil, only the £20 evil was less than the £14 evil, and therefore they

chose the former as a forlorn hope, knowing that if there is to be a Reform Bill at all, a reduction of the county franchise is inevitable, and therefore they ought to accept the inevitable with the best grace possible. After all, they should remember that a rural population is a rural population, and that a village greengrocer, taking large averages, is no more to be compared with the greengrocer of a flourishing manufacturing centre, than Hodge of Dorsetshire is to be compared with Stokes of Lancashire. But the effect of the £14 franchise in counties need not at all be purely liberal. It is quite as likely to be conservative, especially on Mr. Mill's theory of the conservatism of stupidity so warmly accepted by Sir John Pakington.

The controversy respecting the relative merits of a Renting and Rating Franchise is one of some intricacy, which we shall endeavour to state with the greatest clearness in our power. Popularly speaking, the question is, whether the qualification of a voter is to be defined by the *rent* he pays as an occupier, or would have to pay to the owner, were he an occupier, for the premises which entitle him to vote—or by the *value* at which those premises are valued and assessed by the overseer for the purposes of the poor rate. Thus, for example, if the borough franchise be supposed to be fixed at £7, if this means 'rental,' then he who pays his landlord £7 will have a vote, but if it means rateable value, then he who is assessed to the poor rate as occupying premises rateable at £7, will have a vote. But, it will be asked by those who are not familiar with the subject, and even in Parliament the number of men who understand the question is not large—it may be asked, where is the difference? The differences are very great. In the first place, as a matter of fact, the number of voters who would come in under a £7 rental franchise is very much larger than the number who would come in under a £7 rating franchise. Mr. Bright did not exaggerate when he said, 'that £7 rating is a £9 suffrage.' This has been calculated over and over again, and is tolerably well understood. The rateable value of a house is ascertained by the poor law overseers, who make deductions for that purpose from the rent, or gross estimated rental. These deductions embrace an allowance for the cost of repairs, insurance, and other expenses necessary to keep the premises in a condition to command such rent. These deductions vary enormously all over the country. But, for argument's sake, if we suppose them to be, say 20 per cent., a rateable value of £7 would correspond to a rental of £8 15s., while a rental of £7 would correspond with a rateable value of £5 12s. If it is remembered that the present Reform Bill only proposed to lower the borough

franchise from £10 to £7, it will be seen that the difference between rating and rental as a qualification may be not merely a question of machinery, but a question of enfranchisement, and so it was admitted to be by Mr. Cave, the member for Shoreham. The vote of the House of Commons, which, practically substitutes a £7 rating for a £7 rental franchise greatly diminished the enfranchisement proposed, and by a side-wind affirmed a qualification, in many cases equal to the old ten-pound qualification, so that if the figure 7 had remained part of the Bill, the enfranchisement clauses would have been rendered practically nugatory. But apart from the question of enfranchisement, Government refused to accept a principle, which they held, and we think justly held, to be vicious and inexpedient, and one which ought not to be made a party question. We shall not dwell long on the abstract question, because it lies in a nutshell. The arguments in favour of rating need only be stated, and they admit of easy and definite answers. Lord Dunkellin, who undertook to state them to the House, appealed to the Irish system, which has been in operation for two years, and which proves, he says, that a rating franchise is an easy franchise, and a cheap franchise, because it saves the expense and annoyance of registration, because it is a self-adjusting and self-acting register, a register free from political influence, and one which it was everyone's interest to keep correct. To the argument drawn from the Irish system, the answer is conclusive. In Ireland there is a Commissioner of valuation—a central authority—who controls the assessment of the country. Are we prepared to have that here? To the argument that the rating franchise is an easy franchise, the answer is not less plain. The rental franchise is as simple as the rating franchise. Rather more so in fact, since the 'gross estimated rental' is the first column in the rate-book, whereas the 'rateable value' is the second. It must be ignorance or stratagem to represent the controversy as one between rate-book or no rate-book. The question is one between the first and the second columns of the rate-book. The rate-book itself is not in question. Whether rental or rateable value is to regulate the qualification or not, in either case the rate-book remains the register. The 'gross estimated rental' column has all the virtues of the rateable value column if you look to cheapness, ease, and self-adjustment, but it has many more virtues, if you look to correctness of principle, either in a constitutional view, or a practical view. In a constitutional view, a vote for a member of Parliament is an imperial vote, and not a local vote. Therefore it should be regulated by

the fitness of the man to vote—a fitness constitutionally defined by his capacity to pay, not by local, and for political purposes arbitrary calls upon that capacity. Let us suppose the constitution to declare that a man who has the capacity to pay £7 for his house shall be deemed fit to exercise the franchise, whether he lives in Grimsby or Ashburton. In Ashburton a deduction of 30 per cent. is made from the rent to get at the rateable value; in Grimsby, 5 per cent. Therefore, under a rateable franchise of £7, a man who occupies an £8 house in Ashburton, would be disfranchised by a local overseer because if you deduct 30 per cent. from £8, you leave a rateable value of less than £7. But if you deduct 5 per cent. from £8, you leave a rateable value of more than £7, and therefore in Grimsby, by the kind permission of the local overseer, the same man, occupying the same house, and having the same constitutional fitness or capacity to pay, will be permitted to exercise the right equally granted to him and his peer in Ashburton by the imperial legislature, but not equally allowed in both cases by the local authority. In a constitutional point of view, then, if a man's fitness to vote is tested by his general capacity to pay, and not by the local machinery employed to regulate his contributions to local institutions—and it is unconstitutional to make that a local question which is an imperial question,—to make the franchise a rating franchise is to make every vestry a reform cabinet, and every overseer the arbiter of political power. The question is as clear as daylight. Unluckily, it was not familiar to the general public, and the Adullamites who had been defeated in every encounter in which they ventured into the open, were victorious when they were able to fight under cover of a question not very plain to the rank and file of either party.

It is quite true that the old scot-and-lot qualification was a local qualification. But that was a household qualification! That qualification was abandoned deliberately in the Reform Bill, not as a queer exception to the rule in other Acts, as Mr. Dudley Baxter, with so much naïveté, supposes, but on the self-evident principle that an imperial qualification should be defined by an imperial standard, and not by a local standard. The acts cited by Mr. Dudley Baxter, are all local acts,—acts connecting local rates with local votes. The analogue of that would be to connect imperial taxation with the imperial vote, and to give every man in the country cumulative votes according to the tea and sugar he consumes. In a practical point of view the gross estimated column is the best, because it is the most free from error, and the least liable

to variation. For every error in the gross estimated rental you are liable to two in the rateable value column. The clear yearly value, or the gross estimated rental, or the gross rent, *communibus annis*, paid by the tenant (the tenant paying his own rates and taxes), being defined to be as near the rack-rent as possible, is a more definite and independent standard than the rateable value, for the second is deduced, or ought by law to be deduced, from the first. But the law does not say what deductions are to be made. Accordingly they vary all over England from 50 per cent. down to 5. It is no answer to say that we are tending towards uniform rating. We may be tending, but we are not there. And if the principle of deductions were even perfect whereby rateable value is ascertained, it might still be just to make only a deduction of 5 per cent. upon a house in Grimsby whose rack-rent was £8, and 50 per cent. on a house in Ashburton whose rack-rent was also £8. Natural inequalities cannot be made equal by legislation—but the man who is able to pay £8 for his house in Ashburton, ought to be able to vote as well as the man who pays £8 in Grimsby, and he ought not to be enfranchised or disfranchised by the differences in the local circumstances of his house, his imperial capacity according to the national and imperial standard remaining the same.

Passing from the questions more directly connected with the franchise to the Redistribution Bill, we cannot omit some general reflections on the tactics of the Opposition. The Government had separated the bills in order first to obtain a clear vote upon clear and distinct issues, and next in order to expedite the discussion. The Opposition immediately combined to ask for both bills together. To use an expression, which has been employed very often of late, the Government escaped defeat '*with the skin of its teeth*.' And their narrow majority is triumphantly pointed to as showing that the very tactics they adopted recoiled on their own heads, and proved the folly of their course. We understand this language on the part of the enemies of reform, and we understand it on the part of the enemies of the Government. But we do not see the justice of it looking at the matter from any impartial point of view. The Government escaped '*with the skin of its teeth*,' because the House was, not indeed by any means hostile to the Government, but hostile to reform. And unless it can be shown, that if the Government had adopted some other course it would have had a larger majority, the smallness of the majority proves, that in a House hostile to reform, they adopted the only tactics likely to give them any majority at all. Of course the possible objection remains, that

it is unwise to bring on any question, however important, in a House so hostile that you can only look for very narrow majorities. And Government, it is repeated in every tone of emphasis, had no business to thrust a Reform Bill down the throats of an unwilling House.

But this assumes two distinct positions, neither of which we think defensible: one, that a Ministry may not aspire to take a bold and decided lead, and fight a great question in close contested battles without incurring the charge of folly and arrogance; the other, that the majorities in the case of new Reform Bills can ever again be large, after previous Reform Bills have diminished the margin of political injustice, political resentment, and political agitation. Each succeeding Reform Bill must necessarily be harder to carry than the last. The experience of all the recent failures in carrying any Reform Bill show clearly enough what needs little showing, that the secret aversion of any Parliament that can be elected to any Reform Bill whatever, is such, that unless a Ministry is prepared to win it by the skin of its teeth, there is no chance of any Reform Bill being carried at all. The question is not between a good Bill or a bad Bill in the mind of the Opposition, to whom a good Bill seems more dangerous than a bad one. In a *hostile* House, a good Bill is likely to provoke more irritation and a more calculated opposition than a bad Bill, because a good Bill is more difficult to oppose with decency, and more likely to pass. We say distinctly, in a hostile House. And who can doubt the hostility of the House? Who can doubt that hostility and not fair-play was the ruling motive of the Opposition, and the ruling motive of the Cave-hostility in the first place, to all Reform whatever—else why was Mr. Lowe accepted by the House as its own favourite apostle?—undying hostility and hatred to Mr. Gladstone on the part of the tories, for having been a tory at the Oxford debating club and being a liberal in the maturity of his age; a hatred combined with jealousy on the part of the old Whigs because he is the inevitable man and a new man, and a suspicion verging on hatred, because his views are as much wider than their views as the country is broader than their acres. In the face of such hostility, is it not a little surprising to hear the loud complaints of Mr. Gladstone's irritability—Mr. Gladstone's temper—Mr. Gladstone's want of all decent spirit of gentlemanlike conciliation. Why then, if Mr. Gladstone is so unconciliating, let these courteous gentlemen, who complain so loud of the absence of courtesy, show a little themselves, and set the example of a little fair play on their side.

We do not pretend to write the apology of Mr. Gladstone's

peculiarities. It is much to be regretted, that with his marvellous versatility, passionate earnestness, and soaring intellect, he does not combine the bluff geniality of Lord Palmerston, who, when he stood up at the table of the House of Commons, and uncovered his white head, seemed rather like some white English peak rejoicing at the waves, than a statesman under fire. It was also much to be regretted that the bluff and politic old nobleman did not combine the soaring intellect of Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Gladstone's earnestness of purpose. We cannot have everything. Mr. Gladstone has improved too much of late years, not to hold out the confident promise of far greater improvement in years to come, and it is the wisdom of any House of Commons not to fret and goad, and sour, and depress, and undermine its best and greatest instruments, but to foster their genius with delicate care and train them to great national purposes, and great national achievements. No man, in the present day, can hope to tyrannise over the House, but the House may easily, if it chooses, spoil the best horse in its stable, and with an ease the greater in proportion to his value, his mettle, his speed, his paces, and his blood. Mr. Gladstone is, no doubt, at a turning-point in his career, and we appeal to the nobler and more generous wisdom of the House not to throw such a man away. On this topic we will recall an incident which happened to fall under our own notice. In the Redistribution debates, Sir John Pakington taunted Mr. Gladstone with having said, that the Government had only received the electoral statistics the Friday before the first debate, whereas Mr. Gladstone only spoke of a complete and revised copy. In answer to this taunt, plausible, but made, on the face of it, with malice aforethought, Mr. Gladstone, who was lying back on the treasury bench, raised himself on his elbow and uttered an audible and indignant 'No!'. Sir John paused for a second to enjoy the prospect which opened out before him, he tucked his coat tails with much deliberation over his left arm, and with his right arm and fore-finger pointing, with studied provocation, across the table to Mr. Gladstone, 'I am sorry,' he said, 'that I have made the Right Hon. gentleman angry. I am sorry that I should have raised the anger of the Right Hon. gentleman. If the statement of the Right Hon. gentleman's own words is to be the occasion for the exhibition of his temper, I think it is a matter to be much regretted.' And this continued for several minutes, the courteous aristocrat ringing the changes upon 'anger,' 'angry,' 'temper,' 'intemperance,' through twenty sentences with all the coldness of studied malice and pointed insult.

We have described this scene exactly as it took place. It will be in the remembrance of the House. The next morning we looked in all the papers to see if it was reported. But it was omitted in them all, even the reporters, apparently, having felt, in a body, that the exhibition, on the part of a veteran leader on the opposition benches, was beneath contempt, and below record. And this is a sample of the way in which Mr. Gladstone is treated by those who say that his temper and his tactics are not the tactics and not the temper of a gentleman. Mr. Mill lately put the question of conciliation and compromise in a nutshell. 'The opposition,' he remarked, 'said that any bill on Reform must be a compromise. Well, the liberal party made a compromise at the commencement of the session, and a very great compromise it was. They gave up the best part of the matter to the tories, and now, after the liberals had given up to them the better-half, they cried halves for the remainder.' In other words, the policy of the opposition has been a policy of hostility and bit by bit elimination from beginning to end.

The question, we repeat, is, therefore, not a question between a theoretically good or a theoretically bad Bill, but between no Bill at all and a possible and substantial Bill; and we believe it to be clear that no Reform Bill that human ingenuity can devise will henceforward ever be carried by any Government except, as it is said, 'with the skin of its teeth.' That the question can ever be burked we do not believe for one moment. It has become inevitable, and it seems to us to be a most honourable ambition on the part of any Liberal Ministry to make it a question of high statesmanship, to be carried by hard fighting at all hazards, as being eminently expedient and founded in the truest policy of national consolidation. In this view the small majorities of the Government prove not the folly, nor the blunders, but rather the wisdom and earnestness of the Ministry. Men are not to be called fools for other men's assumptions, when those assumptions are unfounded, still less when they are founded in malice. It was gratuitously assumed that the Government was inspired by Mr. Bright, and that they meant to make the passing of a Franchise Bill a lever to obtain a larger Redistribution Bill. The Government denied both charges, pledged its honour, which was ridiculed, and offered an autumn sitting as a guarantee that no dissolution would be allowed, humanly speaking, to intervene—an offer which enraged the country sportsmen, who went about declaring that Mr. Gladstone had threatened them, that they would not be threatened, and least of all by 'a new man.' But the Government having obtained a narrow majority, affirming the lowering of the

franchise, gave way on the point of the separation of the Bills. This concession, instead of receiving the thanks of the House, was treated with contempt, and it was assumed with studied affectation that the Redistribution Bill extorted from the Government in the teeth of Mr. Bright would either be a wretched bantling or 'Red-Republican' measure. It turned out to be neither, but a solid, substantial, and moderate Bill. After a slight pause and a well-concerted feint on the part of Lord Stanley, the Opposition, supported by their foreign legion abandoned their anti-revolutionary cry, and fell back upon the ground of anomalies as their best battle field.

They objected to the anomaly of giving a third member to certain counties, without dividing them, ostensibly on the ground of inconvenience, secretly because in those populous counties to whom a third member was given the liberal minority under a £14 franchise would have a chance of carrying their member. They objected to the grouping of the small boroughs, as introducing extraordinary geographical and other anomalies, whereas these anomalies are as nothing compared with the anomalies in the Scotch and Welsh boroughs, where they work very well. They went into long and complacent proofs of the anomalies consequent upon choosing the line of an 8,000 population, as the limit of grouping and partial disfranchisements, conveniently ignoring the self-evident fact that a 9,000 line, a 10,000 line, an 11,000 line would produce not the same but exactly similar anomalies. They laughed with loud affectation if any man told them frankly what they knew well enough without the telling, that the 8,000 line was chosen as the least impracticable, and at the same time as the least inadequate, and they jeered as if they themselves would be asses enough to choose a line which they knew beforehand could not possibly be passed. They carried the joke still further, and with grave irony declared that the true line was the 15,000 line. There would have been some sense in that, they said. Of course there would. It would have proved the Ministry to be what the opposition wished them to be—geese. In a word the redistribution of seats was certain beforehand to be a leading point of attack on the part of the opponents of the Government Bill, for it was certain to present the greatest number of real or apparent anomalies, and to combine against it the greatest number of malcontents. Any Redistribution Bill must necessarily involve the reconsideration of all the anomalies in our representation, which is a patchwork of anomalies. Any reform which modifies existing anomalies must necessarily substitute a new set, apparently more startling at first than the old; for what men are

accustomed to, strikes them less, be it ever so glaring, than much simpler things if new. An attack upon the anomalies of any Redistribution Bill whatever is therefore, if we may use a sporting phrase, a certain find.

The two main requisites of a redistribution bill are—(1), to get members to distribute; (2), to determine the principle of distribution. The first requisite may be obtained either by total disfranchisement, or by partial disfranchisement of a certain number of boroughs, or both in combination. The Government Bill adopted both, the former sparingly, and the latter to a considerable extent. Eight boroughs lost one member a-piece, and forty-one were grouped, forty-nine seats being thereby placed at the disposal of the Government. The distribution was in the highest degree fair, moderate, and practical, it was even extremely conciliatory to the tory party. Twenty-six new members were given to the counties, although they are already represented up to the teeth, so true is it in politics as in other matters, that to him that hath shall be given. Seven additional members were given to boroughs, eight new boroughs were enfranchised and received eight members, and one member was very properly given to the University of London. Besides this, Scotland received seven new members.*

The allotment was unassailable. The Tories, however, were disgusted because they had been taken at their own word, and the new county members were given according to the population of the counties, and therefore to the most populous; or, in other words, the most liberal counties. New county members they would have accepted thankfully, to any extent, if only they could have them for the agricultural and not for the manufacturing counties. But their great argument had been precisely the excessive population of the counties in comparison with their representation, and it would have been too glaring an inconsistency to grumble at the allotment on its own account. So they set up what they called the 'unicorn county' cry. But they found a more convenient point of attack, and fell partly upon the system of grouping adopted, which they pronounced to be laughable in crudity and absurdity, because of its geographical and constitutional anomalies, and defective in principle, because, instead of taking the large unrepresented towns out of the county representation it had grouped represented boroughs together, which already possessed a representation. And they complained loudly that the Government showed distinct hostility to the rural interest in not taking these towns out of the coun-

* Much to the indignation of Wales. And, certainly, Wales has not been very well treated.

ties, and again betrayed its incapacity to effect any fair compromise. But this is a point on which conciliation means giving up the marrow of the subject debated. If a Reform Bill is to be a *bonâ fide* Reform Bill, it must be so by virtue of making the constitution more and not less representative than it is. But it is one of the chief defects of our constitution, as it is that land is over represented. The agricultural element in the House of Commons is already too compact, too uniform, too homogeneous, too stereotyped, too impervious to the perception of the new phases of thought and civilization which belong even to those very questions which are connected with land itself. It would therefore be a representative solecism to harden that imperviousness, to stereotype that uniformity still further, and to withdraw from the county representation its own best element of educated ruralism. In our view it was too great a concession to land to give the counties new members at all. Mr. Baxter's statistics of the disproportionate representation of boroughs in comparison with counties prove nothing, for his conclusion is founded upon the fallacy of making the polling-booth and not the votes in the House of Commons the test of representation. In the House of Commons land is too strong already. Of course county members are divided upon many subjects, but they are not divided at all upon questions which touch land, that is to say, territorial and agricultural legislation. If it is not desirable that labour should ride over land and trade, even on the few points on which labour or trade can unite, how can the supremacy of land over trade and labour be defended even on points which affect land only? The end of all true Reform must be to make the House of Commons as representative as possible. And to increase the representation of over-represented land is to take a step in the wrong direction. Yet this the present Government actually did, and a Tory government would inevitably endeavour to do it to a very much greater extent. A Reform Bill they must inevitably attempt. The Bill of 1859 provided no representation for the working classes. It was a vast conspiracy to increase the weight and power of land, so that land might recoup its power over trade and shut out the working classes from Parliament finally and for ever. Is this the alternative to which we are to be driven? And has Mr. Disraeli given the slightest symptom of having changed his principles since 1859? On the contrary, they stand out in the late debates more defined, more engrained, more openly avowed, and they are principles which a country unquestionably liberal cannot admit.

Since this article was begun, the resignation of the Govern-

ment has been accepted by the Queen. In the face of the hostility which we have described, we think that the ministry have consulted their own dignity, and, at the same time, the best immediate and ultimate interests of the liberal party. The only other possible and honourable alternative to the course which they have adopted would have been a dissolution, a course which, in the present condition of European affairs, would have been attended with the gravest inconvenience. A change of ministry is bad enough, when the whole continent is on fire, when we are scarcely recovering from a dangerous monetary panic, when Fenianism has scarcely been trodden out, when our relations with the United States are friendly and cordial, mainly because the Americans have sympathies with the liberal ministry. But to dissolve Parliament at such a time is a step even of greater gravity. It could not have been justified simply for the sake of keeping the Government in office, even if ultimately it was likely to have that effect. It could only have been justified if it was certain to operate in favour of reform. But, notwithstanding the strong view of many staunch and clear-sighted liberals, we doubt whether a dissolution under present circumstances would not have retarded rather than advanced the progress of reform. The peculiar unpopularity which would have attached to a dissolution at present, would have reacted on the question which led to that dissolution. A larger majority might have been returned, especially by the aid of the condemned boroughs, against a Reform Bill, and the selfishness of constituencies would have been made use of as an argument to prove the absence of any demand for reform. No doubt the constitutional course is to make the country the arbiter in a question of such supreme importance. But we believe that the ministry were right in not giving room for the plausible argument, that a dissolution would have been a penal act against the present House of Commons, and in rather sacrificing their seats and the momentary supremacy of the liberal party, than compromising the future of reform by an unpopular dissolution at an unpropitious moment. Mr. Gladstone stated his view, when he opened up the subject of reform, that great measures could only be carried, if a government staked its existence on their success. The Reform Bill has not been successful, and the stake has been lost. And the country knows that for the present Mr. Gladstone's services and Reform are equally in abeyance. We trust it may not be long before the country may once more secure both. For seven years Mr. Gladstone has been Chancellor of the Exchequer, and for a large proportion of those years he has been the most conspicuous personage in the cabinet.

But Mr. Gladstone has, we believe, not yet reached his culmination. He is only on the threshold of his greatness. It has been well said by a foreign writer, that England knows her great men, and knows how to use them; and he who does not see the growing popularity of Mr. Gladstone throughout the country, and that the country is determined to make use of his genius and train him to great ends, he who does not see that outside the House of Commons other statesmen's lights are but candles to Mr. Gladstone's sun, is blind to the signs of the time. Mr. Gladstone has only been serving that apprenticeship in power at fifty years of age, which Lord Palmerston served at seventy. At seventy, the coolest and most consummate parliamentary veteran of his day suddenly came into power, and the effect upon him even at that age was to turn his head. Lord Palmerston during his first premiership, so far from being the *beau-ideal* of popularity, speedily became the most unpopular man in the House. It was a favourite expression among the tories at the time, that members used to walk home 'gnashing their teeth' over his insolence. He was, they said, overbearing, he was haughty, he was insolent, he was dictatorial, and, as if to add a dash of venom to the cup of parliamentary resentment, the hectoring levity of his attitude was called by his sedater critics, the 'political ribaldry' of an 'unprincipled septuagenarian,' and 'the snobbishness of an Irish Viscount.' We remember these expressions well. But let us ask, is that the Lord Palmerston whose loss was mourned lately, so much by the country, and even more by the House of Commons? After a short interval, when Lord Palmerston returned to power a second time, his enemies thought he would inevitably founder upon the same rock. But Lord Palmerston was great in nothing so much as in learning a lesson. In a short time the Premier, whose parliamentary insolence had been the byword of every politician, became the most popular minister within the memory of the House. If Lord Palmerston at seventy was able to operate such a miracle, has Mr. Gladstone so much less versatility, so much less aptitude, that he has less chance of learning the same lesson at fifty, in the prime of his powers and the perfection of his intellect? Mr. Gladstone now, like Lord Palmerston then, is the central political figure in the country. He may for a short time be eclipsed. He is too tall to be overshadowed. He will return to power soon, and he will, we venture to predict, show, what he has been showing at every turn of his career during the last ten years, that no lesson is thrown away upon him. We never heard any one maintain, that Mr. Gladstone's temper was anything but the ardour of a great and over-anxious

statesman, impatient of that which seems to him frivolous opposition. No English statesman should be impatient, for patience is of the essence of representative government. The general must wait for the rank and file of his army. But so far from having been arrogant and domineering, Mr. Gladstone, when first he assumed the leadership of the House of Commons, set such a watch over himself, that he was accused of tameness, and it was said his position was too much for him. When he introduced the Reform Bill, it was said that he performed his task so coldly, that it was clear his heart was not in it. But when his determination was seen to be fixed, and his fire rose as his tenacity was tried, when it was found that he meant business, and that he was bent on carrying a measure which he considered to be at once sufficient and safe, he was instantly charged by the opponents of Reform with being intemperate and domineering, and being resolved to thrust an unwelcome measure down the throats of an unwilling House. These tactics show plainly enough, that the true secret of the cry about Mr. Gladstone's temper was the hostility of the House to Reform. And so long as this great question remains unsettled, so long will any statesman, who undertakes to settle it, find himself assailed on different pleas by all the different sections hostile to Reform in general, or hostile to any particular measure. But that it must be carried, and will be carried, there cannot be a doubt. As we have already argued, the agitation can never again, we think, be what it was in 1832. But on the other hand, if political passions are less, the intellect of the masses is far more keen than it was. The question is thoroughly understood by the working classes. They know the meaning of political justice, and they know the meaning of representation. They also know, that Mr. Gladstone is their man, and at this moment after his defeat, his popularity is a thousand times greater throughout the country than it was before. If the conservatives bring in a Reform Bill, they cannot hope to bring in any but a liberal bill. A conservative Reform Bill, a bill omitting to give a substantial share of representation to labour, or giving an excessive weight to land, has no chance of passing. The question is now too clearly defined. On the other hand, if they bring in a liberal bill, one which satisfies the liberal sense of the country, they will have laid down their own flag on the vital question of their party. The only alternative is to leave Reform in abeyance. But to suppose, that in the present state of opinion throughout the country, the conservatives can burke Reform with Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Stuart Mill, and Mr. Bright sitting in front of them, would be a very short-sighted supposition.

Many politicians affect to think that the liberal party is on the point of being broken up, and they prophesy a long lease of tory power. This is, to our mind, the idlest of idle imaginations. The country is hopelessly liberal, and the tories know it. The only chance they have of remaining in power is to abdicate their character and to pass liberal measures.

Besides this, it should be remembered that nothing succeeds like success, and in twenty years of liberal success the bulk of the ability of the country has insensibly gravitated to the liberal side. Mr. Gladstone overshadows every statesman on the opposite benches. No man overshadows him. Of Mr. Disraeli we desire to speak with all respect, but it would be absurd to compare him with Mr. Gladstone for weight of popularity throughout the country and personal ability combined. It is said that Mr. Disraeli, though less eloquent, understands the management of the House better. Of course, a consummate actor has an apparent temporary advantage in the management of other men over a man who is absolutely sincere. But in the long run does that advantage endure? In Mr. Disraeli's case, is it not patent, that he has bought his popularity in the House at the price of his popularity in the country? How is it possible that any reasonable set of men, with ordinary political experience, can represent to themselves Mr. Disraeli in the enjoyment of the confidence of the country? Why the country would rather confide in Mr. Lowe! And every day, as publicity increases, and the country becomes, as it were, more vividly acquainted with the personality of its leaders, the more does it become necessary to the success of a statesman that his personality should be *en rapport* with the heart and the imagination of the country. And of whom is this true except of Mr. Gladstone? We challenge our opponents to say, whether of living statesmen there is one who appeals to the heart and imagination of the country, except Mr. Gladstone? The relative position, therefore, of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli in the country is this. In the House, Mr. Disraeli commands more deference and less admiration, Mr. Gladstone, commands more admiration and less deference. In the country, Mr. Disraeli has a great name—but he is neither popular, admired, beloved, nor trusted. Mr. Gladstone is more popular than any other man—more admired, more beloved, and if ever distrusted, only on the score of cleverness overleaping itself, a distrust which the success of his measures has of late years constantly diminished. Lord Stanley is a man of matured thought upon almost every political subject. He would probably make a good administrator, and he is more liberal than most of the men on his side of the House. His

speeches are generally miracles of common sense, and testify to one of the strongest logical digestions in the country. But Lord Stanley does not appeal to the popular heart. And his ability is not superior to that of many men on the other side of the House. In one single session, Mr. Stuart Mill, adding a parliamentary reputation to his previous fame, has taken a position as a logical speaker fully equal to that of Lord Stanley; while in wit, in a certain learned elegance and refinement, and occasionally a delicate fire of originality and genius, just clear of the line of Parliamentary eccentricity, Mr. Mill is vastly Lord Stanley's superior. Mr. Hardy need alarm no one on the liberal side. He is a stout useful parliamentary cob. Lord Cranbourne during the last two sessions has visibly declined in parliamentary prestige. When he speaks he is listened to with decreasing attention, in spite of the singular weight of his manner and the agreeable flippancy of his matter. Mr. Walpole, high-minded, courteous, popular with liberals as well as with conservatives, corresponding in many ways to Sir George Grey on the liberal side, belongs rather to the past, and is not likely, we think, to take a prominent position in a Cabinet including Lord Cranbourne and Lord Stanley. His relation to these younger statesmen corresponds very much to that which would subsist between a high and dry rector of the old school, and a virulent Puseyite and heretical broadchurchman. What position Mr. Henley will be in, we are at a loss to conceive? If he separates himself from Mr. Disraeli, how will he be able to coalesce with the ultra-Disraelian liberality which alone will render a Tory Government even possible? Sir John Pakington makes an excellent Dryasdust. Sir Hugh Cairns is a formidable adversary, and take it all in all for practical purposes, the best debater on the conservative side. His possible removal to the House of Lords would cause a gap in the conservative ranks which certainly no lawyer, and we believe no other politician, could fill up. The difference between him and Sir Roundell Palmer appears to be that Sir Roundell pierces with a sword, the former knocks you down with a sledge hammer. Lord John Manners represents most admirably the curious and very valuable old china of our British constitution. But for weight of political character and for plain unadorned power combined, Mr. Forster's honest clay is worth a thousand times more to the country than Lord John Manners' china. Man for man, the leading statesmen on the liberal side are neither overshadowed nor overweighted by any single conservative. The liberals have two men to their one. But if we look to the rank and file of both parties, after we

have ticked off some ten men on the conservative side, what have they left? men who represent one idea, and one idea only—land! Whereas the whole variety of national interests, all the opinions not connected with land, have naturally and *ex necessitate rei* found their representatives on the opposite side. We do not say the conservatives are stupid, we do not deny the compactness and strength of their party—we deny them the same variety of ability and the same national popularity. In both these particulars they are, and they know that they are, hopelessly overmatched. Under these circumstances, they cannot long, we think, retain power. Not until reform is carried to the satisfaction of the country, not until every religious question is settled and every vestige of religious intolerance swept away, not until free trade in commerce is extended to free trade in land, not until Ireland is loyal and well affected, can a great conservative party have any chance of a prolonged existence. But when these events have taken place, English conservatism will have passed into a new phase and be separated from the old by a gulf. The old conservative party will have passed away and be remembered only in name.

In conclusion we beg to repeat, what we have already repeated more than once, that we repudiate with our might and main, the charge brought against the friends of the present Reform Bill of favouring a tendency to democracy and the rule of numbers. Nothing that Mr. Lowe could say—not even his brilliant and piercing eloquence—could express all the devotion we feel to the cause of constitutional free self-government in this country, the abhorrence with which we regard even the bare possibility of a many-headed tyranny and the despotism of the million. But we hold the rule of numbers in this country to be an impossibility. We believe the best safeguard against even the semblance of such a despotism to be the extension, and not the limitation, of the principle of free self-government. We hold it most expedient, most safe, most constitutional, to extend the foundations of our representation to their furthest convenient limits—expedient, because the representation of the people is bound up with the political education of the country at large; safe, because political representation is the soul of political safety; constitutional, because according to the best spirit of our constitution, labour is as much entitled to be heard in the House of Commons—heard directly and authoritatively—as either trade or land. And we have defended the Government against the hostility of the House of Commons, because we can conceive no undertaking more truly constitutional—

no undertaking more truly patriotic—no undertaking more truly statesmanlike—on the part of any Government, than to aspire to lead the House, even against its own secret fears, secret ill-will, and secret apathy, even at the expense of narrowly contested and dearly bought victories, to do that which will injure no one, degrade no one, undermine no single interest in the state, but, under Providence, lead to the greater strength and prosperity of the whole community more firmly knitted together in the bonds of constitutional peace, constitutional harmony, and constitutional welfare.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TRAVELS.

The Albert N'yanza. Great Basin of the Nile and Explorations of the Nile Sources. By SAMUEL WHITE BAKER, M.A., F.R.G.S., Gold Medallist of the Royal Geographical Society. With Maps, Illustrations, and Portraits. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co.

. In its combination of the characteristics that make a good book of travels we have no hesitation in pronouncing Mr. Baker's the best that for some years has come into our hands. He has travelled in unknown countries; he has made great discoveries which both gratify the curiosity, and solve the problems of centuries; he has undergone greater hardships, and met with more exciting adventure than any previous African traveller, Bruce perhaps excepted; the romance of his own adventures is enhanced by the companionship of a brave-hearted wife; and he has told his story with consummate literary art. His book is as interesting as Herodotus, as exciting as a sensation novel, and as skilfully, if not as eloquently, written as Macaulay's Essays. The materials are admirably worked up; the journal is sparingly quoted, and the more important incidents are told with an effect that is quite dramatic. At the same time the reader cannot for a moment doubt that he is reading the narrative of a manly, straightforward, and honest explorer, whose estimate of his competitors in discovery is as generous as the account of his own achievements is modest. With the characteristic pluck and pertinacity of Englishmen, the great African mystery has been persistently attacked, and, within a few years, extorted. All that now remains is to perfect the detail of the great geographical facts established. To our own countrymen the honour of the discovery belongs; and we are justly proud of their achievement. No people, no literature, in the

history of the world, can, within the same space of time, boast such contributions to geographical knowledge, as the works of Livingstone, Burton, Speke, Grant, and Baker. Nor should we omit the illustrious President of the Geographical Society, whose sagacious scientific hypotheses have contributed as much to African discovery as the actual travels of any one of its explorers. Each claims his own share of the glory, and it is no more necessary to institute invidious comparison than, happily, it is to decide rival claims, or appease personal jealousies. It is enough to say that Livingstone has achieved the unique enterprise of crossing equatorial Africa, and of exploring the great Zambesi and the Shire, south of the Nile sources; and that he has been anticipated in the discovery of the latter only because he could not do every thing at once. He conjectured their locality and general nature, and intended to put his conjecture to a positive test. Burton also surmised the existence of the great equatorial lakes whence the Nile springs, and began the search for them. Speke and Grant discovered the Victoria N'yanza, the highest source or reservoir of the Nile, and Baker has discovered the Albert N'yanza, in which vast body of water all the separate sources of the Nile are gathered, and from which they issue in the mighty volume of the White Nile.

It is not our purpose to give a *précis* of Mr. Baker's fascinating narrative; this would be scarcely fair to the author, whose book claims the perusal of every one for whom heroic enterprise and thrilling adventure have any claim; nor would it be fair to the reader inasmuch as it might blunt the edge of his curiosity, while it could not fully satisfy it. We will refer our readers to the volumes themselves, confident that their perusal will amply justify the eulogy upon them that we feel constrained to pronounce.

Mr. Baker is not like Dr. Livingstone, a missionary, nor is he like Burton, Speke, and Grant, a soldier. He is a private gentleman, apparently of ample means, who prefers the excitement and enterprise of African travel, that he may do his part in fulfilling 'those duties by which the earth's history is carried on,' to the enjoyment of clubs and Parliamentary honours, and country life at home. He does not formally describe his personal qualifications as an African explorer, but his book abundantly indicates them; these are so many and so great that he must be a kind of admirable Crichton among travellers. In the first place he is physically strong, so that he can stretch a refractory Arab senseless with as much ease and skill as Tom Sayers could have shown; and survive as many African fevers as Dr. Livingstone, although without quinine for months. He possesses undaunted courage; with imperturbable calmness he waits the charge of an infuriated elephant, or the spring of a tiger, when his only chances for life are the certainty of his aim, and the infallibility of his rifle; trusting to his tact and pluck, and to what may turn up, he follows an inimical trading party into the desert, although they have sworn to murder him, and although he knows that his own men have conspired to desert him and to aid them. He quells a mutiny by his fist, rolling the leader over in a heap, and resists an attack of armed Arabs by thrusting his umbrella down the throat of one of them. He is, moreover, very determined; no danger nor difficulty can divert him from his purpose; his enthusiasm is fired by it, and his patience waits upon his enthusiasm. His resolute will, combined with his inflexible justice, gave him an extraordinary ascendancy over the Arabs, so that friends and foes came to regard him as a kind of demi-god. He is, moreover, a man fertile in resources, a self-helping

man, ready to do himself every thing that others will not do for him; and unflinching in the ingenuity with which he can overcome difficulties. He is a sportsman of the first water—hippopotami, crocodiles, elephants, hartebeestes, nothing comes him amiss; he speaks of his rifles as if they were his children, and very affectionately they served him. He had, moreover, the advantage of singleness of council; his noble wife, in every way as brave and patient and wise as himself, being his only European companion. Her companionship gives a touch of beautiful romance and tenderness to the narrative. In more than one crisis Mrs. Baker's womanly tact saved the expedition. When we add to all this a very high degree of literary art—simplicity and beauty of language, power, reticence, and suggestiveness of descriptions, with a dramatic skill of so putting things, as that they produce the effect of a tableau or of a surprise, as the case may be, we get the conception of a heaven-born traveller—*nascitur non fit*—born not only to supply the materials of books, but to write them.

To Speke and Grant the honour of discovering the source of the Nile belongs. Starting from Zanzibar 7° S. latitude, and proceeding N.W. they discovered the Victoria N'yanza, stretching from 2° S. latitude to the equator, and from 32° to 35° E. longitude. This is the eastern side of the great basin of the Nile sources. Out of the north end of this lake the White Nile issues. It was traced by Speke in a N.W. direction to the Karuma Falls, 2° 15' north of the equator, where it made a sudden bend to the W.; but hostilities among the tribes prevented him from tracing it further. He was told by the natives, of a little lake, the Luta N'zigé, to the west, into which the river ran; he was compelled, however, to proceed north, and struck the Nile again at Miani's tree, 3° 32'; the farthest point south reached by the Venetian whose name it bears, 450 miles from the Victoria N'yanza, and 60 or 70 miles from Gondokoro. At Gondokoro he met Mr. and Mrs. Baker on their way to his assistance; a very graphic account of the interview is given by Mr. Baker. Captain Speke told Mr. Baker what he had done, and what remained to be done, generously gave him maps, and all the instruction and assistance that he could. Mr. Baker proceeded to the Karuma Falls, thence in a south-westerly direction until he came upon the Albert N'yanza at Vacovia, in latitude 1° N.; he found that instead of a 'little lake' it was far larger than the Victoria, and probably the largest lake in the world. He ascertained that it extended from 3° N. latitude to 2° S. latitude, between which it was well known to the natives; that in the south it then turned to the west, and its further extent was unknown. Its breadth at Vacovia was 60 or 70 miles. From Vacovia Mr. Baker coasted northward in canoes for thirteen days until he reached Magungo, the mouth of the river which Speke had traced from the Victoria Lake to the Karuma Falls; the continuity of which he verified by ascending it as far as the falls; from Magungo he clearly saw the exit of the entire volume of the Nile at the northern end of the lake. He thus demonstrated that the Victoria N'yanza discovered by Speke, was a high reservoir on the eastern side of the Nile Basin, that the river which flowed from it,—the Victoria Nile or Somerset River, flowed into the Albert N'yanza, to which it falls, by a succession of cataracts, many hundreds of feet, and that the Albert N'yanza was therefore the grand reservoir into which all the waters which form the White Nile proper were collected; many affluents, doubtless, contributing to it, some of them probably of equal volume with the Victoria Nile. It receives, in fact, the drainage of the entire country. In

every particular, therefore, Mr. Baker emphatically corroborates Captain Speke; Mr. Baker simply continuing and completing Captain Speke's discovery. The actual basin of the Nile thus determined, is included between about 22° and 39° E. longitude, and from 3° S. to 18° N. latitude; the Nile receiving the entire drainage of the whole of this vast region. 'The rivers are constant throughout the year, and the 'Albert Lake continues at a high level, affording a steady volume of 'water to the Nile.' The annual overflow of the Nile is caused, not by any fluctuation in the White Nile as it emerges from Albert N'yanza, but in its great affluents, the Blue Nile, which joins the White Nile at Khartoum, and the Atbara, which joins it a few miles farther north. These are two mountain streams having their rise in the mountains of Abyssinia; they are suddenly flooded by periodical rains which fall in June, and raise the volume of the Nile so as to cause the inundation in Lower Egypt. It is remarkable that Ptolemy describes the Nile as having its sources in two great lakes which receive the snows of the Ethiopian mountains, and that there are many ancient maps upon which these two lakes are marked; of course in very erroneous latitudes. Probably a general trade between Central Africa and Zanzibar had given rise to this impression, which is thus proved to have been accurate in its general facts, but erroneous in its details.

For the romantic detail of personal adventure we must refer our readers to this most fascinating book. Mr. Baker also touches on many matters of great importance, which we cannot discuss—on the probability of commerce with Central Africa, on its accursed slave trade, and the means of suppressing it; on missions, their failure and their probabilities; on the inferiority of the Negro race, which Mr. Baker maintains; on the pre-Adamite antiquity of both the geological formations and the inhabitants of Central Africa; and on other questions upon which his observations throw a very interesting and important light. Mr. Baker has completed the solution of the greatest geographical mystery of the last two thousand years; his name and that of his heroic wife, will be imperishably associated with the sources of the Nile; and his book will in future ages be read, as we now read Herodotus,—a classic in literature, a romance in adventure, and a high authority in geographical history.

The Diary of the Right Hon. Wm. Wyndham, 1784 to 1810.

Edited by Mrs. HENRY BARING. Longmans & Co., 1866.

It is probable that this diary was not meant by the author for the public eye. It was begun in 1783, in obedience to Dr. Johnson's injunction—and an injunction from Johnson had with Wyndham the force of a moral law,—and it is a record of the almost daily life and feelings of its distinguished author. The family from which William Wyndham descended was one of great antiquity and consideration in Norfolk, in which county it had been settled since the Conquest. Members of the family served Henry VII., VIII., and Queen Elizabeth; and Sir John Wyndham, a cavalier in the days of Charles II., enjoined his family "tho' the crown should hang on a bush, not to forsake it." From a common ancestor descended the Egremonts, the Wyndhams of Felbrigg, of Wadham, of Cromer, and others. On the female side the house of Felbrigg was connected with the Portmans, the Lyttons of Knebworth, the Ashes of Twickenham, and other old families. The father of the author of this diary, Colonel Wyndham, quarrelled in early life with his

father, and having entered the Hungarian service under Maria Theresa, lived much abroad. His mother was Sarah Hicks, the daughter of R. Lukyn, of Dunmow. The youth himself, the fruit of this union, was born in Golden Square, London, on the 3rd May, 1750. He was sent to Eton when seven years old, in 1757, at which school he remained till he was sixteen. At Eton he laid the foundation of those classical attainments which were the solace of his maturer life. On leaving Eton, in 1766, he was sent to the University of Glasgow, where, under Anderson and Simson, the editor of Euclid, he attained a rare proficiency in mathematics. In 1767 he proceeded from Glasgow to Oxford, entering himself a gentleman commoner of University College, where Sir Robert Chambers and Dr. Winstanley, Laudian Professor of Arabic, were his tutors. The latter, who was also Camden Professor of History, edited the Poeties of Aristotle, which work became a class book in the university, and it is not wonderful that under two such tutors Wyndham, naturally studious, became eminent for high and scholarly attainments. His reading while at Oxford was very various, in classics, history, and science, and so continued during the whole of his life. Beyond any parliamentary man of his day, with the exception of Gibbon, Burke, and Drs. Scott, and French-Lawrence, he was a student and a reader. One has only to open the diary at p. 97 to be assured of this. The heading *Historia Literaria* comprises a list of the books read from January to December, 1786. One wonders that a man so engaged in private and public business, occupying so prominent a place in Parliament and in society, frequenting Newmarket and the theatres, and constantly dining out, and appearing at routs, assemblies, &c., could have gone over so much ground.

On quitting Oxford Mr. Wyndham visited the continent, in company with Thomas William Coke, of Holkham, who sat so long for Norfolk, and who, the Nestor of Whiggism, was ultimately raised to the peerage as Earl of Leicester.

Wyndham was first returned to the House of Commons for Norwich in 1782. So high did his character stand that he was appointed in 1783 Chief Secretary in Ireland, the Viceroy being the Earl of Northington. In this office, in which he succeeded so distinguished a statesman as William Wyndham Grenville, afterwards Earl Grenville, he remained but a few months, his return being rendered compulsory by the state of his health. Yet in his short sojourn in Dublin he conciliated the goodwill of the best men of all parties, and formed valuable friendships with Anthony Malone (Lord Sunderlin), his brother Edmund, Foster and Parnell (Speaker of the Irish Commons), Fitzgibbon (afterwards Earl of Clare), Hussey Burgh Yelverton (afterwards Chief Baron), Flood, Grattan, the Beresfords, &c.

On the dissolution of the Coalition Ministry, Wyndham was returned for Norwich, and on the 1st of January, 1784, the diary before us, the authenticity of which cannot be doubted (for it was given to the editor by her brother, William Wyndham), commences. At this period Mr. Wyndham was a Whig, and a leading member of Brookes's, but his close friendship with Fox, Grenville, Grey, Sheridan, Fitzpatrick, Erskine, Adam, Lord Fitzwilliam, Lord Spencer, George Cavendish, and John Townsend, did not prevent him from being the intimate friend of Dr. Johnson, a high Tory, of Dr. William Scott (the brother of Lord Eldon, and afterwards himself Lord Stowell, a high Tory), and of many other members of the Literary Club, not of Whig principles. Wyndham, like Burke, Gibbon, Henry Flood, the great Lord Chesterfield, and Lord Palmerston, the father of the late first Minister, was a man of Catholic

sympathies, a party man, if you will, yet without any of the narrowness of party views. The being an old aristocratic liberal Whig of Brookes's, supping with Fox, Grey, Sheridan, Norfolk, and Fitzwilliam, served but to strengthen the independent feelings of the fine old English gentleman, and brought into more noble relief the patriot, the scholar, and the man of letters. When a young and fashionable man about town, Wyndham uniformly cultivated the society of men of science and literature, and always read up to and most frequently far beyond their level. This prevailing habit of his mind from early manhood will account for his worship of Burke, for his admiration and love for Johnson, for his journey to Paris with Dr. Wm. Scott (Lord Stowell), for his partiality to Porson, Parr, and Dr. Ryland (an eminent literary Nonconformist), and for his toleration for some years of Cobbett, a man of robust intellect as a writer, but with all his masculine strength, illiterate, coarse, and ribald, though gifted with genius and power of picturesque expression. This will also account for the sympathy that existed between him, an old Whig, and so inveterate a Jacobite and so uncompromising a Tory as Walter Scott. Scott hating Whigs and Liberals, but loving brave, sincere, and good men and gentlemen, dedicated to Wyndham, one of the earliest cantos of *Marmion*.

It has not been sufficiently brought out in criticisms on this book that the chief intellectual gratification of Wyndham was in coming as often as possible into social and literary intercourse with men of letters properly so called. When still a gay young man not thirty-five, his greatest happiness in visiting Edinburgh was in dining and passing the evening with Adam Smith, Dr. Robertson, the historian, and Harry Erskine; the first two professed men of letters, and the third as much a man of letters and a scholar as a lawyer and a man of the world. So too, in London, where Wyndham might, from his birth, social position, and fortune, have mixed with men and women of the loftiest titled rank, or with statesmen and politicians in the highest office, his chiefest delight was to live with Burke, Johnson, Sheridan, Sir Philip Francis, Malone, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Adam Langton, Courtenay, Colonel Barré, Dr. Brocklesby, Geo. Ellis, Jack Lee, the Attorney-General (a scholar and a wit, as well as a lawyer), and Erskine, an orator and a man of genius. This delightful society, composed of philosophers, soldiers, scholars, orators, dramatists, artists, and physicians, mingled with their special aptitudes and acquirements an engrossing love of letters and of the fine arts. Wyndham was always, during the busiest part of his political career, a hard working classical, mathematical, and historical student and man of science, adding new acquisitions to what he had largely gained at Eton, Glasgow, and Oxford. This was the more commendable, as he was of independent fortune, gay, eager, and impulsive in disposition, gifted with every grace of beauty, and a proficient in all manly exercises. He rode, he shot, he coursed, with the most bucolic of squires, he pulled an oar with the jolliest young waterman of the Thames, and sparred and fenced with the most agile in their craft. He could join in a glee or duet with the Prince of Wales, dance as well as Lord Aboyne, and speak more than one modern language, at a time when Lords Chesterfield, St. Helena, and old Hale (of whom the editor appears to know nothing, but who was diplomatically employed by our Government in Russia, France, and Poland), were considered proficient in the gift of tongues. While Wyndham was thus

"So various that he seemed to be
Not one but all mankind's epitome"—

he was also ready to speak in the House when it was thought necessary by his friends or party. That he always spoke well, often ingeniously and eloquently, with great force and acumen, and exquisite dialectical and logical skill, is admitted both by friend and foe, if foe he had. His views were often bold and original. He had a peculiar pride in deviating from the beaten path, and sometimes got into the tangled jungle of paradox; but his paradoxes, though seemingly absurd, were often true, in fact. His defence of the ring and boxing would not hold good now, when the ring is not merely ruffianly but dishonest, sordid and rotten to the core; but in the days of Cribb, Molyneux, Gregson, and Gully, there were fair stand-up fights, as there were fair races, and neither pugilists nor grooms were guilty of a "cross," as was witnessed a few weeks ago between Jem Mace and his opponent Goss. It has been said that Wyndham did but little: that his life was barren, that he left no mark upon his age. But that man of whom Pitt said, "that his speeches are the finest productions possible of woven imagination and fancy"—of whom Grey said that he was a commanding genius of great original powers, a mind cultivated with the richest intellectual wealth, and a fancy of the highest flights of imagery, must have been no common personage. Burke and Johnson had the highest opinion of Wyndham, and Fox said of him "that he was a thinking man, without being a grave man, a meditating man with much activity, and a reading man, with much practical knowledge." It is idle to say that such a person left no mark on his age. But he lived in an age of intellectual, political, and literary giants; he lived and moved with Burke and Pitt, with Fox and Sheridan, with Lords North, Grenville, and Grey, with Johnson and Gibbon. He was not the equal of the four first in the Senate, but he was fully the equal of Grenville or Grey in statesmanship, and far their superior in scholarly attainments. Above the Jenkinsons, Addingtons, Castlereaghs, Vansittarts, Pettys, Spencers, Whitbreads, Ponsonbys, Dundases, Portlands, Aucklands, Ryders, Bragges, and a host of second and third-rate men, whether Whigs or Tories, Wyndham stood pre-eminent. In truth, from 1784 till 1807 he ranks next after the giants Burke, Fox, Pitt, Sheridan, Flood and Grattan, and must be placed before any second-rate man, whether Whig or Tory. There can be no doubt that so long as Burke lived that great man exercised a predominant and prevailing influence over Mr. Wyndham, and induced him to sever himself from the party of Fox, with which both statesmen at first acted; but Wyndham, being Secretary at War in 1794 under Pitt, a second time after Burke's death occupied that office in the administration of "All the Talents" in 1806, a proof that he was considered an indispensable and inevitable man with both parties. He was a person of a generous and noble nature, and wished for an amicable separation with Fox, and not such a rupture as Burke effected. No man of his day, with the exceptions of Fox and Pitt, understood foreign politics so well as Wyndham. The proof of this may be found in his speeches on the war with France, on the Russian armaments, on the Alien Bill, on the Slave Trade, and others. All his speeches were collected in three vols., in 1812, by the late Mr. Amyot, and we will be bound to say no statesman of the first mark has ever lived since then without often consulting them. As a practical politician and statesman Wyndham did much to raise the character of the British army, and to place it on a new foundation. Nor did he confine his efforts to mere desk-work, for he was present in the trenches before Valenciennes in 1793. He loved the converse and company of soldiers, was the friend of Abercromby, Moore, and Crawford,

was the friend and admirer of Nelson, and always, unlike some Whigs, spoke highly of General Wellesley. Yet with all his exquisite scholarship, high attainments, and chivalrous character, he had his faults. In early life a serious illness had rendered him somewhat morbidly sensitive. He suffered occasionally from gloom and melancholy, the effect of hypochondria. This occasionally gave a character of fastidiousness, indecision, and of vacillation to his actions and resolves, but on all cardinal principles he never fluctuated a hair's breadth. In later life he became a healthier man in body. His moral and physical courage were undoubted. He confronted danger in every way, and met the accident which caused his death in rendering assistance to save his friend North's library from the flames. He died on the 3rd June, 1810, in the 59th year of his age.

Though the events in this diary are recorded with great brevity, and many of the personages named are forgotten, yet the volume will undoubtedly contribute to elucidate some of the important transactions of the age in which Mr. Wyndham lived. It throws a good deal of light on personal history and character, on club and political life, and on the social habits and events of eighty and ninety years ago.

William Wilberforce: His Friends and his Times. By JOHN CAMPBELL COLQUHOUN. London: Longmans & Co.

Mr. Colquhoun is not free from the vice of fine writing, nor from that species of hero-worship which belauds in swelling periods, which do not admit of critical discrimination nor of qualifying clauses, and which derive their form and tumidity chiefly from the use of adjectives, the bigness of which is correlative to their vagueness. When fairly wound up, Mr. Colquhoun takes two or three pages of rhetorical grandeur to run himself down. He piles up details to a perilous height, and when he specifies a characteristic, he elaborates it with great and somewhat indiscriminate unctuousness. Nor do we think his judgments of Wilberforce and his contemporaries so true to human nature and to history as they might be; as, for example, those of Sir J. Stephen in the 'Clapham Sect.' His book does not contain much that is new, but it brings together from various sources—chiefly from the voluminous 'Life of Wilberforce,' by his sons—much that ordinary readers would otherwise be unacquainted with. It is well conceived and arranged, and the simple goodness, benevolence, earnestness, and versatility of Wilberforce's character are effectively presented. We see the man as Bishop Jebb described him, 'With the look of an angel and the agility of a monkey.' Always cheerful, he was always devout, sustaining the labours of his outward life by an inner life of great intensity and intimate communion with God. More than most men he lived ever as 'beneath the great Task-master's eye;' severe to his own failings, but full of the broadest charities to the failings of others. One or two anecdotes told by Mr. Colquhoun strikingly illustrate his political conscientiousness. He would not withhold an adverse verdict, would not even be silent when the fate of his own political party depended upon it; and, what was more, they never thought of asking him to do so. Notwithstanding the defects that we have intimated, Mr. Colquhoun's book is well worth reading. We wish that he had written more simply, and had known how to praise with more discrimination, in which case the volume which is now very interesting, would have deserved very high praise, and he would have enabled his readers to understand the large successes and the partial failures of the Evangelical party, of which Wilberforce and his friends were the leaders. In religious purpose and feeling his book is most admirable.

Memoir of George Wilson: By his Sister. A New Condensed Edition. London: Macmillan and Co.

We have seldom read a more interesting and instructive biography than that of Professor George Wilson, by his sister. An unusual combination of scientific accuracy with philosophic breadth, of devout Christian feeling with great social charm, gave a species of uniqueness to the volume which so lovingly portrayed his life, and reviewed his works. We welcome this condensed reprint with satisfaction, under the conviction that the omission of some details which reduce the bulk will extend the circulation, and will not detract from the interest of this delightful biography. The volume is enriched with the characteristic portrait. Professor Wilson was a valued contributor to this Journal.

The Life and Letters of Lady Arabella Stuart, including numerous original and unpublished documents. By ELIZABETH COOPER. 2 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett.

The history of Arabella Stuart is one of those tragedies of real life which fiction can only feebly counterfeit. Miss Cooper, therefore, is infinitely more pathetic than Mr. G. P. R. James; and would be more pathetic than she is, were not her narrative somewhat overlaid with documents and broken with episodes. Documentary evidence is indispensable to the writer of history as distinguished from historical romance; and ordinary students of history are under great obligations to writers like Miss Cooper for printing the documents upon which history is based; but the artistic effect would be greater if they were relegated to the Appendix; and if the biographer would simply and in a straightforward way tell the story and leave off when it is told. Monographs like this have a very great value if conscientiously done. They are episodes worth narrating at full length, which the proportions of history do not permit to be so narrated. They furnish reading which may compete with the encroaching novel, and instruct while they interest. Every such work ought, therefore, to be very heartily welcomed to our homes. Arabella Stuart was the representative of the younger branch of the family of Margaret Tudor, eldest daughter of Henry VII., just as James I. of England was the representative of the elder branch. Her maternal grandmother was the famous 'Bess of Hardwick,' the founder of the fortunes of the Devonshire family. Arabella was by many regarded as the heiress to the throne, and excited in the jealous heart of Elizabeth the suspicions attaching to all who had, or seemed to have, a personal interest in the succession; hence her clandestine attempt to marry William Seymour, son of Lord Beauchamp, and grandson of the unhappy Katherine Grey; hence Elizabeth's outburst of rage thereat and her despotic imprisonment of the unhappy pair. On the accession of James I. she was restored to court favour, which continued until her secret marriage with Seymour in 1610; whereupon the husband and wife were both imprisoned by the ruthless and—we must say—brutal pedant and tyrant. An attempt to escape proved a failure; and, after five years' imprisonment, she died of a broken heart. Miss Cooper devotes three chapters to the similar history of Katherine Grey, the most tragic and pathetic part of the book. One's very blood boils at the lawless cruelty of both Elizabeth and James; and we heartily accord with Miss Cooper's verdict in her

comparison of those 'good old times' with our own; our shame for the nobles and judges and people of England, and especially for the obsequious Bishop of Durham, Arabella's jailer, equals our indignation at the cold-blooded tyranny of the monarch.

Miss Cooper has bestowed great labour and much patient research upon her work. Her investigations make it a new and valuable contribution to history. It has the interest of Miss Strickland's biographies without the discolourment of her prejudices.

Twelve Months with Fredrika Bremer in Sweden. By MARGARET HOWITT. 2 vols. London: Jackson and Walford.

Miss Howitt's book combines the attractions of an intelligent and picturesque description of Swedish life and manners with pleasant delineations and biographical sketches of one whose charming novels have given her a European name, and endeared her to thousands of English hearts. As the translator of her best novels, Mrs. Howitt was the chief medium of communication between Miss Bremer and the English public; this led to the intimacy which resulted in the twelvemonths visit of her daughter to Miss Bremer and the Swedish capital. Genius seems a family inheritance in Mrs. Howitt's family. Not only are she and her husband endowed with it, but an elder daughter made a favourable impression a few years ago by some very charming sketches of 'Artist Life in Munich.'

With the exception of a slight tendency to be prolix, which we could wish otherwise, we have nothing but good to speak of Miss Howitt's book; it is genial in tone, quick in observation, delicate in discrimination, and affluent in quiet artistic pictures of men and manners. Perhaps its success depends on the combination that we have mentioned. A mere memoir of Miss Bremer would not be without its interest; but so quiet and uneventful was her life, that it would be chiefly a literary chronicle and critique. On the other hand, we are almost weary of books of mere travel, especially when they relate to countries so familiar as Sweden. Miss Howitt has avoided each by combining both. Nothing can be more charming than her quiet, incidental, day-by-day delineations of Miss Bremer's home life, and of Swedish manners. Sweden is very proud of her pure-hearted and fascinating story-teller. She is neither a Miss Edgeworth nor a Miss Austen, much less a Miss Mulock or a George Eliot, but she has drawn sweet and natural pictures of life which do more for Swedish youth, because in Sweden they are more unique, than these have done for England.

The excellence of Miss Howitt's book is, that it is a book of pictures, artistically conceived and admirably executed. It puts before English readers scenes of actual national life, such as Miss Bremer has idealized in her novels.

Garibaldi at Home: Notes of a Visit to Caprera. By Sir C. E. MACGREGOR, Bart. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1866.

A short time since some English admirers of Garibaldi sent him a yacht, and Sir Charles MacGregor carried to the General certain addresses which were to accompany the present. He went across France and

Piedmont to Caprera, spent a few days with Garibaldi,—part of the time being occupied by a cruise in the yacht—and returned to England by the way he went. Of the great Italian's hospitality and kindness Sir Charles writes warmly, and it is almost impossible to read without some pleasure any account of Garibaldi, his family, and his island home. We cannot fail to gain some glimpses of the simple greatness and self-sacrifice which have excited the wonder and love of the world. But it must be said that there are very few. The author tells us that Garibaldi expressed his preference of Scott's novels to those of Dumas,—that he thought cotton might be successfully grown in Sardinia—and that he recommended Sir Charles to read Tasso. We learn little else of the hero. What his host 'might have' said on matters of political importance, the author remarks mysteriously, but no doubt properly, it would be wrong to divulge. But whether Garibaldi said anything on such topics is discreetly left uncertain. Notwithstanding this reticence, a volume of 300 pages has been constructed. It is a triumph of book-making. By anybody who cares to know what were the reflections of the author as he travelled, or what he conceives to be the tenets of the Waldenses, the book may be found interesting. To those who do not care to know the former, and would not trust the latter, we cannot recommend it, although its absurdity both in matter and style makes it almost amusing.

POLITICS; SCIENCE, AND ART.

The Exhibition of the Royal Academy of Arts, 1866. The Ninety-eighth. London: Clowes and Sons.

It is impossible to enter the Royal Academy without hearing something of the echo of that clash of arms which, for years past, has been sounding in every quarter of this now almost venerable institution. We see pictures hung in obscure corners, which some of the public would be much better pleased to see conveniently. We hear of others rejected for no reason, as far as very many people can tell, except the great fame of the painter's name. We observe a few pictures placed, if not conspicuously well, yet sufficiently so to make us consider how many, ten thousand times better, have been consigned to the care of the porters, to be branded with a royal condemnation, and to serve the purpose of strengthening hearts, and breaking them. It is the old, old story. These things have always been, and in some degree must ever be; and yet the end of the warfare which, for years has been waging, and which appears to be approaching, may not be so clearly in sight.

The Royal Academy may yet keep about it an opposition which is somewhat unconstitutional; and it is very difficult for us to say whether Art, in the splendour and width of the term, will gain or lose by a knowledge that dissent surrounds it armed with the sympathy of a large portion of the art public, ready at every assumption, or perhaps noble challenge, to give battle in the good old way of hand to hand, foot to foot, and heart to heart, and not with opera glasses and long range rifles. It may be that peace is not always gain:—that true art may not be advanced by an institution which, like all others of its kind, takes years and years to recognise a fresh conquest in a land unknown to itself; which has learned to dwell securely and peacefully by the reflection from the very face of those waters which once flowed and almost flashed in the glory and might of living genius. It may be, that the time has come when art can be safely left to the integrity and art knowledge of the

press, the business taste of picture dealers, and the patronage of the merchant princes and nobles of our land. It may be, that art education is so common in its possession, and so true in its direction, as to render any widely revered board of judgment a doubtful good; that the accumulation of power resulting from the souls of the illustrious dead, from a nation's loan settled into funded property, and from acknowledged social condition, may be things which can now be cast on one side as having served, however well or however ill, their generation and their day. It is possible that a body of men gifted with genius, who, in the strength of unity, shall present a long list of great painters to the public, and shall, by the sheer force of that strength, draw to them the youth of a land already saturated with the teaching of Carlyle and Ruskin, and prove that, however good the interference of government may be in cholera and cattle plagues, and in punishment of crime, at least freedom of love's own passion, or the sea's own motion, or the wind's clear breath, gives most of health, most of strength, and most of food, alike to painters themselves and to the nation. It may be that all young enthusiasm shall be turned to respectability or entirely crushed. It may be, that even now, the President may with quietness and affection, rest from morning until eventide in the haunts of nightingales on many coloured moss, with the sweet soft motion of the green leaves all round him, and the quiet immeasurable sky beyond him; that the honours of an alien 'brush' may be relinquished for this more excellent way. It may be, that in all the vividness of nightmare, the Royal Academy of twenty years ago, and the Royal Academy of to-day, and yesterday, and twenty years hence, may be presented to his vision, and that in spite of the present self-exclusion of men marked by decided genius and undoubted power, he may understand that the Pre-raphaëlitism which he deemed a retrograde movement, may, indeed, be but a change of direction, and a most necessary one, which, even now, has resulted, and which must increasingly result in an expression more worthy of the deep poetic instincts of this mighty nation.

The compliance of the Council of the Academy with the suggestions of Government may meet the just demands of the whole body of artists. We have not space here to discuss how far it may be advisable for Government to extend power to the Academy, and to examine the evidence of men within and without that body, as to the value of the art-education given, and likely to be given, by them; or how far some direction in South Kensington affairs might be thus right; or how far our national buildings, and national sculpture might be trusted to the direction and control of a widened art committee. With any changes, however, the Academy can scarcely retain its position of irresponsibility.

One thing as touching the Academy 'hanging,' we may say, that some clear principle might be settled, which should be acknowledged by all to be the cardinal point of that part of its government which alone the public will judge. A colossal statue of Justice may form part of the new buildings in Burlington Gardens, with a sword in one hand, and an everlasting scroll in the other, on which might be written:—'We divide all works into four classes,—the bad, the good, the better, and the best; the first we reject altogether in the interest of art, the best we hang entirely, and as many as possible of the better and the good.' The application of this law would not be so very difficult as might be imagined, from the diversity of perception of really good art in different men. Perhaps, whatever space might be at the disposal of the Academy, art production would increase in a greater ratio, and the public would be no

better served by the jostling together of very bad and very good ; of course the obvious remedy is not in extension of space, so much as elevation of the standard of necessary excellence.

We find in other departments, as well as that of art, that the 'senior wrangler' is not the man gifted with those powers which shall last through life, and reflect or command the age ; and we are inclined to assert that the Academy education, whatever it may have been in the past, is not now great in its influence, and is not likely to increase in potency, and that art can afford to trust to other influences for that expression which the wealth and fashion of the nation demands at its hands. That the Academy may do good service it is impossible to deny ; with an accomplished chemist, as well as an accomplished bishop, among its number who shall throw the subtlety of his energies into realizing one, at least, of the many wishes of Sir Joshua ; whom now we sometimes think of in another state, as deploring his chemical ignorance, and breaking over and over again his many gallipots, and trying again and again to discover the meaning and intention of his cracked and defaced canvasses. A chemist might lay this restless spirit, and might settle what we believe no living man certainly knows, the exact method of Titian ; a method held in common, we believe, with Tintoretto, John Bellini, and all the most illustrious of the Venetian School, as well as with Velasquez and Murillo. It might not be necessary to destroy the all but priceless Titian in our own National Gallery, but it would be certainly necessary to submit to the destruction by the most subtle chemical analysis of some of the good paintings of the age of this prince of painters, if thus we might learn their secret.

It has been left to this age to discover with certainty the mode adopted by the earliest, brightest, clearest, simplest, and most indestructible of colorists,—Van Eyck ; and the age has even profited and applied such knowledge. The brilliancy of Mr. Millais's earlier work depended largely upon it ; Madox Brown, Hunt, Rossetti, and others, profited by it, and although the germ lay quietly in a note made by Reynolds himself, it must never be forgotten that Reynolds never, like Columbus, made his egg to stand. Mr. Watts in practice comes nearest in his pictures to the result obtained by the Venetians, and he is not yet a member of 'the Body. If the re-discovery of the secret of the Venetian method, which we believe is now understood only in the most irregular and partial way, shall be added to the trophies of this age, then we shall be in possession of everything relating to the art of painting that it may be desirable to teach ; and the Academy will deserve some great national recognition.

In looking over the ten resolutions which the Academy has adopted, it is impossible not to see their genuine liberal tendency ; and we cherish the hope that in the new buildings at Burlington House, the interests of the largely increasing body of artists may receive a more ample consideration than hitherto.

But without more preface, we hasten to make such a general examination of the Academy of the year, as may enable us to say a word or two on its strength and direction. Its aspect differs from that of other years, for many men who in former years have contributed largely to its interest are unrepresented, and their places have been filled by less familiar names ; some of our most revered painters are not now so elastic and vigorous as they once were, and though Maclise is seen in all the strength of old, Stanfield in his Tintagel scarcely exhibits the power of mountain drawing, or the spraying restless sea we are accustomed to ask at his hand.

Wm. Herbert, Charles Landseer, Millais, Elmore, and Foley, are not represented. Landseer seizes us by force of old association, and the very echo of his name fills us with pleasure. There is a poetry in almost every thought he has expressed through his pencil. He is a draughtsman equalled by very few, and exhibits a power of appreciating and using that mode of arrangement of light and shade, of which Titian is the master; he is a colorist on a scale of his own, which, if not the widest and most glorious, is still harmonious, and is faulty mainly by an apparently irresistible force, impelling him at every hazard to secure a splendour of executive power which no modern painter has excelled. We cannot look at any painting of Sir Edwin's without much pleasure; perhaps 'Lady Godiva' may scarcely convey to us a vivid impression of Tennyson's line, 'Then she rode forth, clothed on with chastity;' and altogether we may not this year find quite the same measure of that sort of poetry, which in a million ways has shown us how the mere animal nature in the depth and affection of its instincts teaches us something of the weakness and perversion of our own.

Mr. Maclise, who long years ago achieved his title as an art representative, has an oil painting of the large national picture of 'Nelson's Death,' already painted on the walls of the Houses of Parliament. Very many will be delighted and satisfied, whilst others having settled upon a mode of criticism which can scarcely be applied to such subjects as the one now chosen by Mr. Maclise, will gain more enjoyment from other men; but few will deny that we have here the work of one of our great imaginative painters: and it is not difficult to perceive how a certain mode of criticism if applied also to Rubens would affect his reputation very materially, and would not leave Raffaele unscathed. We suspect this painter never did care to consider how exactly such and such an event would take place, which oftentimes would be as rapid as lightning, as blinding as smoke, or as painful as death, and as disgusting as the worst horror of vice: but with a placidity of genius, not unlike many of the artists of those everlasting mosaics in the corridor of Saint Mark's, he rather symbolizes than realizes the facts he wishes to convey to us.

But without passing carelessly by the works of such painters as Messrs. Cope, R.A., Lewis, R.A., Faed, R.A., Goodall, R.A., or Frith, R.A., who exhibit pictures similar to those which, for a few years past, have given to them a large measure of popularity; or the works of Dobson, A. Gale, Horseley, A., or Le Jeune, A., O'Neil, R.A., or Sant, A., with the general character of whose works most are familiar; we must refer to the 'Bridal Procession' (292) of Mr. Leighton, which, in the choice of its subject, indicates yearning after the beautiful wherever it may be found, whether in the wide realm of the past, in the still wider future of Milton or Dante, or in the vision of Saint John. It aims at producing an impression on the human heart and imagination akin to that which we feel when brought before nature in her purest and sweetest moods, 'which felt along the blood and in the heart,' becomes a memory that we never can forget: it does not, perhaps, evince any great width or force of expression; its animals have that dim sweet sort of nature, which forcibly recalls the prophecy of the time when "the lion and the lamb shall lie down together;" it never moves us passionately, but it calls upon us to enjoy that sweet dream of beauty, which, if it never rises to rapture, is at least a relief from the never-ending battle of this our daily life. It has to do with only beautiful things; its clouds are white, its trees are gold, its palaces are marble, its wild creatures tamed; its human expressions are simply and calmly joyous, and as unconscious as a summer cloud: nevertheless, it demands a very strong art perception and wide art acquirements to

achieve this great aim perfectly. Paul Veronese, Titian, and Giorgione, when they passed by, what now appears to us, the very splendour of the age, but which to them might appear for purposes of the highest art full of fetters and difficulties, have alone accomplished it, if, indeed, for any mortal such a word may be used. Perhaps, no man living goes to work armed with a deeper and truer love for this aim in art, and a greater reverence for these immortal men, than Mr. Leighton, and this reverence is so great that there are few to whom this picture will not recall some one of the many efforts of Paul Veronese. Perhaps, this is the most sustained effort in the Academy of the present year. We look with great interest to a painter who has, above all things, had the courage and the faith to paint what has given to himself most delight, with a magnificent carelessness for the fashions already prevailing, despising the merely piquant and glittering on the one hand, and the vulgar on the other. We should have been better pleased with some diversity of character in the female heads, but as the one type chosen is decidedly beautiful, our lament is not loud; whilst the draperies are so remarkable for beauty in arrangement and design of pattern, as to give to Mr. Leighton, in this special department of work, a place where very few can approach him.

Mr. A. Moore, in his subject from the 'Song of Solomon' (354), seems to have a theory of art not generally accepted. He deems, perhaps, that a mural decoration, such as we see in those brought from Pompeii, is that at which the painter should aim. Whilst we object to the theory, we cannot but feel delighted that the Greek ideal of composition and drawing should secure the devotion of any one, and especially of one so likely, ultimately, to succeed. Our admiration for the picture is great; the draperies throughout, though perhaps rather thin and ragged in line, are still good, and the figures well drawn, and with beautiful proportion and expression, whilst the design is solemn and exceedingly impressive. As a translation of any part of Solomon's Song, we entirely object to it, every part of which poem is suggestive of a luxury and wealth of affection for nature, and a wildness of a passionate sorrow, and deepest joy, which such painting can never yield to us; but, as the type of painting by men who feel the value of no other, we admire; and are inclined to think, when a painter arrives at this stage of art, architecture might stretch forth her hand pleadingly, and beg for the decoration of her walls as in the elder times. Our hospitals might be filled with all that is soothing, and pleasant, and healthful, occasionally, as in the convalescent wards, with subjects likely to afford meditation and instruction; the very colours, when used without formal design, might at least be arranged beautifully, and the painter might easily prove himself to be a true physician, or, at least, a gentle nurse. The new infirmary, at Leeds, now in course of erection under the direction of Mr. Scott, and which is expected to be the most complete in the kingdom, might expend some of its wealth in this direction, and gain thereby a character for true art encouragement which would pale the fame of other larger towns. The ceilings might then be covered, as is that superb room now used as the Hospital of San Giovanni e Paulo, in Venice; and other institutions devoted to the expression of Christian love might adopt the same plan, so that the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and, doubtless, in some way or other, the blind also, might have the gospel preached unto them.

Mr. Calderon's choice of subject (24) is almost certain to appeal to every gentleman and lady with quiet force. It represents two very powerful

feelings, love and reverence for absolute simplicity and humanity, and submission to power, and the symbols thereof. Great imaginative strength may, or may not, be brought to bear on such themes. A painter may rely on his power of reproducing a past age, for the pictorial material, which is the simplest method to arrive at what shall please most easily the largest number of those educated in art. It is, however, proved by the rarity of the appearance of men in an entire generation who are capable of throwing themselves so completely into the past, as not to permit some offensive portion of the present to cling to them. Mr. Burne Jones, amongst painters, has this rare quality; how few, in literature, is scarcely for us to think. This feeling may be touched in a large number, by such pictures as Mr. J. Hayllar's 'Miss Lilly's carriage stops the way' (334), which, though not strong or powerful elsewhere, is strong enough and good enough to touch us by the innocence surrounding the child herself.

We do not find this year that any painter displays, in the choice of his subject, any very deep force of passion or pathos. We scarcely recognise one who has seized the great pictorial and moral points in the lives of the great heroes of the past or present; we find few who have deemed it worth while to look into the depths of this great seething whirlpool of life around us, bold enough to plunge into those depths, and bring to the surface with strong right arm, those nearly maimed, and crushed, and drowned, yet still patient and noble ones, worthy of our sympathy and love. Such subjects would appeal to the very highest instincts of our nature; and whilst approaching us with all the tenderness, yet with all the splendour and force of the very best art, would seize our intellect and conscience with a strength, that not all the fret and falsehood we may meet in our daily life, could render powerless or forgotten.

Perhaps, our art patronage scarcely demands this sort of material; perhaps what is sought for most is simply pleasure, mere rest; so that the ghost of the past may never be stirred, and the dream of the future be no more changed, that comfort must yet be the end and aim of our lives, that enthusiasm in all the brilliancy of its expressed joy, or in all the depth of its unexpressed emotion, shall yield to a more placid, quiet, equable, unobtrusive, and perhaps happier, though not more blessed, way.

Mr. Poole in his *Imogen*, and Mr. Hughes in his picture catalogued with Browning's words,

'Over his head his arm he flung,
'Against the world.'

(457), and marked on the frame with a long quotation from Miss Rossetti's poem, both appeal to us in their quiet way; the first with the same language which long ago produced the picture of Job, and the other with a delicacy and colour, and perception of the truly lovely which unites in our thoughts the poets of the past, with the poets and painters of the present.

Mr. Phillip, R.A., has proved once and again that he can grapple with the commonest material, such as a Spanish festa or a Spanish home may provide. He always paints veritable men and women, often in their dirt, and often not forgetting their vice. He does this with a force in the rendering of accessories which, in vigour of painting and sometimes in accuracy of result, few have equalled. Yet his Spanish pictures seem to deal impatiently with the matter in hand; he very rarely pauses to look round, whether even in Spain he may not find pathetic material. He may be right. It is possible a nation which has no such expression

as 'broken heart' in its language may, in fact, have little reflection and less remorse; but his pictures would be the more attractive, if added to the manliness and sense of open air, nature and colour, this binding quality and grace might also be given.

Mr. Burgess, whilst he grasps a Spanish subject, does so with a gentler hand, and without so much sense of what may be characteristic of Spanish colour, and without a notion that in a fancy fair, figures and dresses, however fresh and new to begin the day with, soon become worn and torn, and available for securing an infinity of gray and relief from the glare of the ordinary colour of picture-making. Mr. Princeps makes no error in this direction. He seems to have the faculty of painting directly from the figures themselves, with their soiled draperies, and with only such arrangement as art demands; and when this is accompanied by a careful design and a power to deal with the glow of external nature alike on land and sea, and human face and figure, his pictures will have a greater charm.

Mr. Phillip has a powerful portrait of the Right Hon. Duncan M'Neil (93). Mr. Tom Taylor is painted by Mr. H. Fless in all the strength of walking costume. Mr. Wells' portrait picture of 'Volunteers at Firing Point,' interests us as much by the character he has expressed in the portraits of men themselves as by his arrangement and quiet colour. The President and Secretary are in all their vigour, and Mr. Boxall, in all his perfection of delicacy and refinement, as in his portrait of Mrs. Peto; whilst Mr. Leighton in his beautiful portrait of Mrs. James Guthrie, whilst charming us with the accessories, compels us to wonder how far the complexion is correct.

Mr. Hughes, this year, in his portrait of Mrs. Thos. Woolner, (397) shews what a deep sense of appreciation he has for portraiture, and how the English lady may look to us for ever from his canvas, in all her native delicacy and beauty.

Mr. Hart, R.A., has a portrait hung beside one of Mr. Burnand, of Mr. Knight, R.A., which strikes us as better than his picture. Mr. H. Weighall has three portraits, all very good, but the one of the Right Hon. Sir Edmund Head, Bart., K.C.B., strikes as a very successful rendering of a face, with much refinement of form and expression; but in the absence of any large work by Mr. Watts we are compelled to rest most satisfied in the portrait of Mrs. Holford, by Sir Coutts Lindsey, fresh and agreeable in colour, good in drawing, simple and unaffected in design, and save for some thinness in colour, suggesting much of what we know to be so valuable in the Venetians; that same quality we admire so much in Reynolds and Gainsborough, when every portrait was treated as a work of colour; when even a feature of the face, tending, however slightly, to carbuncle, was but the key-note which swelled and modulated into harmony and glory. Excepting the portrait of Mr. Maclise at his work in the houses of parliament, we seem in some degree to be receding from making mere incidents (often fictitious or exaggerated) express the character of the man. There are fewer harps and books and rolls and philosophical instruments, and dress boots and garters and mayor's robes. It seems as if the race which sat to painters has changed, and that it relied in all simplicity on the fact of their life-work's leaving a true mark in their faces, easily recognised, not perhaps easily seized by the painter, but giving most satisfaction to those who desire the portrait at all. Some exceptions indeed there are; but not very prominently placed. Mr. Sant's portraits have a simplicity of composition, an ease of position, and such an uniform elevation of character as to make us fear much individuality has been lost.

The representations of nature, or impressions from nature, are this year more than usually lost. This arises either from their position, from the very modesty of the pictures themselves, or from the absence of any painter who has the art to rivet us by his power of seizing any of those grand impressions of nature which, though fleeting in duration, still hold our spirits in affectionate thrall. Perhaps when the wealth of 'properties' is employed in a painting accompanied by moonlight and firelight, or what, at least by virtue of a distinct contrast of red and green we accept for such, then the sweet soft green of nature may be contentedly left on one side. Perhaps draperies are of more intrinsic interest than clouds and flowers, the surface of silk and satin more subtle and soothing and delightful than the scattering of mist on the face of nature by the morning sun. Some may think that to depict even the humour of the countenance is far higher occupation than to give to us the working of God in the quietness and holiness of spring time; that nature has no life, or motion, or expression, no fire, nor rush, nor agony, nor profundity of peace, which find their counterparts only in divinest life. Some may think that because great men, and some painters are called by the necessities of the case, to leave the sun to rise and set unseen for forty years, whilst they arrange a nation's business or a family portrait, therefore the sweet instincts of love in childhood may be crushed; that amongst those arts meant to refine and purify and to strengthen, this one of landscape painting may take a part of a side room, some of the ceiling, and much of the cellar in our national building. But the respect of a Leslie, the affection of a Mulready, and the enthusiasm of some worthy critics, will not allow us to think this is the right course. It is possible to have what may be termed a material perception of nature, such as Wordsworth discovered in Peter Bell, when—

‘A primrose on the river’s brim
A yellow primrose was to him,
And it was nothing more.’

Scientific drudges at nature may have this, but men of a true science have much more; and in art the truth seems to be, that whilst nature should, if possible, be represented in all her wondrous form and detail, pictures should, like herself, be unobtrusive, and rarely command us imperatively; and painters should never forget that those not painters, who love their work most truly, are sensitive and impressible, perhaps impatient, unless deeply imaginative, and will not at any time be arrested violently by the obtrusion upon them of a part of nature; even ‘the anemone red hanging its head’ may not be received happily when the sky palpitates, and the stream rushes, and the very mountain itself is alive with flitting light and shadow.

Nature cannot be known without considerable study and some patient waiting on the variety of her moods, and on the variousness of the aspect of her living and beautiful forms. Such young and true students are likely to have in their work a painfulness which repels, but which ought not to be confounded with the audacity of dishonesty, or with confirmed incompetence.

Many reasons may be adduced for the scarcity of good landscape painting in the Academy, but for one who is resolute to find it there may be some reward.

In his picture of ‘Evening Rest’ (No. 503), Creswick is the strongest of familiar leaders; whilst Mr. Cole, catching the same homely strain (poetic in its first singing at least), carries this forward with an ease of painting and a certain conventional beauty of colour as far as may be

desired; yet line for line, and hue for hue, it is another's invention, and we cannot give very high praise to it. It seems to us that every one desirous of occupying an important position, whilst he achieves a certain mastery over material, if he has not force enough to discover new regions, should at least treat whatever he touches, freshly and from his own heart.

Mr. Mason, uttering boldly and clearly the music that is in his soul, yet excites in us the desire that he would take a slightly enlarged canvas and give us an entire change of subject; it would be impossible to conceive the kind of fresh joy he would then impart to us, but we are certain it would be joy.

In the Linnells, father and son; in Mr. Thomas Danby; in Mr. Raven and Mr. Sant, we have individualities of their several kinds. In Mr. Paton we have precisely the same faults which Mr. Noel Paton exhibits in his figure pictures—a certain method of painting in miniature on a large canvas, a want of appreciation of, and joy in colour, and a certain helplessness before the wealth of tint which nature presents.

Anthony is here, in a picture called 'the Peace of the Valley,' (380), which varies in the impression it makes on us by the kind of light in which we may have happened to view it, and perhaps from the taint of bad colour left on the retina by bad pictures. He has painted it frequently before, and we cannot help recurring to those bright gleams of forceful poetry from his canvas which we have had in the past: above and beyond all, his 'Dream at Killarney,' bought, we believe, by the late Prince Consort. May we not hope sometime to have others, if not like this, at least painted from a like strong inspiration, and bearing proof of the same joy and exhilaration in their execution.

Mr. Cust, R.A., Mr. W. Henry, Mr. MacCallum, and Mr. Dillon, have each a subject from Venice, of which that by Mr. MacCallum is the best. Indeed, in this work he seems to have abandoned a desire to impress us, at any hazard, and seems to have relied on the modesty of the colours of nature herself for producing the effect on us. Mr. Mawby, in his subject called 'Autumn,' has a very simple composition, with quiet evening tone, and with an easy execution. Mr. Brett's work has always individuality, as in 'Capri,' and even sometimes strikes us as final; and yet if he would now abandon single leaves and single blades of grass and single ripples of waves, all of which, at the distance from which a painter must approach them, are seen as legions or masses, he would, in whatever he did from nature, achieve a facility, and we believe, infinity of execution, which alone would render his paintings valuable to many. Besides, we believe that the human eye cannot bear the strain which is necessarily demanded by the production of such work as the 'Capri;' or, at least, that after about a dozen years, blindness may be said to have set in—and a painter's sight is a painter's life. Mr. V. Herbert, jun., in the 'Outskirts of a Storm,' gives us an original subject and treatment, well drawn although not marked by force or delicacy of true colour. Mr. L. R. Mignot gives us a fresh subject, and recalls what has yet to be done in tropical regions. Humboldt, in the splendour and force of his eloquence, has reminded us how much is waiting for art to achieve in those regions; some of the peculiarities of mist and great heat, so frequent a feature in all the 'burning south,' are given here with sweet touches of coloured vegetation; but there appears too much artifice of design, a certain smallness of form, and too little strength of real knowledge and executive power, although we believe these scenes have been visited by the painter.

Mr. P. Graham has a 'Spate in the Highlands,' with the sun breaking

the clouds, and lighting with brilliancy some shreds of mist in the middle distance, with some dark trees against it: this picture is painted with great facility, and is good colour of its kind. It is, however, deficient in real force and power, and without much suggestion of wind or foam, or nature's might.

Mr. Davis, in his 'Spring Ploughing,' shows the result of careful and earnest study: this picture is a steady advance on his previous work, and confirms our hopes and expectations.

We have some creditable work exhibited by gentlemen of other professions, but as these gentlemen must all feel, when they know the present deficiency of space, that they occupy room which, from a sense of delicacy they might leave to others, we shall take another opportunity to notice, and another place to look at them.

We regret our space will not allow us to notice adequately the sculpture and the architectural rooms. In the last, we have two or three excellent drawings; architects seem more and more advancing in power to seize their fleeting thoughts, which sometimes for beauty of proportion and grace are of greater value than much more elaborate work, whilst mere splashy designs are steadily receding from the walls. In the sculpture room, every one of Baron Marochetti's works arrests us at once with an impression of its lifelikeness; imperfect in many ways they may be—but we prefer them to most there. Sir Edwin Landseer's 'Stag at Bay' (942), will bear a careful examination from every point of view, and in none suffer materially; though it does not convey to us any impression of starting to life from one block of marble. Mr. Woolner's 'Puck' (732), though having much character, and cast in bronze, will not bear a searching examination. All Mr. Durham's work is good this year—the 'Children' especially so; whilst the bust of Mr. Charles Knight is exceedingly beautiful. Mr. Weeks, R.A., Mr. P. MacDowell, and Mr. Noble, are in their usual strength. All Mr. J. G. Boehm's work is exceedingly good; whilst Mr. Munroe, in the bust of 'the late Right Hon. Sir James Stephen,' (993), but especially in his charming child portrait of 'Master Walter Ingram,' (1030), shows his power in the selection of an expressive pose and an endearing expression. Mr. Leifchild's work is always of the highest order, but we are slightly disappointed with his sculpture of 'the Agony of Lot's wife as she turns to take her last look of guilty life, and burning home.' The confusion occasioned by the first stages of the change is not to us exactly sculpturesque.

The Early Races of Scotland and their Monuments. By Lieut.-Col. FORBES LESLIE. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

The author of this work is an independent and well qualified investigator of a difficult but fascinating subject. As he studied some of the Aberdeenshire antiquities fifty years ago, it may be presumed that his attention was drawn in early youth to the remarkable and numerous monuments of antiquity for which that part of Scotland is famous. During military service in India, Colonel Leslie appears to have carried on his archæological researches, especially in the Deccan and in Ceylon. Some of the plates in these volumes are from drawings made in Ceylon as long since as 1826. And, since his return to Europe, the author has, in the course of the last ten years, made visits not only to remote parts of his own country, but also to Ireland and Brittany, for the purpose of sketching and describing some of the most noteworthy relics of the pre-historical races. These volumes may therefore be con-

sidered as containing the results of an intelligent observer's life-diversion, if not life-study. At the same time, they show an acquaintance with the works of British ethnologists and archæologists, and also with those of such French writers as MM. Fremenville and Souvestre. In common with imbedded human bones, flint implements, and lake-dwellings,—indeed everything which may be supposed to cast light on the origin or the habits of pre-historic man,—the rude stone erections, which for centuries were disregarded as uninteresting, have received of late years most scrutinising attention; and the uncouth sculptures, which can scarcely be said to deck them, have been questioned, as it were, by torture, for further evidence. Burrows of earth and cairns of stones; *menhirs*, or rude columns; *dolmens*, or table-stones (sometimes, though less properly, called cromlechs); *kistvaens*, or stone cells, the so-called Druidical circles; these are the chief relics of a forgotten people. If we can define these relics, and determine when and for what purpose the original structures were reared, we may infer something at least concerning the architects and builders. Now, many learned and thoughtful writers—Mr. Dennis and Mr. Pritchard, for example—deny that it is lawful to reason from similarity of monuments or of customs and superstitions, to community of origin. Colonel Leslie is not so clear in his arguments as in his descriptions; but his method of proceeding seems to be this: Rude monuments, evidently reared by the hand of man, almost precisely the same in formation, and, inferentially, designed for the same purposes; are to be found this day in India, on the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean, in Spain and Brittany, and in the British Isles. But in the north-west of Europe these remains seem probably to have been constructed—certainly to have been used—by the Celtic tribes. This not only points to the Eastern origin and the probable advance and route of the Celts, but has a yet farther argumentative significance. Planetary worship and sacrificial rites appear to be two most marked features of the life of these early peoples. Sculptured figures are supposed to be symbols of the former, the fanes and altars to be indicative of the latter. The most original part of the book before us is the latter part of the second volume, where the author depicts by pencil and pen certain circular—as would be popularly said—Druidical fanes, which he has seen in Southern India, the stones of which are smeared with red and black paint, representing the blood of victims still to this day slain on these spots. The existence of these fanes was already known, and it was also well known that human sacrifices among the Khonds were only put down by British influence a few years since. Our author very plausibly argues that these Indian superstitions, part of an older and cruder religion which Brahminism and Buddhism have not been able to expel, cast light upon the purposes for which similar monuments have been erected in other lands. And this view is supported by an elaborate and interesting account of the remnants of superstitious belief and practice still to be met with among the Celtic nations, and by an exhibition of the identity, as our author deems it, between those traces of a bygone Paganism and the surviving superstitions of the East.

Colonel Leslie is a strong advocate of the sacrificial as opposed to the sepulchral and monumental theory concerning the Celtic dolmens, though he admits that the structures first used as altars were afterwards often employed as tombs, and maintains the usual sepulchral character of the *kistvaens*. It must be confessed, however, that the author altogether fails to connect the Druids and their known religion with the edifices which have commonly gone by their name. The least

satisfactory part of the work is the treatment of the sculptures and inscriptions. Here, all appears to us to be conjecture and speculation: indeed, of the most famous inscription, at least seven equally plausible but different and irreconcilable interpretations are presented!

The plates in this work, mostly from drawings by the author, are remarkably good. Many of them are reproductions of the costly illustrations published by the Spalding Club. The reader may gain a very fair acquaintance with many of the antiquities of our own land and of Brittany from these drawings. The letterpress would be more interesting were there fewer repetitions. By the time the reader reaches the close, for instance, he is utterly weary of hearing of the famous sea-fight between the Veneti and Cæsar's Roman fleet.

The Beautiful in Nature and Art. By Mrs. ELLIS, author of 'The Women of England.' London: Hurst and Blackett.

Popular antitheses are as frequently wrong as right: and among those that are wrong, no one is more so than that which opposes the beautiful to the useful. How often have we heard ecstatic dreamers pour forth their rhapsodies about the beautiful, sublimely contemptuous of everything that by any possibility could be suspected of utilitarianism. Such people think that they take very high ground indeed for the beautiful; and if they be gently criticised by others, it is on the ground that the ideal is too transcendental for ordinary life, and that for its poetical realization we must be contented with something not only lower but different. Writers like Mrs. Ellis, who really take counsel of common sense, will find very little favour with such fervid aspirants after the beautiful, inasmuch as while they make to themselves wings and soar into the Empyrean, she is contented to plod on common ground. And yet Mrs. Ellis's claim for the beautiful is really much higher than theirs. She insists not only on the beauty of the useful, but on the utility of the beautiful. According to her writing, the beautiful is not to be regarded as the mere æsthetic which appeals only to the eye; it has in many ways a practical and powerful influence upon all that pertains to human life. Not only would she therefore protest against all gratuitous ugliness, but against all indifference to what is comely. Within certain limits the most comely is the most useful; and even beyond these limits, ornament and grace have their fitting and most important ministries to the practical interests of life. Mrs. Ellis writes for educational purposes, and chiefly for the class represented by the pupils of Rawdon House, for many years under her superintendence. We say chiefly, for any general principles treated so as to be applicable only to a particular class, must be either false in themselves or made false by erroneous treatment. Mrs. Ellis was in the habit of preparing short papers or addresses to the more advanced pupils of Rawdon House, and among other subjects to which she directed attention was the one treated in this volume. An accomplished artist herself, and a poet of no mean quality, she was qualified to speak with the authority of intelligent appreciation. With these, moreover, she combines an unusual degree of practical homely common sense which tests every accomplishment by utilitarian principles, in the broad and inclusive sense thereof; she speaks, therefore, with great authority. The topics which she treats are such as these, 'The Usefulness of Beauty in Nature and Art,' 'The Truthfulness of Art,' 'The Love of Beauty,' 'The Love of Ornament.' Chapters on the history and on

some of the details of art follow ; and the volume closes with two chapters on 'Lady's Work,' and 'Lady's Handiwork.' As a sensible practical handbook for those whose education is so far advanced that they are endeavouring to help themselves ; for those also who have to direct the aims and efforts of more advanced pupils this volume stands alone. It is written with great skill, simplicity, and beauty, and is full of sound common sense. Mrs. Ellis writes with a serious purpose, with great ability, and with a ripeness and richness of practical wisdom, the result of many years of varied experience. Just as in morals, the wise religious teacher seeks to lift the commonest and most trivial things of life into the region of the spiritual ; so in manners, Mrs. Ellis seeks to lift such into the region of the beautiful. In our judgment she has written no better book, and rendered to her generation no greater service than this. It should be in the hands of every teacher, and in the library of every young person.

The Resources and Prospects of America. Ascertained during a Visit to the States in the Autumn of 1865. By Sir S. MORTON PETO, Bart., M.P. London : Strahan and Co.

Sir Morton Peto has written a very useful and compendious book on the resources and prospects of the United States of America. It does not affect to be profound, and leaves untouched many of the deeper problems which yet remain for solution ; but it may be fairly said to represent the views of an intelligent practical politician, well acquainted with the springs of national wealth, as to the present state and future prospects of that country with regard to its material well-being. A most friendly tone pervades the book, as is most meet when writing of a country allied to us by so many ties ; but still Sir Morton does not hesitate to point out the wasteful misapplication of the remarkable skill and enterprise of the American people, which is caused by the protective policy to which they cling with such fond ignorance. Probably no errors in policy can stop the progress of the United States, but it is certainly somewhat mortifying to the friends of popular government to see so well educated a people conducting their affairs on the basis of theories which have become exploded fallacies ; and it is not a little perplexing to find in the *New York Tribune*, and other honest and able journals, arguments in favour of protection, which have been refuted by both reasoning and result.

It is no uncommon thing in life to find men very proud of the supposed possession of some endowment in which they are really very deficient, while, on the other hand, they are comparatively modest and insensible to their true merits. As with men, so it sometimes seems to be with nations ; for we learn from Sir Morton's book that the Americans are only anxious to magnify the importance of their manufactures, while they are less sensible of that wonderful command of the great necessities of life which constitutes their glory and strength. Hence in official documents they 'pile up' the list of their manufactured articles until it reaches the annual value of £400,000,000, by including not only the beer they brew, and the boots and shoes they make and wear, but even the fish that are caught in their rivers and seas. By the European standard indeed this enormous amount would be reduced to about £40,000,000, which Sir Morton Peto thinks would include all the textile fabrics usually classed by us as manufactures. This may seem a matter of little consequence, but it appears to be one means by which this

usually acute people persuade themselves of the duty of 'protecting' their manufactures and supporting a sickly growth of occupations which are unable to endure the free winds of healthy competition.

The American people are happily so rich both in opportunities and in the capacity to use them, that they can afford, without much suffering, to make many errors in their progress to economic truth. That the great truths of which Cobden and Bright, the warmest friends of the United States, have here been the champions, can remain long unlearned by so intelligent a nation, it is almost impossible to believe. In addition to its full description of the resources of the people and country, Sir Morton's book has the merit of pointing out with great force and clearness the way in which these resources should be used to produce the greatest and most beneficial results.

The Crown of Wild Olive. Three Lectures on Work, Traffic, and War. By JOHN RUSKIN, M.A. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

We must, we suppose, accept Mr. Ruskin's rare eloquence, his superb rhetoric, his magnificent pictures, and his separated bits of fine moral teaching and impulse, and disregard his wild political economy, and his paradoxical social ethics. The little volume before us is occupied with the latter. It professes to lay down great principles of work, of commerce, and of war; and Mr. Ruskin propounds them with the fervour of an old Hebrew prophet, and sometimes with almost the shriek of a Solomon Eagle. We confess ourselves utterly unable to determine what Mr. Ruskin would have us to do. We have a general impression that he regards society as given up to false principles and bad practices, and that his Utopia is the exact reverse of every thing that is; but then he descends to no particulars, formulates no decalogue, helps neither our repentance nor our reformation, by any specific teachings. Some things are said which charm us by their beauty, and some which amaze us by their extravagance, such as that all the wars and woes of Europe are owing to the selfishness and thoughtlessness of women, and that if every lady would but wear black while war was raging, with 'no jewel, 'no ornament, no excuse for, no evasion into prettiness,' no war would last a week; especially if, 'instead of unroofing peasants' houses and 'ravaging peasants' fields, it merely broke the china upon their own 'drawing-room tables.' But then we feel sure that Mr. Ruskin does not mean this; that it is merely an extreme case of that popular exaggeration to which all rhetoricians, and all successful lecturers, especially, must have recourse. We can, however, find no other meaning, and therefore, in sheer despair, we give up Mr. Ruskin's chapters and delight ourselves in his paragraphs. We puzzle over his sermons as mystical riddles, or else abjure them as impracticable extravagances, and betake ourselves to his sentences, regretting that eloquence so grand, and moral feeling so noble, should be expended upon paradoxes so wild. We wonder what the manufacturers of Bradford would understand by his declamation about traffic, and what the cadets of Woolwich would think of his wild talk about war. For the life of us we cannot make out his meaning. He seems to mean not one but many things, some of them contradictories. His lectures, indeed, are a promiscuous assemblage of grand sentiments, wild paradoxes, and indiscriminate abuse. It is, therefore, impossible to deal with them critically. And yet no one can read them without being charmed by their beauty,

moved by their earnestness, and made better by their goodness. Every page teems with golden sentences and high aspirations. There are passages in this little volume almost ethereal in their beauty and sublime in their goodness. ~~The book will be read with delight; and it will suggest meanings of great and precious worth, even although its theories excite our laughter, and at the same time move our pity to arrest it.~~

Swiss Pictures. Drawn with Pen and Pencil. The Illustrations by MR. E. WHYMPER, F.R.G.S. London: The Religious Tract Society.

The sketches which from time to time Mr. Whympers has furnished for various publications of the Tract Society, are here collected into a handsome drawing-room volume. They are very spirited and truthful, and are informed by the knowledge and feeling of a practical and daring mountaineer. It would be difficult to name a series of illustrations that would convey to stay-at-home travellers a more accurate and vivid impression of the 'palaces of nature,' built among the Alps of Switzerland. The illustrations are very profuse, and could not have been produced for thrice the cost of the volume, but for the previous possession of the plates. Considering that thousands of impressions must have been taken from some of them, they are marvellously fresh, although here and there they look somewhat faded. A little more substance in the paper, moreover, would have thrown them up more; but then it would be unreasonable to expect the substance and finish of a guinea Christmas book for one-third of the price. The letter-press consists very largely of extracts from Alpine travellers and poets, slightly strung together by the editor. The volume is valuable as a kind of common-place book of Alpine travel. Many will be glad to have thus brought together some of the best passages of Ruskin, Longfellow, Bulwer, Byron, and others. The book, on the whole, is admirable and tasteful: a capital gift book for those who do not estimate excellence by cost.

Beauties and Wonders of Vegetable Life; or, Rambles in Parks, Forests, Conservatories, Orchards, Gardens, Fields, and Heaths. With numerous Illustrations. London: The Religious Tract Society.

Another of the valuable little scientific volumes of the Tract Society; in which they have admirably combined thorough learning with popular interest, and proved that "science made easy" is not necessarily science made foolish. A more admirable hand-book for a summer holiday in the country could not be found. It abounds with popular information, anecdote, and allusion. To young people it will be as attractive by its style, method, and illustrations, as it is instructive by its varied knowledge, and elevating by its devout feeling.

POETRY, FICTION, AND BELLES LETTRES.

The Handbook of Specimens of English Literature: Selected from the chief British Authors, and arranged Chronologically. By JOSEPH ANGUS, M.A., D.D. London: The Religious Tract Society.

This volume affords another illustration of Dr. Angus's admirable faculty for compiling Handbooks—a faculty which requires extensive

knowledge, critical sagacity, æsthetic taste, and high moral feeling. In his *Handbook of English Literature*, Dr. Angus aimed somewhat higher, viz., to supply a history of the progress, a philosophy of the composition, and a critical estimate of the character of our literature; this volume is a supplement and companion to the former work—it supplies illustrative specimens to it, filling a volume of equal size. But as an independent volume of selections it is interesting and valuable, especially for the space devoted to the Early English Period. While we are made acquainted with many less familiar pieces, considerable light is at the same time thrown upon the formative period of the English language. For the most part the old spelling is retained. The extracts are carefully made, and are accompanied by ample references. Even where the passages selected are familiar, the references to their original positions will be very useful to many. The extracts, moreover, have been made with a strict regard to moral and religious influence, so that, while the illustrations of our literature as such, are ample, the pure character of the volume makes it suitable for school and family use.

A Son of the Soil. A Tale. London: Macmillan and Co. 1866.

This is a pleasant story of the early life and education of the son of a Scotch farmer as he passed through the successive stages of life in the country, in the Scotch and English Universities, and in the position of tutor to the son of an English baronet, until at length, after passing through the ordeal of 'objections' raised by the amateur theologians of a Scottish parish, he found himself installed as occupant of its manse. There is so much vividness in the delineations of character and incident, such reality in the narrative and the persons to whom it introduces us, that we read it with the impression that it must be a veritable biography. Colin's kindly sensible father, with his pardonable pride in his son's abilities and success, and his gentle, dignified poetic mother, whose presence acts as a charm, soothing and sanctifying all under her influence, each seem like old friends whom we rejoice to meet again. Comparisons are drawn between the worship and ceremonial of the Scotch and English churches, and discussions of sundry theological questions are introduced, all, however, characterised by the breadth of view which perceives the essential unity that underlies all the diversity of Christian faith and practice, and acknowledges the true and lovely wherever it may be found. The religious teaching of the story is perfectly free from narrowness and bigotry, but it evinces no lack of reverence or faith. The volumes contain graphic descriptions of the simple life and lovely scenery that may be met with on the shores of the Holy Loch, mingled with notes of foreign travel and diversified by a pleasant love story. With entire freedom from any sensational plot there is enough of incident to give keen interest to the narrative, and make us feel as we read it, that we have been spending a few hours with friends who will make our own lives better by their own noble purposes and holy living. The volumes are a reprint of a story which appeared last year in the pages of 'Macmillan's Magazine,' and its influence is so sound and healthy that we wish it a wide circulation in its more permanent form.

The Story of Gisli, the Outlaw. From the Icelandic. By GEORGE WEBBE DASENT, D.C.L. With Illustrations by C. E. St. John Mildmay. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

Dr. Dasent has achieved a great success in one of the most unpromising fields of literature. He has overcome the manifold difficulty of

mastering the obscure Norse literature, of rendering it into vigorous and picturesque English, and of interesting English readers in a form of thought and fiction far remote from their own. The two forms of Norse literature which are more frequently talked about than understood, are the Eddas and the Sagas. There are two Eddas, the elder and the younger. The elder, or Poetical Edda, is the work of Sæmund the learned, in the beginning of the twelfth century, it is a collection of old myths and songs of heroes: the younger, or Prose Edda, is a learned treatise on language, with an accompaniment of mythological stories. This is attributed to Snorro Sturluson in the first half of the thirteenth century.

The Sagas are simply stories. The word is derived from an Icelandic word signifying stories, and is used with pretty much the same latitude as its English equivalent. The Saga or story, as distinguished from the legend or myth, dates from the twelfth century; after which Sagas multiplied very rapidly, and constituted an important vernacular Icelandic literature. They are the sources of Icelandic history; in this respect corresponding to our old English chronicles; and are also the fountains of Norse romance. The Sagas culminated in Snorro Sturluson, when Iceland possessed one of the richest of the mediæval literatures of Europe. Sir Edmund Head, indeed, proves that the Sagas formed the earliest prose literature of modern Europe. Many translations into English of lesser Sagas, and of portions of larger ones, have been made by Mallet, Sir Edmund Head, and others; but in both the magnitude and the excellency of his translations, Dr. Dasent bears the palm. The 'Njála,' which Dr. Dasent translated four or five years ago, fills two goodly volumes, and won the praise and gratitude of every student of Northern history, literature, and philology. The 'Burnt Njal,' however, appealed, we fancy, more successfully to the student than to the general reader, with whom the volume of shorter 'Tales from the Norse,' found greater favour. The Saga of Gislí is more akin to the latter than to the former. It is short and vivid, and is rendered in admirable English, into which Dr. Dasent has contrived to transfuse much of the quaint rough vigour of the original.

Gislí is the son of Thorbjörn, of Surnadale, in Norway. Through a fraud of his uncle, who refused to return the famous sword Graysteel, which a thrall had lent him, a curse fell upon the entire family, who, upon the burning of the old house, emigrate to Iceland. Gislí kills Thorgrim, the priest, in requital of the murder of his brother-in-law Vestein; for this he is outlawed, and the story of his adventures for fourteen years, accompanied by his heroic wife, and of his tragic death in the fifteenth, make up the bulk of the Saga. The story is wonderfully told; full of weird romance and tragic tenderness. On almost every page vivid side-lights are thrown upon northern customs, character, or history. We are transported into this older world, where Christian and Pagan elements, light and darkness, civilisation and barbarism, were struggling for the mastery. Dr. Dasent prefixes to his translation a most able 'Introduction,' pointing out the comment which the Saga furnishes upon early Icelandic history, and its illustrations of laws and manners. While Dr. Dasent has presented English readers with a story that will charm alike the nursery, the drawing-room, and the library, he has also contributed a valuable and learned study to early northern history.

Hereward the Wake. 'Last of the English.' By the Rev. C. KINGSLEY. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co.

The proverbial difficulty of 'serving two masters,' is nowhere more

forcibly felt than in historical fiction: the writer whereof needs to be both a perfect historian and a consummate novelist. If in either he be wanting, the exigencies of his composite forces make sad work of him. It would be difficult to name half-a-dozen writers, we might almost say half-a-dozen works, which successfully combine historical truth with artistic fiction. Even if the writer have genius various enough to execute such a work, there are very few incidents of history that will lend themselves to the conditions of fiction. Things do not happen in real life as they happen in novels. Perhaps a writer of historical fiction is justified if he but preserve the great outlines of historical fact, and, at whatever sacrifice of detail, produce a true picture and true impression of the life and times that he describes. There will no doubt, be room for debate concerning what are great outlines of historical fact; human minds are differently constituted, and some are marked by odd incongruities; but he is a captious and nibbling critic who objects to a historical fiction, that its writer has departed from certain details of historic fact; and especially when, as in this instance, our knowledge of the so-called facts is vague and disputable.

It is not easy to say whether in *Hereward*, the historical or the fictitious element predominates; still less easy, perhaps less important, is it to determine whether *Hereward* was really Leofric and Godiva's son, whether he can with propriety be called the 'last of the English,' whether the 'false Ingulf' be really an authority, or whether Torfrida was *Hereward's* only wife. Had Mr. Kingsley aimed at more than general historical outline and truthful colouring, he would have thrown his work into the form of history and not of romance. Whatever may be the historic truth concerning these and other points—and we do not think Mr. Kingsley's historical professions commit him to a judicial position in relation to them—his book is a very careful, a very vivid, and a very successful delineation of the period of which it treats. It is very perverse and unjust to him to insist that he is writing history and is to be judged by historical tests, when he tells us that he is writing romance; the very fact that a romantic form for his narrative is chosen, proves that he selects a romantic as distinguished from a historical basis.

As a romance therefore we judge *Hereward*; but as a romance professing to be true to historical outline, and to the spirit and colour of a given period of national life. We do not think that as a work of art, *Hereward* is equal to *Hypatia*; but, as a careful study of the eventful period of the Norman Conquest, of the position of English parties, and of the general character of the times, it is worthy of comparison with any historical fiction of our time. Following the general guidance of Mr. Wright, Mr. Kingsley has introduced, perhaps, a little too much of antiquarian lore: readers of sensation novels will probably, therefore, get no farther than the threshold of his story, but those who care to be instructed while they are interested, will thank him for his vigorous and vivid reproduction of some of the most eventful chapters of our history. *Hereward* is well chosen as his central figure, and he is well conceived; a grand figure, part of iron and part of clay, full of courage, nobleness, and faith. Torfrida, too, is a fine character; and the influence upon *Hereward*, of her boundless love, and high-toned feeling, of her learning too, and her slight tinge of superstition, is admirably set forth. The seduction of *Hereward* by *Alstruda* is an artistic defect, and is not justified by the exigencies of historical fact. The crowd of knights, barons, and retainers, the descriptions of Normandy, Cornwall, and, above all, of the weird fen-country, of the sack of Peterborough, and

the siege of the Isle of Ely, are put in with great care, and with the hand of a master. Altogether, and notwithstanding certain drawbacks of excessive lore and over-exactness, Hereward is a work which, for its terse and idiomatic style, for its vigour skill and vividness, for its rich and beautiful descriptions, perhaps no other living writer could have produced.

Leighton Court; a Country House Story. By HENRY KINGSLEY.
2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co.

Mr. Kingsley's novels are characterized more by vigour and smartness than by congruity and subtlety. They are bold, dashing creations, very cleverly delineating and describing men, women, and things; but they are crowded and feverish, and a little 'loud.' Mr. Kingsley is so far like his brother, that he aims by careful and vivid word-painting, to make his readers familiar with the Devonshire landscapes, amid which his scenes are laid. He has, moreover, a robust sympathy with horses and dogs and field sports. His characters, therefore, are anything but of the poetical or sentimental sort; the Countess of Southmolton, friend and disciple of Hannah More, being the only example of still life in 'Leighton Court.' She, however, is very admirably done. Laura, the heroine, is brought up according to the straitest Hannah Moreism; but at length openly revolts, and would rather hunt with her father than 'be good' with her grandmother. Her mother, Lady Emily Seckerton, is a clever worldly woman, drawn from life. The villain, Sir Harry Poyntz, is a somewhat incongruous villain, explicable only by his madness. Lord Hattersleigh is one of those wise gabies one never meets with in real life. Robert Poyntz, the hero, presents himself as a disguised groom, and as such wins Laura's heart: he is great in field sports and muscular accomplishments. The moral of the whole is that there are in both men and women, strong physical instincts which Hannah More did not recognize, and for which her regime is utterly insufficient, the effect whereof is very likely to be falling in love with a superb groom as Laura did. The story is full of improbabilities, but it is told skilfully, and is fresh, dashing, and interesting.

The Dove in the Eagle's Nest: By the Author of the 'Heir of Redclyffe.' London: Macmillan and Co.

The authoress of the 'Heir of Redclyffe,' has deserted our English homes and country sides, our village tattle and clerical friendships, 'our noble liturgy,' and 'venerable church,' and has floated up the stream of time until she has reached the dividing line between the Middle Ages and Modern History. She helps us to climb the steep ascent to the robber's fortress, and makes us familiar with the blood feuds, and barbarism of his wild eyrie, with the magnificence of Maximilian's imperial train, and with the pompous amenities and proud independence of burgher life, then first successfully contending with hereditary and elective despotisms. Savage indeed is the Schloss Adlerstein, but suiting well its rugged inmates, hardly distinguishable from the swine in their court-yard, or the wolves that howl round their desolate crags, living on the proceeds of plunder and cruelty, and yet proud of their hereditary nobility, and looking down with superb disdain on the wealthiest, wisest, and perhaps noblest men, then living on the earth. Into this eagle's eyrie, this wolf's den, out of a species of animal compassion, for a dying

daughter on the part of the Baron, a burgher maiden, a sweet, pure, dove-like creature, is inveigled, and we presume the moral of the tale, if it have one, may be found in our Saviour's words, 'Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.' The story shows 'how awful goodness is, and in herself, how lovely;' Christina Sorel does not slay her adversaries with the point of an invincible lance, nor does she transform them from eagles into doves; but one by one the evils and the evildoers disappear before her. We will not spoil the reader's pleasure in the volumes, by saying how she becomes eventually the Frau Freiherrinn Von Adlerstein, the widowed mother of two noble sons, whose profound affection for each other, intense enthusiasm for her, and remarkable diversity of character, create the principal charms of the narrative. We can scarcely overpraise the wonderful pathos and thrilling interest attached to many of the scenes. If the authoress here and there verges on the sensational, such as at the moment when Christina resolves to spare the life of Sir Kasimir at the imminent risk of the lives of her new-born infants, or when young Eberhard saves the life of the Emperor Maximilian, by an almost preternatural bravery; still, the circumstances of the times so admirably depicted, are a sufficient vindication of these and other scenes. We are not brought actually face to face, except on rare occasions, with the terrible suffering, injustice and wrong, of which we hear the echoes; we have not presented to us the attraction of a love-story, yet there is an affluence of love, ever flowing from the Dove in the Eagle's Nest. There is none of the sentimentality of the 'Heir of Redclyffe'; there is no preaching, no advocacy of peculiar views of church polity, dogmatic faith, or household management. No Nemesis pursues, as in 'The Clever Woman of the Family,' the strong-minded, well-meaning girl, who has mistaken her vocation; but Christina shines like the moon with a reflected glory, transforming the rude armour of these belted knights into helmets and corslets of silver, and the unclean bastions of the robbers' schloss into a palace of alabaster, and in that blessed light the dews fall on the orage, and they are clothed with vineyards and waving corn, and even still, so we are told, the light of that love may show how the debatable Forl has become the highway of the nations, and the consecrated resting place for domestic affection and wise, well-directed energies. We think the authoress of the 'Heir of Redclyffe' has surpassed her previous efforts in this illuminated chronicle of the olden time.

Clemency Franklyn. By the Author of 'Janet's Home.' 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co.

'Clemency Franklyn' is one of the best and pleasantest stories that we have recently read; it is full of wisdom and goodness; simple, truthful, and artistic. Its characters are admirably drawn; its plot is perfectly natural; and yet it excites much interest in its evolution. It is capital as a story; better still in its pure tone and wholesome influence. There is nothing sensational in it; it is a quiet home picture, drawn with delicate shades of colour, and with unexaggerated lines of character. Clemency herself is a very beautiful character; her truthfulness and unselfishness surround her like a halo, and in their contrast with the little insincerities and superficialities of Sydney, who is not painted over dark, produce and nurture a wholesome hatred of all that is mean. Good, clever, over-managing Mrs. Edgcombe is well portrayed, and is a valuable study for those whose over-cleverness, however well meant,

unconsciously tends to defeat itself. Arthur Yonge, the hero, is of course perfect, but not unnaturally so. Colonel Edgcombe is too good and true a man not to excite pity for his matrimonial fate. A quiet moral pervades the whole story, and is insinuated rather than obtruded. The story is full of merit—a story for young girls to read, the reading of which can hardly fail to elevate and refine all feelings and aspirations that are noble.

Felix Holt, the Radical. By GEORGE ELIOT. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Son. 1866.

George Eliot has placed herself at the head of all our female novelists, if not at the head of English fiction, and that in virtue of profound and truthful conception, of transcendent tragic power with its obverse of genuine humour, and of almost perfect executive art. What Shakspeare is among dramatists, that George Eliot is, or bids fair to be, among novelists. If we think of the characteristics of Fielding, Scott, Thackeray, and Dickens, to say nothing of female novelists, like Miss Austen and Mrs. Gaskell, we shall feel, that while George Eliot is not inferior to any one of them in truthfulness, vividness, and perfect literary art, she successfully rules a world of tragic passions which they scarcely dealt with, and for the counterpart of which we must go to Lear and Hamlet. Her beauty of style, delicacy of touch, and exquisite finish of portraiture, are equal to anything in the literature of fiction; while her most tragic passions are exhibited with a broad harmony of character and colour that only Goethe or Shakspeare displays. From the very heart of human nature, alike in its quietest and in its wildest moods, she looks outward. Without violence or spasm, and with composed masterful strength, she exhibits almost all the moods of human passion from the tragic sorrow of Hetty, or the massive reposeful strength of Adam Bede, to the sharp and inexhaustible art of Mrs. Payser. And her genius is seen as much in its lightest touches as in its most elaborate figures, in the balance and finish of her thoughts as in their conception—it can do nothing imperfectly. We must, however, reserve our general characterizations of her great genius to a future, and we hope an early, occasion, and simply welcome now her new work, which in various fertility and power will sustain, if it do not enhance, the reputation won by Adam Bede. It is a grand work of art, as simple as it is great. A work full of grand imaginative conceptions, the naturalness of which may for a moment make us forget their greatness.

'Felix Holt' owes nothing of its charm to the intricacy, ingenuity, and stimulating power of its plot. The story is improbable, and, in parts, extremely awkward. But the people that live and move in these pages are as real and interesting as George Eliot's creations always are. The honest, enthusiastic hero of the book; his poor weak-headed old mother; the member of the Independent Meeting in Malthouse Yard; the proud Mr. Transome; sweet, beautiful Esther Lyon—we seem to know them all as well as though they had been neighbours of ours for the last twenty years. They are all very well worth knowing too. George Eliot never exhausts her genius upon the chief figure in her books. The drawing of the secondary characters is as pure and true, the colouring as sober and thoughtful as the drawing and colouring of the hero and heroine. It is worth watching the means by which she produces her effects. Take the Independent minister—the Rev. Rufus Lyon—the story about him, so far as it properly comes into 'Felix Holt'—amounts to

nothing; his challenging of the Rector to a public discussion of the claims of the Establishment and Nonconformity, is ridiculous; and yet, by innumerable slight touches, he is made to be a man whom many will love, and all will respect. No doubt the effect, in this case, is produced partly by the romantic history of his relations to Annette, which lies in the background, and changes the whole aspect of his common-place and obscure life; but there is a most patient and painstaking effort to complete every character in its minutest details, and where another reader would trust to a few rough, strong lines to indicate and to identify one of the minor actors, George Eliot works away quietly, and gives us a perfect picture. There is all the difference between Miss Braddon's stories, infinitely clever as some of them are, and George Eliot's, that there is between the 'scenery' at Drury Lane and one of Linnell's pictures. There is a certain something in the moral feeling of some parts of the story that we could wish other than it is—a falling below that high inspiration of pure thought and sympathy which is the characteristic of the noblest genius. The great lessons that George Eliot would teach and the tragedy of life that she would delineate, do not require a certain tinge and suggestiveness that are found in almost all her books.

'Felix Holt' is much more than a novel; it is a thoughtful study of a noble and heroic life. The genius which gave us 'Adam Bede' is still unquenched, and we may hope that it will surprise and delight the world with further proofs of its power.

Hester's Sacrifice. By the Author of 'St. Olave's,' 'Janita's Cross,' &c. &c. In three vols. Hurst and Blackett.

The idea intended to be developed and illustrated in this story is one of great moment, and is capable of suggesting very serious and serviceable practical lessons. The object with which the authoress sat down to her task, would seem to have been this,—to show how wrong, once done, cannot be undone; that, having become a fact, a fact it must remain; that it will and must have issues and consequences to the wrong-doer in spite of repentance or remorse; and that such consequences may come at the distance of years from the commission of the error or the crime; at a time, too, it may be, when least expected, and in such a way as utterly to destroy the hope and prospect of deliverance and impunity which might have come to be indulged. A great subject—one true to nature, that may be seen embodied in the working out of God's moral government, in cases of obvious retribution, and one which is pregnant with lessons which cannot be learnt and pondered too early. In order, however, to be thoroughly impressive, a story illustrating this solemn law under which we live, must be so constructed as to fall in with our ideas of propriety and justice, in respect, especially, to something like equitable proportion between the wrong done and the punishment endured. Such a tale may either be deeply tragic,—a great crime, terrible remorse, or terrible insensibility,—years, it might be, in which judgment slumbered, and then a sudden waking up, and the infliction of 'the recompence of reward,' perhaps by some unheard of and unexpected catastrophe; or the story might deal with ordinary and every-day materials,—some serious error or fault, into which any one might be betrayed, which, though deeply regretted, or inadequately felt, might yet operate in such a way as to show that it had been taken up into the great system of ever-acting law, and came out at length, and when little looked for, in the form of direct though remote consequences, very mate-

rially to affect the delinquent, but yet so proportioned to the original wrong as to be consistent with probability and experience. Now, the author of 'Hester's Sacrifice,' has, as it seems to us, failed in the selection of the facts out of which the illustration was to be drawn of what she set herself to develop. The error of Nils Brayton (if it is to be called one) was really a comparatively venial matter; indeed, considering the insight he got into the fiery spirit of the dark beauty to whom he had hastily and foolishly given himself, it was the best thing he could do to achieve his emancipation. Such an act might, however, have been shown to become the source to him of much annoyance, and indeed, of serious consequences; but the remorse which he is represented as suffering is utterly disproportioned to what he had done; and the awful event in which the long-nursed revenge of the disappointed woman culminates, many illustrate the heat and hatred of West Indian blood, but it is not in keeping with the laws of Providence as illustrative of what may be expected to follow from even the unjustifiable abandonment of a first love. Nils Brayton should either have done something worse than he did, or his punishment ought to have been lighter;—unless, indeed, it was the writer's intention to show how mortified pride, or disappointed passion, may, in a hot, proud, bad nature, prompt to deeds of revenge matchless and incredible. That, however, does not seem to have been the object of the book, or it would have had another name; even as it is, the title is not very happy. With respect to the style and story of 'Hester's Sacrifice,' apart from the one mistake we have adverted to, we have to express very hearty admiration. The book is written with great quietness, purity and beauty. The most of it deals with what is familiar and domestic, and with the ordinary characters that are to be met with in every-day life. In depicting these the author is eminently successful. From some of them indeed, such as 'Brooke,' and 'Sister May'—looking at them as to what *they* reap—very precious lessons, well worth learning, may be gathered by the young. 'Margaret,' an old methodist housekeeper, is a rich and admirable creation. We cordially commend the work as well worth perusal.

Duke Ernest: A Tragedy, and other Poems, by ROSAMOND HARVEY. London: Macmillan and Co.

We single out this volume of Poems from half a score of others which have been laid upon our editorial table within the last twelve months, for a few words of hearty approbation. *Duke Ernest* is conceived in pure taste and true historic feeling, and is presented with much dramatic force. With great felicity, the authoress places us in contact with the feelings and feuds of burgher and noble in the days when their respective rights began to clash. The character of *Duke Ernest* is perhaps too perfect; and the contrasted infamy and evil deeds of Oswald too utterly vile and miscreant. Still, with light and easy touches in graceful flowing metre, a long history is told of suffering and of love, of outraged innocence and holy friendship, of treachery and death. The terrible ceremonial and awful consequences of the ban of the Empire and the Church are forcibly depicted. The imagination is not shown in florid pictures or brilliant simile, nor in discourse overlaid with rare exotic fancies, but in the ideal floating before the mind of the authoress, and in the methods she has adopted for revealing the characters and grouping the incidents of her tragedy. The poem resembles the tragedy of *Ernest of Suabia* by Uhland; but it is, nevertheless, thoroughly original.

The minor poems are some of them very beautiful; exhibiting considerable variety of metre and novelty of suggestion. 'The Deaf Man's Deathbed,' and 'The Judgment of the Sea,' are both remarkable, and all the Poems are pervaded by a deep love for the simple ministries of Nature.

www.libtool.com.cn

The Poet's Hour. Poetry selected and arranged for Children.
By FRANCES MARTIN. London: Walton and Maberly.

Spring-time with the Poets. Poetry selected and arranged by
FRANCES MARTIN. London: Walton and Maberly.

Poems of the Inner Life. Selected chiefly from Modern Authors.
London: Sampson Low and Co.

Lyra Consolationis; or Hymns for the Day of Sorrow and Weakness. London: James Nisbet and Co.

It is much more difficult to compile a good selection of poetry than those who have not made the attempt might imagine. Good taste, intuitive art, and an extensive acquaintance with poetical literature, are indispensable—if, as every selection should be, the book is to be a structure and not an album. The compiler must choose his specimens upon an intelligent principle, and arrange them according to an architectural plan. Few compilations of the hundreds that are given to the public evince these qualifications in so high a degree as these two selections by Miss Martin—the one for children, the other for more mature students. She has the advantage of a familiar poetical acquaintance with a great variety of youthful mind. Her own poetical sympathies have kept her from didactic pieces, which are often only sermons in rhyme. 'Children,' she justly remarks, 'often teach us more than we teach them.' 'We are apt to lament their frivolity when they turn aside to gather wild flowers, or to scare butterflies. I have a conviction that the butterflies and the wild flowers teach them as much at the least as any of our precepts. Both will be found in these pages, as well as the more solemn groves and their many bird-voices which we would teach children to love.' The intelligence and practical wisdom with which this selection is made, and the wide range of poetry which it includes, should give it a place in families and schools second to none of its class, and superior to most.

'Spring-time with the Poets' takes a higher range, and furnishes a greater variety of examples, taken from our older poets to our most recent. A fine sense of adaptation has determined each, and a felt unity of idea binds them all together. The result is very admirable.

'Poems of the Inner Life' are selected by a Unitarian Minister, with exquisite taste, deep spiritual feeling, and a very admirable catholicity. They are intended 'to show forth the deeper meanings of nature and of life, giving some of the words of truth and beauty which the poets have spoken concerning that side of our inner life which is turned toward heaven, and which is lighted up by the light of God.' The compiler desires for his volume 'a place amongst the aids to the religious life—a welcome friend on bright days—a solace and comfort on dark ones.' He purposely omits the hymns and poems which are to be found in ordinary hymn-books, and brings together such gipsy children of song as are found only in the hedgerows of literature, and with which ordinary travellers on the dusty highways of life are not likely to become

acquainted. It is a very precious little volume; it appeals thoughtfully, tenderly, and spiritually to the higher and deeper moods of our life.

'Lyra Consolationis' brings together many well-known, with other less-known hymns and verses; some of the latter are very beautiful. The editor has not, however, a very extensive acquaintance with hymnology, or he would not attribute so well-known a hymn as 'God moves in a mysterious way' to Newton, or call Philip Quarles 'John,' or so frequently append 'Anon.' to hymns whose authorship is known: for example to Mrs. Miles's beautiful lines 'Thou who didst stoop below.'

THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, AND PHILOLOGY.

The Church and the World. Essays on Questions of the Day.

By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

The chaotic state which for the last quarter of a century has characterized the Church of England is somewhat subsiding. There has been a great upheaval of its very artificial crust; explosive elements had gathered, various convictions and feelings had simultaneously grown to strength, and the first effect of their eruption was a wild confusion, in which very heterogeneous elements were mingled, impossible to classify, almost to recognise. After a while it became possible roughly to indicate 'Church parties;' and Mr. Conybeare's essay formulated them almost for the first time. The subsequent course of things has given sharpness to his lines of demarcation, and for some time to come, perhaps with fluctuating strength, there are likely to be three great parties within the boundaries of the Established Church, very widely differing from each other—more widely than many who are avowedly Nonconformists differ from them—but using the same formularies and subscribing the same creeds. And this, be it remarked, is the painful anomaly and immorality of the National Church; not the comprehension within a national establishment of diversified creeds, but the subscription of the same rigid articles of belief, however notoriously men may differ from or deny them. These three great parties are the High Church, the Broad Church, and the Low Church parties—or, as with as much truthfulness as wit they have been waggishly described the 'Attitudinarians,' the 'Latitudinarians,' and the 'Platitudinarians.' Besides becoming more clearly defined, great changes have passed over these parties during the last twenty-five years. The Low Church or Evangelical party has rapidly lost the high position which it had, and which with its strong hold upon the sympathies of religious people it might easily have retained. It has, with some honorable exceptions abjured learning, denounced intellect, and enshrined itself within a narrow dogmatism of ignorant ideas, that—sublimely regardless of fact, does little but anathematize those who presume to differ from it. The Broad Church party has become cold and unspiritual; it starves religious life by its cold intellectuality, and has been largely discredited by the open infidelity of some, and by the portentous latitudinarianism of others of its leaders.

The High Church party has, on the whole, made the most progress; it has consolidated its power, formulated its position and aims, and by the undoubted piety and devotedness of many of its supporters conciliated the religious sympathies of some who differ the most widely from its theories. For ourselves we have scarcely an ecclesiastical notion in common with it; from the Broad Church party we have

theological differences, some of which are almost fundamental. Our sympathies are with the theology which the Evangelical party has represented, but which we fear, by a process of narrowing dogmatism, it is beginning to misrepresent. Over this in the interests of Evangelical truth we very greatly grieve; but we are constrained to say that in spite of its priestly assumption, its ritual frippery, and its ecclesiastical exclusiveness, our religious feeling is strongly appealed to by the spirituality and moral goodness, and by the ministerial devotedness of the Anglican party. The change that has passed over this party is very remarkable. When the 'Tracts for the Times' appeared it seemed to be, and to a large extent was, a movement towards Rome: this is clear from the actual secession to Rome of many of its leaders. Its present movements, however—and possibly with Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and two or three more—its movement from the first was not directly towards Rome, but on a line parallel to Rome. This volume of eighteen essays, by various Anglican writers, lays this down as a fundamental position. They do not identify themselves with Rome; they are not going in the direction of Rome; secession to Rome it is affirmed has almost entirely stopped since the movement was clearly understood. They claim to be a distinct and legitimate branch of the Catholic Church of Christ; in close affinity with Rome and with the Eastern Church: but not identical with either, and in their Anglican distinctness as valid as either. Thus much therefore is conceded—that organic oneness as claimed by Rome is not essential to a true church. The essential notes of the true church are priestly orders, apostolic succession, and the sacraments. These may be possessed by churches having different organizations and jurisdictions, and having only a federal relation to each other; so that as there is apparently no divine virtue in the number three, other churches beside the Eastern, Roman, and Anglican, would be valid churches had they valid orders, a valid succession, and valid sacraments. So far good, it is well to know the exact points involved in a controversy. Naturally, eighteen essays, written by eighteen different persons, each writer independent of the rest, and free to express his individual convictions, and responsible only for his own opinions, present some diversities of opinion; but as with the 'Essays and Reviews,' the famous prototype of the volume, these diversities are inconsiderable, and the whole may fairly be regarded as a manifesto of the party, and characterized as such. We are reluctant on such matters to indulge in characterizations which space prevents us from justifying by quotation and argument. We may, however, say that, as a whole, the spirit of the volume is unexceptionable; conceding the stand-point of the writers, there is but little intolerance and no abuse. Some of the papers are very beautiful in style, very admirable in feeling, and very able in execution; there is, however, a great deal of bad argument and untenable assumption; and we must express our amazement at the puerilities for which grown up and able men here contend.

It is, of course, impossible for us to touch on even the main topics of the whole of these eighteen essays, much less on their various incidental assertions and arguments; Ritualism, Cathedral Reform, Religious Confraternities, Clerical Celibacy, Re-union of the Church, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Vows and their relation to Religious Communities, &c., are among the chief topics discussed, and the Anglican theories concerning them are maintained. Dr Littledale discourses on 'the Missionary Aspect of Ritualism,' and contends for ritualism in the Anglican sense as a great religious means of bringing

men to Christ, or rather to the Church, for to this his missionary ideas have reference chiefly. He thinks, for instance, that Anglican ritualism has a very powerful influence on Nonconformity, and that it is opposed and denounced by Dissenters on the ground 'that a dangerous leakage from them into the channels of the Church has set in contemporaneously with the new movement.' So far from being aware of this fact, our knowledge of Nonconformity would have led us to affirm precisely the contrary process. The writer is perhaps nearer the truth when he speaks of the effect of ritualism upon certain members of his own Church—'the advocates of ritual within the Church of England are not Roman Catholics, nor likely to become so; and their practices tend to keep a number of persons within the Anglican communion who would otherwise have abandoned it for one which could supply their cravings after a stately worship.' He thinks that deficiency of ritual has brought the Evangelical school, inclusive of what is called orthodox Dissent, 'into a state of irrecoverable decay.' The Evangelical party having failed, the Broad Church party having failed to become the national church, 'the Tractarian now claims his turn.' It is only right to say that Dr. Littledale pours scorn upon mere dilettantism in ritual, as furnishing only 'a religion for gentlemen.' He defines true ritualism as 'the object lesson of religion'—men and women being, of course, religiously children. Worship should, he thinks, be historic, for three reasons. 'First, because it is an attempt to imitate and represent on earth what Christians believe to be going on in heaven. Secondly, because this representation is partly effected by the employment of material symbols, to shadow forth invisible powers. Thirdly, because personal action, rather than passive receptivity, is the essence of its character.' He also informs us that 'it is a matter of notoriety, so much so as to be no longer matter of reproach, that Dissent does not deal with the very destitute and needy.' The article on 'Religion in London' in our January number might possibly tend to correct Dr. Littledale's judgment on this point. 'The shopkeepers and artisans,' he says, 'have gone to Dissent, and the labourers have gone to the devil.' Then we ought to hear no more of the claims of 'the poor man's church.' 'Islam and Calvinism,' he says, 'are the only religions which used the sword alone, and which, when deprived of the power to persecute, have also lost the power of converting.' Dr. Littledale's historical lore is manifestly as much at fault as his contemporary knowledge. He thinks that the greatest triumphs of Christian missions among the heathen have been effected by an imposing ritualism; of course the missions of the last fifty years in India, China, and the South Seas do not count, for he says, 'even if the reports of the proselytizing societies were as true as they are *unscrupulously mendacious*, the results would be a very poor return for three centuries of monopoly.' As a final and crucial test, he adds, 'take two street-Arabs, perfectly ignorant of Christianity. Read to one of them the Gospel narrative of the passion, and comment on it as plainly as may be. Show the other a crucifix, and tell him simply what it means. Question each a week afterwards, and see which has the clearer notion about the history of Calvary.' London possesses some thousands of ragged-school teachers, any one of whom could probably tell Dr. Littledale more about street-Arabs than he knows; but we never heard of any of them achieving their remarkable results by means of a crucifix. If Dr. Littledale's theory of true missionary power be the right one, the apostle Paul was sadly mistaken.

All this is sad enough, but the volume contains much more serious

and sensible matters; these require to be dealt with in detail and by patient argument, for which we should require almost equal space. If it be true that 'the Protestant bodies in Europe form no portion of the one body,' 'because they have renounced the one priesthood,' we are in an evil case. If our designation be **the** the unfortunate word *Protestant*, the sooner we get rid of it the better. If it be a mark of a true bishop and priest to be 'adorned with that ornament of nature, the beard,' by all means let us have done with the razor. It is well too to know on such authority that the Thirty-nine Articles are 'those Protestant Articles, tacked on 'to a Catholic Liturgy, those forty stripes save one, as some have called 'them, laid on the back of the Anglican priesthood.' We fear, too, that we have not hitherto paid due attention to 'the round of Christian 'seasons, marked by their own appropriate colour, instructing the eye 'as well as the ear, and preaching Christ and his Redemption.' We are told, moreover, that 'the teaching of the Catholic faith with and by 'Catholic ritual' 'is now drawing all the most earnest and most devout 'of the various Protestant bodies towards the Church, and leaving only 'the Political Dissenters behind.' Well, if it comforts the writer to know so much more about us than we know about ourselves, it does us no harm; only is it not going a little beyond any possible province of the writer's knowledge to say that 'Dissenters and all Protestants 'know nothing whatever really of union with Christ, although they 'talk of it,' that upon the doctrine of the Incarnation, 'Protestants, 'whatever they may think or say, are never in reality orthodox;' that 'the conventionalities and dry counsels of such writers as Jeremy 'Taylor become dusty on our shelves.' We sympathize, however, with this writer's painful experience and beautiful spirit of resignation when *she* says, 'our place is appointed us among Protestants, and in a 'communion deeply tainted in its practical system by Protestant heresy; 'but our duty is the expulsion of the evil, and not flight from it.'

It is well to have the position of great parties well defined; well for those who agree with them, and well for those who differ from and oppose them. Many and severe are the conflicts yet to be waged both within the Church and out of it, but we utterly mistake the temper of the English nation if theories like these will find much acceptance, or indeed if they will very long be tolerated in the national establishment.

The Way to Rest; Results of a Life-search after Religious Truth.

By ROBERT VAUGHAN, D.D. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1866.

Amid the strife and clangour of modern theology, the conflict unto death, the war to the knife between science and metaphysics, dogmatism and rationalism, the letter and the spirit, the title and subject-matter of this work are eminently soothing. The wearied man longs for rest, the strong man takes it as a matter of duty to prepare him for 'fresh conflict, and after the battle, in the flush of victory, the veteran leader finds it blessed. Which of us does not yearn after some quiet resting-place, founded on a few first principles and indisputable truths; garnished, too, with old memories and sweet affections, having communications open to the heavens, and hard by 'the river of the water of life.' It is refreshing and helpful to younger men to follow Dr. Vaughan along the way which his mental processes have indicated for him, to the resting-place which he has found. Though that resting-place differs little from the home where his spirit has been at peace for many years, yet is this work none

the less a genuine record of his search after it. Though his opponents might say that the end of his search was pre-determined from the beginning, it is none the less genuine, and step by step he advances to his goal without *arrière pensée* or conscious prejudice. He has re-stated old arguments with clearness and admirable condensation, he indicates lines of investigation which may fairly be regarded as original, and he shows throughout his discussions how deeply he has pondered the offers of help of which the past generation has been so fruitful. We cannot in this brief notice do justice to the various and interesting expositions which Dr. Vaughan has given of the first principles of faith, of holy living, and ecclesiastical authority, and must content ourselves with referring to a few of the way-marks which lead to the quiet resting-place from which, we trust, he will often issue with wise counsels and words both of warning and of peace. The sections on Revelation and Inspiration appear to us extremely valuable, and the suggestions with which they abound are worthy of serious attention; such, for instance, as his proof of the incompatibility of the late origin of the Pentateuch, with the account it gives of the first founders of the Hebrew race; or his estimate of the degree to which any revelation from God to the ancient world must have been materially affected by those characteristics of the Asiatic man as God fashioned him; or, again, his summation of the testimony borne by St. Paul to Christ, which is of such a kind as to prove that any trustworthy account of Him must ascribe to Him the exercise of supernatural powers; or, once more, his powerful rejoinder to the advocates of the mythical hypothesis, that the growth of the supposed mythical narratives would have been rebuked by the Apostles as other great errors were, if they had not been substantially true. Dr. Vaughan's treatment of the nature and extent of inspiration, is pre-eminently scriptural and satisfactory, admitting degrees in inspiration, and, calling great attention to the fact that only the Lord received the Holy Spirit without measure, he declares it to consist 'in the presence of a Divine influence in the mind of the inspired person, sufficient to ensure *truthfulness* to the things set forth by him 'as truthful.' He maintains that if it were conceded that there were errors in Holy Scripture he could believe in Judaism if David and Isaiah were the only authorities; he could believe in Christ if Paul were his only teacher. He declares with regard to the science of the Bible, that the record is not responsible for the notions of uninspired men on that subject, 'that it should be the science of the times in which 'the Bible was written, presenting its truth and error, whatever they 'may be. It is not too much to say that to be true as history it must 'be in a great degree false as science. It was not possible that a 'description in strict accordance with the science of our time should 'have been credible or even intelligible to the men of that time; that 'it might be truth to the minds of men in those days, it was inevitable 'that it should be in many respects very obscure truth, and even apparent untruth to our minds.' He guards himself with wise and noble words, against any unfair use of these concessions, and the whole question of inspiration has never been stated more succinctly, firmly, and rationally than in this way-mark.

The sections on the Atonement, and on Pardon and Justification, are admirably reasoned. With great force our author expounds the universality of the Divine law, and shows that if there is to be concord between God and man, it can never come by the abrogation of that law; that not only the rectitude but the benevolence of God demand its perpetuity; and that the cry of the conscience and of the reason will ever be, 'How

'may right be saved, and sinners be saved; how may God be God, and 'sin be forgiven?' He shows that the only answer to the cry is found in the Incarnation and Propitiation of Christ, and with great ability he points out the amount of truth and the degree of deficiency involved in those theories concerning the work of Christ which stop short of a full admission of His vicarious propitiation for sin. We have seldom read a more masterly treatment of the exceeding sorrow of our blessed Lord, its bearing upon the government of God, and the sanctification of man. We heartily agree with him in the argument by which he practically turns the entire theory of M'Leod Campbell and of Horace Bushnell into a defence of the orthodox position, while with strong and impassioned words he vindicates it from the *quid pro quo* degradation. Both the objective and subjective views of the atonement are alike accepted, and shown to be inseparable. The history of the doctrine of Pardon and Justification is succinctly presented, and he goes very far, indeed, in indicating the moral power of the Atonement, the moral consequences of justification by faith in Christ. He says, 'The way of forgiveness as thus seen goes far toward winning back our whole nature to God;' and while admitting that faith in the righteousness of Christ includes the seeds of an approval of that righteousness, and of an ultimate conformity to it, and pointing out the irrationality of any transference of moral qualities from Christ to the believer, he is Protestant to the core in his exposition of the effect of faith on justification.

The sections on man in his moral relations, on spiritual influences, and on Church authority, are all full of admirable teaching, though they do not seem to us to indicate the same ease or grasp of the difficult problems discussed in them, as characterize the other sections. Although many minds fancy that they have found the way to rest in the teaching, sacraments and absolution of an infallible Church, Dr. Vaughan has shown that it would be more difficult to scale the rocky heights, or cross the spongy morass which intervenes between his position and such a quiet resting-place, than to decide, with the aid of enlightened reason and the Holy Ghost, the questions which the Church presumes to settle on her own *ipse dixit*. Though this volume, in the hands of some readers, may provoke inquiry and antagonism, yet thoughtful men, who are longing for light and peace, cannot read it without great advantage.

1. *Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon, considered in relation to Catholic Unity.* A Letter to the Rev. Father Lockhart. By HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. London: Longmans and Co., 1866.
2. *The Anglican Theory of Union, as maintained in the Appeal to Rome, and Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon.* A Second Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Birmingham. By the Right Rev. Bishop ULLATHORNE. London: Longmans and Co., 1866.
3. *Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church.* By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. London: Longmans and Co., 1866.
4. *Dr. Newman and his Religious Opinions.* By CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE. London: J. F. Shaw & Co., 1866.

5. *Fidelity and Unity. A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D.*
By the Rev. HUGH M'NEIL, D.D. London: Hatchard
and Co., 1866.

The 'Eirenicon' literature is becoming formidable—formidable from its magnitude, and formidable from its general dulness. At present, more has been written on the Roman side than on the Protestant; and it is very evident, notwithstanding the existence of a liberal party in the Roman church, that Dr. Pusey's dream of mutual concessions and explanations, in order to effect the re-union of the two churches, finds no favour at Rome. We cannot but hope that the controversy will have the effect of creating in England a more intelligent and resolute hostility to the principles and spirit of Popery, by revealing the irreconcilable antagonism between the characteristic polity and peculiar dogmas of the Papal Church on the one hand, and the genius of the New Testament and the highest prerogatives of the human soul on the other. The blind hatred of Romanism, and the indiscriminating contempt for the intellect and character of all Romanists, which existed in this country fifty years ago are fast disappearing; the controversy will help to diffuse and to strengthen a wise and uncompromising spirit of resistance, not only to Romanism itself, but to every movement, by whatever name baptized, which would undo the work of the Reformers.

Of the pamphlets whose titles are given above, Mr. Oxenham's 'Letter to the Rev. Father Leckhart' is by far the most readable and interesting. His conversion to Romanism is comparatively recent, and he has a vivid appreciation of the present tendencies of thought in the English Establishment. Unlike most converts, he writes without bitterness of the Church he has left, and, with measured devotion, of the Church to which he has conformed. His estimate of the importance of the 'Eirenicon,' and his expectations of a re-union of England and Rome, are, however, very exaggerated. He believes that Dr. Pusey's book has not only 'stirred the religious sympathies of a large portion of our countrymen, as also of foreign Catholics,' but that it 'bids fair to form an epoch in the history of English theology and of the National Church.' The most remarkable passages in the pamphlet are those in which he considers the relation of Rome to the three great parties in the Anglican establishment. He thinks it most fortunate that the Privy Council, in its recent judgments, declined to commit the English clergy to the doctrine of imputed righteousness, which is expressly condemned by the Council of Trent, and to the theory of verbal inspiration, which has never been defined by the Roman Church, and is probably held by very few Roman theologians of our own day. Any other sentence, while it would have fettered the liberals in the Church of England, would have increased the difficulties of re-union with the see of St. Peter. The Evangelical clergy, Mr. Oxenham thinks it unnecessary to take into account in considering the policy of Rome towards this country; 'noble as was their early devotion in an age which had forgotten Christ, and though many admirable and excellent men are still ranged under their banners, while many more have left their ranks for the service of a purer faith, their work has long been done. The party, as a party, is too divided and decrepit now to exert any critical influence, and too hopelessly incompetent to deserve it.' But it is supposed, strangely enough, that the Liberal party is accessible to the arguments and appeals of the Romanists. That by a natural recoil from despair at the loss of all faith, some weary but noble hearts may seek refuge in Rome, is very possible, but as long as Liberalism does not drift

into total unbelief, we cannot imagine on what reasonable grounds it can be anticipated that any section of the heterogeneous party of which Dean Stanley and Mr. Jowett are the most conspicuous representatives, will be disposed to promote any union or confederation between the great churches of Christendom. One of the few definite convictions common to the 'Liberals' among the English clergy, is an almost superstitious faith in the sanctity of national life; the nation, to them, is the Church; any violation of national independency—and this is necessarily involved in the very idea of a Universal Church—would provoke their strong hostility. As a party, they are well read in European history; and whoever else may forget the dark and terrible pages in the history of Rome in the fifteenth century and the early years of the sixteenth, they will not. They are also irreconcilably opposed to the dogmatic faith upon which both Rome and Constantinople must insist. The Encyclical of 1864 is a decisive proof, if any were needed, that between the Papacy and every form of Liberalism, there must henceforth be eternal war.

Mr. Oxenham dwells with special emphasis on the recent development of Ritualism in the English Church, and the following paragraph is worth quotation:—

'It seems to me, considering the nature and circumstances of the movement, nothing short of paradoxical to regard it as other than a decided advance in a Catholic direction. In itself, of course, ceremonial religion is of very small importance, and the measure of its influence varies indefinitely with different minds. But the contrast between the present Ritualists and those of twenty-five years ago is suggestive in more ways than one. Then all England was set in a blaze, towns placarded, churches gutted, clergymen mobbed, bishops rebelled against, because it was sought to introduce a few trivial changes, either having no doctrinal significance whatever, or tending (as in the famous crusade for the Church Militant Prayer) to obscure rather than to illustrate Catholic belief. Now, in many churches, both in London and elsewhere, *all or nearly all the ritual of the Mass has been adopted*, not only without protest on the part of the congregations, but with their hearty concurrence, and often at their earnest desire; while in many more churches there is a more or less close approximation to the same ideal of worship. Two large editions have been sold, and a third advertised, of the "Directorium Anglicanum," which supplies minute directions for these services, drawn from the Sarum Missal. It is, of course, very possible to believe in the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice without lighting candles or wearing a chasuble; and I doubt not there are multitudes who do so. What is simply inconceivable is that men who are neither babies nor buffoons, should care to dress themselves, or see others dressed, in vestments indelibly associated to the popular mind by the immemorial usage of at least fifteen centuries with doctrines which they do not hold themselves. Such incredible folly would be fitter for a strait-waistcoat than an alb.'

The chief part of the remainder of Mr. Oxenham's Letter is occupied with an enumeration of the advantages which would flow from Re-union. In the Appendix there is a catena of testimonies pointing in the same direction, from Catholic, Greek, and Anglican writers, including the Bishop of Orleans and the Patriarch of Constantinople on the extreme right, and Professor Goldwin Smith on the extreme left. Mr. Goldwin Smith, however, never intended to lend any sanction to what is now meant by 'the re-union of Christendom;' the context of the passage shows clearly enough that in his judgment the fall of the Papacy is imminent, and that the regeneration of Christendom is to be effected, not

by a confederation of churches, but by the development of a new type of religious liberty.

Dr. Ullathorne gives an authoritative contradiction to the theory of a prominent representative of the Association for promoting the Unity of Christendom, that the Roman decree against the Association 'was notoriously issued in consequence of a petition in which Dr. Manning was 'the chief mover.' 'I will pause here,' continues Dr. Littledale, 'since 'the name of so accomplished a master of the art of suppression and 'mis-statement is almost enough of itself to demolish any Rescript based 'upon his representations.' These controversial amenities are rather curious aids to 'Re-union!' The real history of the Rescript, which, however, Dr. Ullathorne tells us is not technically a "Rescript," throws an interesting light on the processes by which documents of this kind are elaborated, and is very well worth reading. The greater part of the letter is occupied with a vigorous reply to Dr. Pusey's argument for the independence of the African Church in the time of Augustine.

Mr. Allies, who writes with some sharpness and bitterness, endeavours to prove that if Dr. Pusey will only be true to the principles of the early Church, he must abandon his theory that Anglicanism, Photianism, and Romanism are branches of one holy Catholic Church. The following is a courteous description of Dr. Pusey's book :—

'A particular interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, which was 'presented some twenty-five years ago by its author only as one of 'several allowable varieties, yet even so was rejected by the vast majority 'of the Bishops, clergy, and people as not within the range of permission, Dr. Pusey now borrows from that author, disowning it, and produces as the proper interpretation of the whole community; and by the 'aid of this subterfuge, as if it was a true picture of the life of this community during the three hundred years of its existence, confers a "truth and office" upon what he calls the English Church, being his conception 'not of what it is, or even of what it ever was, but of what it ought to 'be. The conception, then, of something which should be, but is not, 'and has never been, is presented by him on one side over against a caricature of the Catholic Church on the other; and the insult to truth, on 'the one side and on the other, he terms an *Eirenicon*, while it is constructed as a scarecrow to frighten troubled consciences from seeking 'their true home; and in it devotions sanctioned by himself for private 'practice are mentioned as derogatory to the honour of our Lord when 'used by Catholics.'

The words 'Intellectual Dishonesty,' which form the running title at the top of the page in which this passage occurs, give it additional point.

Dr. McNeile's pamphlet shows that old age has not chilled the fervour of that Protestant zeal which has been a chief characteristic of his protracted public life.

Mr. Collette's book is a curious piece of controversial literature, but is not very likely either to restrain Protestants from drifting to Rome or to convince Romanists that they should change their church and their creed. He strongly inclines to the belief that Dr. Newman was ordained a Romish priest in 1833! And he says, 'It is also a fact that Dr. Newman spent the early years of his life in the college of the "Propaganda Fide" at Rome. He was then, it is asserted, a Roman Catholic.' We believe that Mr. Collette is a barrister; on what evidence does this 'fact' rest?

The First Age of Christianity and the Church. By JOHN IGNATIUS DÖLLINGER, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Munich, &c. Translated by Henry Metcombe Oxenham, M.A., late scholar of Balliol College, Oxford. 2 vols. London: Wm. H. Allen & Co.

Dr. Döllinger can write nothing that is not worthy the earnest attention of ecclesiastical and theological students; and that, not merely on account of his vast erudition and vigorous intellect, but also because of his manly candour and modesty, and of the resolute independence with which he examines evidence and states the result. Perhaps no other Roman Catholic has won so large a degree of respect and sympathy from Protestants. Perhaps to no other Roman Catholic writer can so little suspicion be attached, of blind submission to the traditions and pretensions of his church. Dr. Döllinger is a sincere Roman Catholic; the firmness and intelligence of his conviction cannot for a moment be questioned; but his mental independence keeps him from ultramontaniam, and places him at the head of the liberal party, within the pale of his church; a party which finds no favour at Rome. The interest of the work before us lies largely in this fact. We are all of us too apt to think that reason and truth are wholly upon our side, and that there can be neither intelligence nor sincerity in the conclusions of those who differ from us. It cannot, therefore, fail to be serviceable to Protestants to see how the facts and teachings of primitive Christianity appear to an able and candid man occupying Dr. Döllinger's stand-point. Of course we differ from many of his conclusions, and, consistently with deference to his great learning, great ability, and perfect honesty, we venture to say we have no misgiving about the untenableness of his conclusions concerning the distinctive claims of his church. The prerogatives that he claims for Peter, his assertions of the hierarchy, his doctrine of the sacraments, his assumption of infallibility for the church, and many other things that he contends for, rest upon false and unscriptural assumptions, which all the learning and ability in the world cannot validate. It is, however, a great thing to have these claims put forward fairly, intelligently, and reasonably. He who would controvert Dr. Döllinger will have to deal with no arrogant assumptions or intolerant denunciations, but with plausible arguments, and honest appeals to reason. In his famous speech at the Munich Congress of 1863, Dr. Döllinger urged upon his Catholic brethren 'to make a firm resolution for the future, to use none but scientific weapons in philosophical and theological inquiries; to banish from literature, as un-German and un-Catholic, all denunciations, and holding up to suspicion of those who differ from us, and rather to take for our model in dealing with them the grave and truly evangelical gentleness of Augustine, and the enlightened teachers of the ancient church.' The present work is an admirable illustration of the advice thus given. Dr. Döllinger is any thing but a narrow dogmatist, or a supercilious priest. Although we think the case of the Roman Catholic, as of every Sacramentarian church utterly hopeless; although the pretensions of Rome have been discredited, and its pleadings refuted over and over again,—and, with the accumulated mass of three centuries of argument, it is one of the easiest of controversial tasks,—yet it were simply presumptuous sciolism to say that men like Dr. Döllinger have no argument whatever on their side. In this, as in most questions, conclusions can be reached

only by preponderance of evidence. It is obvious, however, that in a notice like this, we can only describe Dr. Döllinger's book, and not controvert it.

It is, in fact, a system of ecclesiastical and dogmatic theology, based upon the facts and teachings of primitive Christianity. It is the commencement of a great ecclesiastical work, in which Dr. Döllinger proposes 'to investigate the Church in the entirety of her outward life, and historical continuity from the beginning until now, and do his best to exhibit it adequately to others; and this' Dr. Döllinger justly adds, 'is the work of a lifetime.' The elaborate volumes translated by Mr. Darnell, and published four years ago, 'the Gentile and the Jew in the Court of the Temple,' was, strictly speaking, an introduction to the great work on Christian History of which this is the first instalment. At the same time, as Mr. Oxenham observes, 'the Apostolic age, while it forms, 'so to say, the first chapter in the life of the Catholic Church, is, in many respects, an exceptional period, standing alone and isolated from all later epochs of Christian history. It is no mere portion, however integral, of the edifice of that new society which Christ set up on earth, but the foundation of the entire building.' It is, therefore, capable of a separate treatment, and, so far this is an independent work. We should say that Dr. Döllinger's work is purely historical; he simply narrates the course of events, and interprets them as he himself conceives of them. He furnishes neither evidence for his statements, nor defence of his interpretations. A very occasional scriptural or historical reference, at the foot of the page, is all the *apparatus criticus* with which he encumbers his history. The work, therefore, must be accepted as giving simply the conclusions of a learned, able, and candid man. Its bearing on ecclesiastical and theological controversies, therefore, with the exception of very occasional animadversions on heretical writers like Strauss and Renan, is only indirect.

The history is simple, succinct, and unincumbered, and the judgments pronounced are modest, learned, and impartial, so far, that is, as any one with strong and distinctive beliefs can be impartial. Having examined the Biblical and historical evidence, Dr. Döllinger merely states his conclusions from them.

In the first book on 'Christ and his apostles,' he simply gives us a summary of the New Testament history, telling us what they did, and what they said; in this we find little to which we take exception, and very much with which we heartily concur. We demur of course to the asserted primacy of Peter, and to the passing assertion of the transubstantiation of the bread and wine at the last supper, both afterwards treated very elaborately. More relative authority, however, is attributed to Paul than the theologians of Dr. Döllinger's own church would generally allow. Several of Dr. Döllinger's judgments on minor matters might also be questioned; for instance, the statement that 'Barnabas and Saul were appointed to fill up two vacant places in the apostolic college, one caused by the sword of Herod in the execution of James son of Zebedee, the other, by James the son of Alphæus, being withdrawn from the peculiar work of an apostle;' and the assertion that 'a forged letter of Paul's had been circulated' in the church at Thessalonica; that the so-called epistle to the Ephesians 'clearly had a more general scope, and 'was a circular addressed to the churches on the Asiatic coast, in whose assemblies it was to be read;' the formation of the church at Rome by Peter; the identity of the 'Babylon' of Peter's epistle with Rome, contrary to the general tradition which identifies it with old Cairo in Egypt; the statement that John's second epistle was 'addressed to a community',

and not to a private individual; the theory that 'the important variations of style between the Gospel and Revelation are explained by 'John having used a different translator for the one and the other;' but these are points fairly open to diversified judgments.

The second section of the work treats of 'the doctrine of the apostles,' and here we are gratified to find how greatly Dr. Döllinger accords with ourselves, and how triumphantly he vindicates the great fundamental dogmas of the Christian faith; of course we do not accept his theory of the church in its relation to Christian doctrine, we do not think that any organized visible church is the essential medium of Christian truth, or its infallible interpreter, nor that the Bible is an insufficient source of doctrine. It is quite true that the apostles were verbal teachers of Christianity; but this fact does not warrant the inference drawn from it by Dr. Döllinger, that the existence and preservation of the truth are dependent upon any visible church organization, much less upon an organization now represented by the Romish Church. Unless we wilfully shut our eyes to the facts of history, Scripture originated with inspired individual men, not with an organised church; the canon, however formed, was certainly not formed by any ecclesiastical council; and the infallible church, to which Dr. Döllinger belongs, has seriously and fundamentally erred a thousand times, so that either Scripture is wrong or she is wrong. We think Dr. Döllinger's doctrine of Scripture and tradition utterly untenable in the light of Scripture, historical fact, and reason. Much in the chapter, however, is very true and wise and forcible. Dr. Döllinger's remarks on the inspiration of Scripture, especially, are worthy of careful perusal. Chapters are also devoted to 'the Church and the Sacraments,' 'The last things, and the future of the Church and the world.'

The third book treats of the constitution, worship, and life of the apostolic church, the order and office of its ministry, spiritual gifts, ordinances and public worship, ecclesiastical institutions and customs, social and political relations, in which a hundred points provoke our comment; but to give any satisfactory account of these chapters would require extended space. One of the most interesting sections is that which treats of the 'Man of Sin,' which Dr. Döllinger thinks was the heathen Roman empire, more specifically Nero.

Dr. Döllinger's work is, to those competent by familiarity with authorities and church questions to use it, a great and important contribution to ecclesiastical and theological literature; to those not so qualified, its perusal will be perilous, in virtue of its generous frankness, its charming modesty, and its Christian goodness. Those elements of it, which we think erroneous, are clothed with so much of the plausibility and attractiveness of moderation and candour, that to those unaccustomed to examine evidence closely, and test arguments severely, they may seem conclusive. Our differences from Dr. Döllinger are important; but to all who value the great fundamental truths of Christianity, his work will be a valuable storehouse of precious facts and arguments.

Biblical Studies. By WILLIAM ROBINSON. London: Longmans.

These 'studies' show that their respected author, the minister of the Baptist congregation at Cambridge, has for many years been pondering the deepest, most interesting, and most controverted points of biblical theology. His aim is to check the 'scepticism that originates in, or is 'confirmed by erroneous views of what the Bible teaches.' Twenty-one entirely different topics are handled by him with more or less develop-

ment. His observations on some of these questions, though shrewd and suggestive, are mere fragments. Of such we may enumerate his chapters on the Creation of Man and Woman, the Noachian Deluge, the State of the Dead, the Resurrection of the Dead and the Coming of the Lord, the Genealogical Tables of Matthew and Luke; while the subject of Prophecy, the Doctrine of the Trinity, Predestination, Congregationalism, and other important questions, are treated at greater length. Assuming the divine inspiration and infallible truth of Holy Scripture, and deeply penetrated by its spirit, the author attacks in a rather Quixotic manner, but with a candour and good feeling too often excluded from religious controversy, many of the speculations, phrases, and terms of ancient and modern theology. Living in the glasshouse of a speculative theologian of no ordinary pretension, it hardly becomes him to throw so many stones. We admit that Mr. Robinson's theories, startling and original as some of them may be, are all intended to remove the difficulties, establish the accuracy, disencumber the teaching of Holy Scripture, and that they are characterized by a deep and fervent piety; but he rejects as oriental or mediæval speculation, much theological doctrine which its advocates maintain to have most sure warrant in Holy Scripture; nor is the mode in which he states his own view more satisfactory to us than the positions which he rejects. The most original portion of the volume is his dissertation on the creation of the world; without presuming to have done more than propound a theory, he endeavours to show that physical science and the Biblical narrative may be harmonised by the supposition that during pre-Adamic periods the earth rotated on its own axis, once, instead of 365 times during one revolution of its orbit; consequently presenting the same features in relation to the sun that the moon does now in relation to its primary, and that the facts established in geological science may be accounted for by the tremendous cataclysm that must have occurred when the present system of rotation was inaugurated, and such a cataclysm with its results he believes to be described in the work of the first four days of the creation. Some of the vast changes of level, and arrangements of the secondary formations, and some of the appearances in the southern hemisphere, might receive explanation on this hypothesis, but it would leave the carboniferous periods and those of the Saurian monsters and extinct mammals, a deeper mystery than ever. Mr. Robinson's treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity is ingenious and reverent; but his acceptance of the exploded opinion of Apollinaris, his vigorous repudiation of the doctrine of the eternal Sonship, and the inconsistency between his reason for thus doing, viz., its admission of a subordinate position and one of derived existence for the Son, with his hesitation in offering supreme homage to the Lord Jesus Christ, do not satisfy us that he has grasped the true conditions of the great problem.

In our opinion the church was far less metaphysical than its opponents. The heretics could never rest; they continually strove to manipulate formulæ to explain the union of God and man, which one by one either damaged the purity of the Divine essence and unity, or created a second God, or took away the perfect humanity of Jesus. The church repudiated one after another of these metaphysical wiredrawings, and reasserted the incompatibility of Scripture truth with the various ideas of its opponents. Mr. Robinson may be trying to do the same, but we do not think he is successful. In his repudiation of the idea of the Triune God, and accepting that of a Trinity, we are often in doubt as to his real meaning and standpoint. We are in similar perplexity when he is handling the doctrine of predestination. There is an obvious desire to set everybody to rights, but as it

appears to us, great inconsistency of statement and argument. We congratulate Mr. Robinson on the force, manliness, and clearness of his style; on the energy and originality of many of his thoughts; and on the suggestiveness of his speculative fragments, but we can hardly restrain the wish that he had been endowed with health and time necessary for a full exposition and defence of his theses.

The Biblical Antiquity of Man, or Man not older than the Adamic Creation. By the Rev. S. LUCAS, F.G.S. London: Whitaker and Co.

Mr. Lucas takes an entirely different view from that of Mr. Robinson as to the best method of harmonizing Scripture with geological data. He is willing to concede, and sums up skilfully the various evidence on which the antiquity of the human race is supposed to have been demonstrated. With a strong deliverance on the authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture, he is of opinion that the chronology of the Hebrew Scriptures, from the creation of man to the call of Abraham, to say nothing of any later periods, is in the most indeterminate condition. Accepting the chronology of the Septuagint and of the Samaritan Pentateuch as far more likely to be accurate than that of the Hebrew text, it would not trouble him in the least if geological or archaeological discoveries demanded thousands of years over and above those specified in the longest Biblical chronology. His next point is to establish the universality of the deluge, which he defends with all the ardour of a Faber; and then he proceeds to account for the flint implements in the river-beds of France and England, the bone breccia and other remains of the caves, and the discoveries in the valley of the Mississippi, &c. &c., by the hypothesis of the universal deluge; saving thus, as he thinks the unity of the antediluvian race and the Noachic paternity of all existing races. It will, as Mr. Robinson says, be a marvellous testimony to the divinity of Holy Scripture if, by the year 1860, all scientific explorers shall be compelled to admit that supernatural and Divine wisdom gleams even from the letter of the first few pages of the wondrous book. So various, and so constantly renewed, are the attempts to establish this conclusion, that we do not feel bound to submit them, one by one, to close or detailed criticism; but we thank Mr. Lucas for his volume, convinced that 'Truth like a torch, the more it's shook it shines.'

The Home Life; in the Light of its Divine Idea. By JAMES BALDWIN BROWN, B.A. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

Mr. Brown's volume consists of a series of pulpit discourses on the various relations, duties, and influences of home. Its topics are diversified:—man and wife; children and parents; masters and servants; education; recreation; settling in life; family ministry to those external to itself; the autumn of family life; and the gathered family in heaven. The unity of the whole lies in the central family idea. The Divine idea, in the light of which Mr. Brown expounds family relationships, is, that divine relationships are the prototype of human relationships; the things of God, a pattern for the things of man. Human affections, therefore, are to be conformed to divine affections; for in likeness to God,—likeness of relationship, likeness of love, likeness of truth and goodness and service, the perfection of home is to be found. The idea is both just and beautiful, and it is worked out with great force and felicity.

We would first thank Mr. Brown for the selection of such a topic. We do not wish to see the pulpit less theological, but we would more closely connect its theology with practical universal human life. Theology is but the means. Practical holiness in common human duties is the end of all religious instruction. The pulpit has, perhaps, too technically and conventionally restricted itself to metaphysical theology, and men have, therefore, looked upon it and upon religion as things apart from ordinary life. Ordinary moral duties,—buying and selling, serving and working, amiability and usefulness, are its prime concerns. It is useless to preach doctrine unless it tend to practical and universal holiness.

For the discussion of topics like these, the broad human sympathies of Mr. Brown peculiarly fit him. He has large and unsectarian conceptions of life, keen catholic sympathies with good in every form, and unconventional and spiritual recognitions of the moral basis of all things human. He has, moreover, very tender affections, which enable him to divine much in human hearts and in human lives that no books could teach him. His book, therefore, abounds in many precious passages, wise discernments, loving sympathies, and felicitous counsels, which will appeal very powerfully and touchingly to both parents and children. Mr. Brown has the faculty of looking broadly at human life. A large acquaintance with its history in the past, and with its varieties in the present, enables him to lay hold of universal principles, and wisely to apply the great laws of all moral being to each individual case. Like most able men, Mr. Brown has a strongly-marked individuality, which puts its stamp not only upon his method of presenting truth, but upon his form of holding it. Sometimes he opposes an angle of his convictions to the broad surface of those of his brethren, and it is not always seen either by himself or by others that they are substantially the same. We have no wish, however, to see all truth formulated uniformly. The freshness, force, charm, and helpfulness of books like Mr. Brown's consists largely in this individuality. Mr. Brown thinks as fearlessly as he thinks strongly; but always within the pale of great fundamental convictions, in which he is thoroughly and entirely at one with the evangelical church of Christ. Great earnestness, often passing into intense fervour, and kindling a very fine eloquence, characterizes all Mr. Brown's writings. The defect of this is, that they are sometimes too strained and intense, and afford no opportunity for rest. Mellowing years, however, are correcting this defect, and this book has more resting-places than any of its predecessors. It is a book of very great ability and very great beauty, and will be a very valuable manual for Christian homes.

The Mystery of Pain. A Book for the Sorrowful. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

The world is full of sufferers; man is born to trouble; and these facts form so deep a mystery, that any book would be attractive which professed to throw light upon the great problem. But no speculation could more test or measure its author. Pain can be understood even in its moral uses only by sympathy, and by sympathy touching the springs of deep thought, of devout feeling, of an imagination and a heart habitually hallowed by communion with God, and by implicit trust in him. The exquisite charm of this little volume is owing to these manifest qualifications;—a tender feeling for human pain on the one hand, and a thoughtful and trustful recognition of the Divine Father of men on the

other. With much reverence, with unassuming simplicity, and, therefore, with great wisdom and tenderness, the writer proposes his considerations upon the mystery of pain, if haply they may soothe and reconcile those who endure. His theory is, that all pain not only has its moral purpose, so that those who endure it are purified and elevated by it, but is itself a necessary condition of the highest joy; that a painless life would be an inferior, insipid, and ignoble life. All pain becomes joy by being regarded as self-sacrifice for the sake of others. We endure not for our own sakes only, but for the sake of others, for the sake of God. All joy is great in proportion to self-sacrifice. And if we feel any self-sacrifice to be a pain, it is so far proof that the self-sacrifice is defective; perfect love swallows up all sense of pain. Things are either good or vile; and things that are evil cease to be so only by being converted into a good; they cannot be negative, inoperative things;—just as with waste materials, which ‘are the source of inevitable disease,’ if they are not utilized and made a blessing. A perfect state is not that in which no sacrifices have to be made—God made a sacrifice when He gave His Son, but in which the absorbing love swallows up the pain of sacrifice.

This, which is the main thought and thesis of the essay, is illustrated in many ways, and by many analogies. The author speaks of the pains which we consciously endure for others, in which the truth of the reasoning is more apparent; but he applies it also to the pains which have no apparent relation to others, which are subordinated to the good of no other being; nay, which are the apparent cause of evil, racking pains of body, for instance, or the paralysis of sickness, even remorseful memories. He thinks that the relation of these to God, and to our character as God’s children, may make them the very highest of sacrificial endurances, and enable us, as Paul did, to ‘glory in tribulation.’ Faith in God’s goodness, and wisdom, and great purposes, will enable us joyfully to bear even these, assured that we are enduring for His sake and for noble purposes. This, of course, does not involve the ascetic coveting of pain for its own sake; this would be diametrically opposed to that utter absence of selfishness, and almost of self-consciousness, which is the essential condition of the sacrifice of pain. Pain in itself is evil, and he who seeks pain for selfish reasons, realizes the evil, and utterly fails of the good. The writer has very little to say about the sentimentalism of pain, he is too earnest, and thoughtful, and sincere, for mere sentiment. He speaks only instructive thoughts and practicable lessons. His profound sense of the reality and greatness of suffering is everywhere manifest, and is ever urging him to set forth the sacramental character that is possible to it. There is not a sentence in the book that is not thoroughly real. In a right interpretation of pain itself lies the source of its moral power, only by a right understanding of sorrow can we be made great by it. Like most men whom an idea possesses, however, the author does not make sufficient allowance for its exceptions and qualifications. This little book must find its way into thousands of homes, and then into the room of its suffering member. Its intellectual beauty, its manly truthfulness, its spiritual wisdom, and its devout and tender sympathy will make it precious to every heart.

Reason and Faith, with other Essays. By HENRY ROGERS.
London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1866.

The larger portion of this volume is occupied by Mr. Rogers’ now classical essay, entitled ‘Reason and Faith, their Claims and Conflicts.’ We observe certain modifications in the arrangement of the matter,

some omissions of topics of temporary interest, and several valuable additions which give strength, vigour, and permanence to a work which has already done such good service in the cause of our Holy Faith. The second treatise is a critique on M. Renan's 'Vie de Jésus,' and we think, without exception, it is the most crushing treatment of that effeminate romance that we have yet read. It may be very well for M. Renan to smile and say, 'O Sancta Simplicitas'; but when a man is proved to be grossly dishonest, entirely destitute of historic faculty, and infinitely presumptuous and silly, and this with a cogency of argument, which nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand readers will admit, the boasted serenity of M. Renan becomes a new confirmation of his incapacity to deal with the 'Origines du Christianisme.' The remaining essays have recently appeared in 'Good Words,' and though characterised by the cutting irony and delicate humour with which the author has so frequently assailed the enemies of God and His revelation—though dexterously adopting the *reductio ad absurdum* with the extremes of modern sociology, and though in the two latter of the essays assuming the functions of the Hebrew Prophet, and gravely and bravely rebuking the pride of this generation—yet we miss some of the vivacity, high temper, and extreme polish for which some of his earlier writings were conspicuous. There is at the same time a force and flavour about them which are *sui generis*, and will do something more to fasten upon their distinguished author the functions and the fame of the Pascal of this generation.

St. John Chrysostom on the Priesthood. In Six Books. Translated from the original Greek by B. HARRIS COWPER. London: Williams and Norgate.

Mr. Cowper has laid us under great obligation by his learned researches into the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum and elsewhere, as well as by his able conduct of 'The Journal of Biblical Literature.' He has now given us a translation from the Greek of Chrysostom's famous dissertations on the Priesthood, that marvellous utterance of the greatest orator of the early Church, which as it has been well said, 'would lose nothing by comparison with any similar productions, ancient or modern,' which deal with the fearful responsibilities, perplexing dangers, and overwhelming duties of the Christian pastor. Augustine does not penetrate more deeply into the roots of Christian consciousness; Shakspeare scarcely shows a more accurate acquaintance with the balance of conflicting motives; Baxter does not spur the lagging conscience with more directness and ardour, than does Chrysostom in these well-known dialogues. In spite of all the differences of judgment between ourselves and him of the 'Golden Mouth,' which we are not slow to recognise, notwithstanding his dangerous admissions on matters of ethics, sacerdotal authority, and sacramental grace, yet he soars so far above many of his contemporaries in the lofty tone of his spiritual life, the breadth and brilliance of his exposition of Scripture, in his freedom from servility, and in heroic endurance, that we greatly rejoice in the opportunity now afforded to every man who is aspiring to the Christian pastorate to ponder with reverence, and prayers, and tears, these wonderful contributions to Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. Mr. Cowper has executed his task well. The translation is simple and lucid, and it fairly represents the thought, even if it does not aim at the diction, of the illustrious Father. We wish that Mr. Cowper had expanded his intro-

duction, excellent and moderate as it is, into a monograph on the life, the genius, and theology of Chrysostom, and had annotated his excellent translation with illustrative notes, and with some sketch of the controversies to which the original work has contributed; but we heartily thank him for the service ~~which he has rendered to~~ the Christian student.

Discourses. By A. J. SCOTT, A.M. Vol. I. Macmillan and Co.

This volume appears, sadly enough, as a legacy. Mr. Scott died early in the present year at Veytaux, in Switzerland, and some scattered discourses, of which one volume only is at present published, is all that remains to us in a permanent form of the public teaching of one of the most remarkable men of our times. We imagine that there are few who have heard Mr. Scott lecture on any of the wide range of subjects of which he was such a consummate master, who do not hold him to be, on the whole, the most powerful and impressive man who has crossed their path. It was not only that his power of extempore discourse, on subjects demanding the severest mental effort, was, in the estimation of no mean judges, matchless; but there was a singular weight in the words which fell from his lips, due partly to his splendid intellectual faculty, but chiefly to the spiritual reality and intensity of the man, which cast a spell on his hearers altogether peculiar, and commanded a homage which, though alas! it is rarely exacted by teachers, it is a pure delight to pay.

Mr. Scott's public career commenced in Scotland, where he was at least one of the leading spirits in that great stirring of the higher life of the Church of Scotland, which was coincident with the preaching of Irving, the Row controversy, and the asserted re-appearing of miraculous gifts in the church. In the year 1828 he accompanied Irving to London, and wrought with him for a time as his assistant. Irving wrote and spoke of him in those days as 'the greatest hope of the church.' Irving was no mean judge of men, and some of the very foremost men in England have since, by their estimation of Mr. Scott, amply sustained his words. Mr. Scott did not long remain with Irving, and was in no way mixed up with that which ultimately got baptized with Irving's name. But during his brief ministry in London, he devoted himself with singular earnestness to his work as an evangelist in the poorest and most wretched districts of St. James', and laid the foundation of that intimate knowledge of the thoughts, the habits, and the needs of the industrial classes, which gave him such command over the most important social questions of the day.

Refused ordination in the Scotch church, because he felt it impossible to reconcile with its Confessions the idea of the universality of the atonement, which was dear to his heart as the sense of the Divine love, he became, on a truly independent basis, the teacher of a little Christian community at Woolwich, where he lived in comparative retirement for many years. Thither some of the most eminent men of the time were wont to resort, to refresh themselves by intercourse with a man who lived in such a large, free, and unworldly sphere, and thence, from time to time, he came forth as he felt moved, to deliver lectures and discourses, which have become landmarks in the intellectual and social development of the time.

None who heard them will ever forget a series of five discourses on 'The Social Systems of the Day compared with Christianity,' which were delivered in London in the year 1841. They were published at the time in the *Pulpit*. They are happily reprinted in this volume. If any of our readers wishes to measure Mr. Scott's power as a teacher,

and to understand the range and depth of his thought, we earnestly advise them to study these five lectures. They anticipate, and furnish the clue to, the chief controversies which have perplexed our times, and they forecast the line of progress with a largeness and farness of vision, which a future generation will appreciate better than our own.

But the great element of his power as a teacher was probably the centralness of his point of view. He knew all subjects from within, and their inner relations and harmonies. His knowledge was immense, and on subjects most various; and all his knowledge had that organic wholeness, which reveals the rarest, as it is the highest, power. And when we add the intense convictions of a most loyal and loving disciple of Christ, whose life was in its great lines a simple and noble obedience to the truth, we have the image of a man before us singularly large, lofty and complete. Well may the writer of the preface to this volume declare, that while 'there are men whose intellectual sympathies are wide and elastic as his were, and men whose convictions are as intense, those who knew him best must feel that they can hardly hope, in this world, to see the perfect union of both these things, since he has passed away from it.'

In most of the great departments of modern thought Mr. Scott's words were listened to as the words of a master, by those whose special knowledge gave them the right and the power to judge. But it was not so much the variety and completeness of his knowledge of a wide range of subjects, as its internal harmony, which lent the chief charm to his discourse. He had learnt from the great Master the meaning of unity; he searched for it everywhere, and found it in a measure to which few men in a generation attain. He was able to unfold the bearings of the great spheres of thought upon each other, and their relation to the highest knowledge, that knowledge which is Life eternal, in a manner which laid all who delighted to listen to his teaching under obligations, the expression of which might well seem extravagant to those to whom the thirst for 'the truth' is unknown. He who leads us to the discernment of undiscovered unities; and unveils to us some vision of the central unity in which the many are eternally one, is the teacher whom the soul delights to honour. The system of human thought, to those whom he drew towards his standing point, began to unfold itself in an order, such as a solar system might reveal to him who gazed on it from the central sun. This we believe to have been Mr. Scott's highest endowment. His marvellous power of thought, his imagination, his humour, his aptness of illustration, laying bare a truth by a word, and his intensely reverent spirit, gave him the right and the power to claim the most earnest attention of his hearers. But the measure in which he discerned the oneness of truth, and its relation to Him who is the truth, remains the great characteristic of this master who has passed away from us, and who has left this volume, and another which is anxiously expected, and which will contain some of his most important and recent lectures, and it may be yet a third containing some specimen of his method of secular instruction, as his legacy to the world.

Our Lord Jesus Christ the Subject of Growth in Wisdom. Four Sermons (being the Hulsean Lectures for 1865), preached before the University of Cambridge: to which are added three Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in February, 1864. By the Rev. J. MOORHOUSE, M.A.,

St. John's College. London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co.

Mr. Moorhouse has boldly selected for the theme of his Hulsean Lecture a topic which brings some of the claims of Christ and of Christianity to a crucial test;—Does the proper humanity of Christ necessarily involve His limitation in knowledge, or does His inherent Divinity endow Him with omniscience? Upon the answer depends not only our estimate of what Christ was, but of many things that He said. M. de Pressensé, in his recent *Life of Jesus*, has affirmed that if we accept the human nature of Christ as real, we must accept it with all its proper human limitation. That to suppose Him, in virtue of his incarnation, exempt from any of the ordinary conditions of humanity, is virtually to say that he was not human at all, and so far to fall into the old heresy of the Docetæ. Mr. Moorhouse takes the same view, and there appears to us no escape from it. That our Lord's human knowledge was limited is not only involved in the declaration concerning his youth,—that he 'grew in knowledge and in wisdom, and in favour both with God and 'man,' but is expressly intimated by himself when, during his public ministry, he declares that he, the Son of man, did not know the day and the hour of his second coming. Mr. Moorhouse addresses himself to the adjustment of this admitted fact, with the divine character and claims of Christ, and to the various questions that it suggests. His method of treatment is scholarly, but somewhat metaphysical and vague. He points to conclusions rather than conducts to them; and although we are never uncertain about his aims, we are not always clear about the precise value of his arguments. Mr. Moorhouse conducts his argument in the light of modern scepticism. His first lecture is devoted to rationalistic philosophy, and to its unsuccessful attempts to solve the great problems of human existence and of human relations to God. His subsequent lectures are devoted to the questions which he himself thus puts: 'Is 'the hypothesis of a limitation in our Saviour's human knowledge consistent with the doctrine of His Divinity?' If this question should be answered in the affirmative, is such an hypothesis further consistent with the doctrine of his human sinlessness? And again: 'Should both these 'positions be affirmed, can we point out the spiritual direction in which 'such limitation is to be expected?' Mr. Moorhouse answers these questions in the affirmative; but we will not attempt even to indicate his argument, lest the few words to which we are restricted should produce misconception on a matter so delicate. The chapter on the sinlessness of Jesus is, after all that has recently been written on the subject, very new and beautiful, and the reply to M. Renan conclusive. The limits of the argument are well put, especially in reply to Dr. Colenso. Altogether, although there is, as we have said, a certain vagueness, and occasionally an apparent wavering in Mr. Moorhouse's reasoning, his book is a strong and reverent discussion of a very important and interesting problem; an orthodox putting of another of the great lines of theological thought, which are theological teaching, spiritual nutriment, or Christian evidence, according as they are regarded.

Memorabilia Ecclesiæ; a selection of passages of interest in connection with the History of the Christian Church. By HENRY GRANT. Vol. I. London: Hatchard and Co.

A valuable compendium of ecclesiastical history, not characterised by any great breadth of conception; not confused by clashing judgments;

omitting, for the present, all discussion of the various secessions and differences of opinion which agitated the early church; and offering to the young student of historical Christianity the advantage of authorised translations from the apostolic fathers, the apologists and historians of the church. It bears the same relation to Neander's general 'Church History,' that a portion of 'Chambers' Cyclopædia of English Literature' might bear to Hallam's or Sismondi's greater works. The volume will be useful to young beginners.

A Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, designed for Teachers, Preachers, and Educated English Readers generally. By EUSTACE R. CONDER, M.A. London: Elliott Stock.

It would be difficult to speak too highly of this thoughtful, useful, comprehensive, and admirably-written commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel. Mr. Conder has crowded into a brief introduction carefully considered opinions on the matter suggested by this Gospel. Every page reveals the energy, research, and self-repression of the author. The results of very extensive reading of all the best authorities, are given in homely and singularly lucid English; here and there burning into eloquence. The notes are not overburdened with opinions. The studious reader is directed to healthy and sound information. Considerable attention has been given to the Natural History of Palestine, to the Rabbinical customs and Jewish literature, and, above all, to Scriptural illustration. Additional notes and 'Hints for Teaching' are appended to each chapter. Sceptical objections are undermined without being stated, and the whole work is charged with a humble, holy spirit, without a tinge of mannerism. It will, to the classes for whom it is designed, be more useful than Lange's Biblical Commentary, and in its concise, cautious, and comprehensible exegesis more valuable than Stier's 'Words of the Lord Jesus.' We earnestly commend it as worthy of a wide circulation.

The Secret of Life: Being Eight Sermons preached at Nottingham. By SAMUEL COX. London: Arthur Miall.

The only qualification of our strong commendation of Mr. Cox's little volume, that we feel disposed to make, is its title, which has neither descriptive nor other appropriateness. Any other title would do just as well. The sermons themselves are admirable specimens of the robust, practical, earnest, common sense, dealing vigorously and thoroughly with the high thoughts and problems that theology and human life present,—which is characteristic of the Nonconforming Pulpit. They make no pretence, they shirk no difficulty, and they say, perhaps, all that can be said in solution of difficulties that most thoughtful men feel, and from which many religious teachers shrink.

Hamilton versus Mill; or, a Thorough Discussion of each Chapter in Mr. J. S. Mill's Examination of Hamilton's Logic and Philosophy.

A clear, caustic, powerful, anonymous pamphlet has fallen into our hands bearing the above title. It is a first instalment, and examines only chapters 17, 18, and 19 of Mr. J. S. Mill's work. The writer affects to regard the subject of criticism as a philosophical joke perpetrated by Mill, presuming

on the ignorance of his readers. On reading Mill's 'Examination,' an indelible impression was left on our minds that we never perused a philosophical production more replete with misrepresentations and inconsistencies. It produced in us the conviction that there must be a suicidal defect at the root of the system it expounded. But we candidly confess that we never suspected it of being a metaphysical hoax. If it be such, the whole of Mill's literary existence, metaphysically viewed, is nothing but a joke, for we find cropping out in his *Logic* and *Political Economy*, the principles which are systematically developed in the work under consideration. We soon discovered, however, that the writer used the term as an euphemistic substitute for epithets, which are ugly and decidedly unphilosophical. The pamphlet before us discusses the subjects of which formal logic is usually represented as treating, viz., notions (for which Mill substitutes *names*), judgment, and reasoning. The author's plan is to fasten upon the leading proposition in each chapter, to criticise it first as a whole, and then by a searching investigation, to follow it out to its minor issues.

In the 17th chapter the main question is, do we think with words (or, as Mill always says, with names), or with words plus concepts? with word-symbols or with thought-symbols also? Mill says with the former, Hamilton, with the latter. The critic here shows conclusively that abstract qualities can have a logical, though not a physical existence apart from the concrete objects; that concepts are both generic and individual, with this difference, that concrete-concepts are also image-concepts, whereas genus-concepts are not; that we can *think about* genus-concepts, but cannot *think* (i. e. imagine) *them*; while we can not only think about concrete-concepts, but also *think them*; and finally, that concept is synonymous with 'signification,' 'notion;' and, consequently, that Mill's proposed substitution of the latter for the former is erroneous as well as awkward. He, moreover, convicts Mill of confounding 'concept' with 'image,' and of affecting to regard 'thinking a thing' identical with 'thinking about a thing.'

The chief question discussed in chapter 18 is, whether the attribute of a thing is a part of the thing. Hamilton says that of two concepts compared in an affirmative judgment, 'the one concept is actually a part of the other;' in other words, that 'every quality is a part of the thing in which it resides;' for which Mill would substitute, 'one concept co-exists with, or is superadded to, another.' Here again, the writer, with equal logical force and aptness of illustration, exposes the absurdity of Mill's amendment, and that instead of proving that individual objects cannot be logical parts, he only proves that if concrete objects cannot be logical parts, they cannot be predicates, which all admit. He further shows that Mill constantly mistakes predication for identity, and that in this sense of the term, neither individual nor generic concepts can be predicated of one another, whereas in the genuine logical meaning of the term, concrete objects and concrete concepts are as predicable as the abstract.

The proposition controverted in the 19th chapter is Hamilton's definition of reasoning, as the comparison of two notions by means of a third; which Mill manipulates into the shape 'that reasoning is a mode of ascertaining that one is a part of another.' Mill's objections to this statement are, that we cannot fail intuitively to perceive that one concept is a part of another if it really be so, and that if we fail to see this intuitively, no third concept can help us over the difficulty.

Mill's critic, with great force and acuteness, proves that two notions of which we are conscious may stand in juxtaposition to each other, without

our being able to ascertain the relation between them, unless we had some third notion whereby to compare them. He points out the weakness and vagueness of the remodelled form of the dictum as proposed, the incorrectness of his assertion that all reasoning is in comprehension and not in extension, and the absurdity of the statement that in every syllogism considered as an argument to prove the conclusion there is a *petitio principii*, whereas every one knows that the syllogism is only the universal form of reasoning, and not an argument at all. We have only indicated the leading features of this excellent brochure, which we regard as the most damaging criticism of Mill that has yet appeared. If the author follows up successfully the severe castigation he has begun, Mill and his disciples will have reason to doubt the wisdom of having originated the controversy. The pamphlet manifests a great deal of vivid buoyancy, stirring freshness, and logical compactness, and is evidently the production of one who is master of all the weapons Mill knows so well how to wield.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Les Travailleurs de la Mer. Par VICTOR HUGO, 3 vols. 1866.
A la Librairie Internationale.

M. Victor Hugo has in this new publication recovered himself from his fall of last winter. He has this time amends for the dreary inspirations of the *Chansons des rues et des bois* by this romance, in which, while we certainly discover his faults, we find at the same time his best characteristics. As a novel indeed the book is badly constructed,—it drags through interminable details, and mixes up technical science with dramatic incidents in a very wearisome manner. One must be well versed in mechanics and in all nautical matters to understand some of the chapters. The author's psychology is without depth; he rather portrays capricious and violent feelings than analyses delicate ones; he sees mainly in the human soul those impetuous forces which we call instincts and passions, while the moral struggle, properly so called, finds little place in his investigations. He is still delineating nature when he describes humanity—taking it as he does by preference on its instinctive side. Thus his young girls are charming linnets singing in the sunshine, rather than women with profound and complex sentiments. His hero is a kind of gentle Cyclops, pursuing a fugitive Galatea; he manifests the absolute devotedness of the faithful dog, but of any conflict between passion and duty there is not a single trace. As to religion, that comes before us only to be sacrificed in the persons of certain clergymen who are made odious or ridiculous at pleasure,—a very easy style of polemics! But where the author recovers all his brilliant superiority is in the painting of nature. He gives us half a volume on the sea, which is incomparably powerful. The sea is, in fact, the heroine of his work; he represents it now sparkling under golden mists, now covered with fogs, which, like a damp winding-sheet, envelop the vessel near the rocks on which it is about to perish, or again raging under the terrible breath of the tempest. His descriptions move our imagination to an admiration mingled with terror such as he alone is able to excite. But the great poet unfortunately resembles that nature which he depicts for us, as by turns smiling and terrible, like her he yields to every influence of the breeze that blows upon him. He does not rule his genius, but abandons it to the capricious sway of inspirations the most various. Therefore is it that this book bears even less than his other works the marks of that refined beauty which is the seal of perfection. With a single effort the

author mounts to summits the most elevated, only to fall again the moment afterwards into the trivial and grotesque; and this is because the Muse of Pantheism is a very dangerous inspiration, for after having deified nature it is difficult to control her; and yet is not this the very distinction of high art, that it educes from the confusion of things that harmony and true beauty which are pre-eminently moral!

Les Apôtres. Par ERNEST RENAN. Paris, 1866. Michel Lévy.

If M. Victor Hugo has somewhat raised himself by his new book, the same cannot be said of M. Renan. His best friends are obliged to confess that this time at least his hand has lost its cunning. The circulation of the *Histoire des Apôtres* has therefore been infinitely less general than that of the *Vie de Jésus*, and this is because the author has not varied his methods of accusation, which now no longer possess the piquant attraction of novelty. The scandal of attacking the apostles is of course much less than that of defaming the Founder of our religion Himself; and we must remember that in cases such as these, scandal is a condition of success. We recognise in *Les Apôtres* the art of disguising affronts in unctuous words, of offering insults under the form of homage, and lavishing perfidious insinuations; but the book is a frightful caricature, though in a sentimental style. We are reminded of the way in which, in his *Vie de Jésus*, the author commended the employment of fraud in the founding of a new religion in the name of the excellent axiom: *Humanitas vult decipi*. According to Him Jesus lent himself without blame to the ideas that were current in His time, and wrought pretended miracles in order to gain through them a hearing for His sublime instructions; and M. Renan calls these useful frauds *oriental sincerity*. He has now perfected his system—not only is falsehood good in the East, it is useful also in the West. Not content, therefore, with describing the apostles as dishonest sorcerers worthy to rival Simon the Magician, he openly commends hypocrisy in a passage so full of significance that we cannot refrain from quoting it:—‘There are circumstances,’ says the considerate author, ‘in which it is difficult to apply these principles. The spirit bloweth where it listeth—the spirit, that is liberty; but some persons are, in a sense, tied down to absolute faith—such, I mean, as hold sacred orders or are invested with a pastoral charge. Even then a noble soul will know how to find an outlet. A worthy priest in a country parish has come, we will suppose, through his solitary studies and the pureness of his life to perceive the impossibilities of literal dogmatism. Must he then grieve those whom he has until now consoled, or explain to simple minds changes which they will ill comprehend? God forbid! There are not two men in the world who have exactly similar duties. The good Bishop Colenso has performed an act of honesty such as the church had never seen from its commencement, in publishing his doubts as they arose in his mind. But the humble Catholic priest, amid a narrow-minded and timid community, ought to be silent. Oh! how many sheltering tombs around village churches cover poetic reservations, angelic silences! Those whose duty it has been to speak,—will they ever attain merit equal to that of these secrets known to God alone?’ What a state of conscience is indicated by counsels such as these! and where should we be if they were followed? Every intellectual relation among men would be falsified and perverted. M. Renan is the Loyola of free thought.

Nothing could be more contemptible than the interpretation which he gives us of the foundation of the Christian church. He pretends to explain everything by the generous enthusiasm of the early Christians; but he

soon falls back into the absurd explanations provided by that insipid rationalism which we had thought to be dead and buried fifty years ago. The belief in the resurrection is traced to the commonest incidents. The encounter of a man in festal robes by a few women,—a fish cooked on some coals near the lake of Tiberias,—the waking dreams of five hundred persons in Galilee, the carrying away of her master's corpse by the demoniac Mary Magdalene,—these things are enough to call up the disciples from their despairing dejection and to send them forth to the conquest of the world, spreading on the four winds of heaven the glorious words, "The Master has risen!" A strong current of air on the day after Pentecost explains the descent of the Holy Spirit. An attack of fever followed by ophthalmia; this is the whole conversion of St. Paul. That which occasioned the success of the primitive church was, that it was a communist society, a commercial association in which it suited unmarried persons to invest their little fortunes. Add to this beautiful institution pretended miracles and the alluring charms of the Syrian women, who were zealous missionaries of the good tidings, and you will understand the remarkable successes of the Galilean sect. It did indeed meet with persecutions, but they were so slight as scarcely to deserve notice! The Cæsars were not such odious tyrants as they are represented; for, with the exception of one or two monsters, they gave more liberty to the world than any previous régimes. They were to blame, no doubt, for not suffering the Christian communities to exist in peace; but then these communities did in fact cause considerable inconvenience. A well-ordered state could not easily allow that under pretence of excommunication members of the sect should be got rid of by secret murder as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira. Beyond this the Roman world was not so bad as was imagined; it freed its slaves and established charity upon broad foundations. Christianity did not bring to it much that was new; and if it won a rapid triumph, this was owing to the miserable ignorance that had spread through all classes of society.

Such then is the historical system of M. Renan. He has always at his command a finished and elegant style; but even as an artist he fails in the present work, for the colours of the picture are untrue and inharmonious, and we desire no better proof of this assertion than the wild notion of comparing the church of Jerusalem to a commercial society. The language of the book, with its soft and weak beauties, soon fatigues us. It has neither warmth, force, nor true brilliancy. The beauty is of a sickly kind, like that of a poisonous plant. As to the explanations they are merely ironical, and offend no less against philosophic reason than against Christian feeling. It is a sort of drawing-room theology, fit only for silly women. The appearance of the book is a just punishment for the enemies of the supernatural; it is as it were a *reductio ad absurdum* of the boastful system which believes it possible to dispense with the intervention of God in accounting for our religious history. They would not have miracles, and they are thrown back upon miserable legends, which trace the grandest events to the meanest causes, substitute jugglers for the holy apostles, and turn the sublimest drama into a wretched comedy of intrigues. A system no more honourable to humanity than to God!

Méditation sur l'état actuel de la Religion Chrétienne. Par M. GUIZOT. Paris, 1866. Michel Lévy.

This volume, which has just appeared, excites the most lively interest, alike from the illustrious name of its author and the nature of the subject

of which he treats. He gives a rapid survey of the intellectual forces now facing one another, ranged as we may say in battle array in the great crisis of minds through which we are passing. The author does not deceive himself regarding the seriousness of this crisis. He plainly recognises that Christians have arrived at one of those most important moments when they must meet the coalition of their adversaries by redoubled energy and zeal. M. Guizot, as it were, causes to pass in review before us the different companies of the anti-Christian army—spiritualism, which issues in deism; rationalism, which mutilates human nature and admits nothing but what cold reason can comprehend; positivism, which denies the religious problem altogether; pantheism, which wraps religion in the infinite delusion of nature; scepticism, which takes advantage of all the contradictions that it encounters to assert one day that truth is a dream, and the next that virtue is nothing more than a name. The author does not pretend to give us a complete and systematic refutation of all these systems, but contents himself with characterizing them by a few strong and rapid strokes. His argument is marked by great breadth and elevation without the least acrimony. Severe upon ideas, he is kind and impartial to men. To awaken our courage he sets in opposition to the anti-religious movement that distresses so many of our contemporaries, the Christian revival as well in Catholicism as in Protestantism; he shows us the interest in questions of a high order, everywhere awakening,—faith being asserted amid much weakness and obscurity, and the worshippers of Christ grasping each others' hands across the barriers by which they are separated. All that is said in characterization of our respective churches is of the greatest interest, and especially the portraits of the eminent men who stand at their head. Here M. Guizot preeminently excels, he paints *à la Vandyke*. His touches have great breadth, and give us lifelike figures. We regret that he has felt it right to insist upon the excellence of the union between church and state, and upon the merits of the illicit acts by which Napoleon I. bound religion to his throne! How was it that the noble writer did not see that the church has need of all its freedom of movement if it is to conquer in that awful conflict of minds which he has so well described, and that at all hazards it must rid itself of that unbelief which would destroy its own vitals? But the ecclesiastical crisis will be more powerful than the most honourable regrets for the past, and, cost what it may, the fatal tie will be broken. However this be, it is a grand sight to see a man like M. Guizot consecrating his green old age to the noblest of causes. He still wields the cestus as in the best days of his literary career, adding only increased serenity to his former strength of thought and vigour of expression.

Les Psaumes, traduits de l'Hébreu, d'après de nouvelles recherches sur le texte original. Par CH. BRUSTON. Paris: Chez Ch. Meyrueis. 1865.

A very decided movement has been made, for some years past, in those Protestant countries where the French tongue is spoken, towards the revision of our versions of the Holy Scripture. These versions cannot be traced like Luther's or like the English translation, to the creative period of the Reformation, and they must be allowed to be both insipid and inaccurate. There exists, consequently, a wide-spread desire for new versions, and attempts have already been made in this direction by MM. Perret, Gentil, and Arnaud. The specimen now before us indicates very extensive philological knowledge, its speciality being the endeavour, in

several cases, to make some correction in the Masoretic system of points, so as to discover a reasonable meaning where exegesis has failed as yet to do so. It is of course this attempt that has given rise to the principal objection brought against the work, which is distinguished, as a whole, by scrupulous exactness and a felicitous adoption of such archaisms as will preserve the primitive character of the Hebrew text.

Les premières transformations historiques du Christianisme. Par M. COQUEREL, fils. Paris : Germain Baillière. 1866.

This book, written in an easy and lively style, is designed to maintain the favourite thesis of the party, to which the author belongs—which consists in affirming that there are as many different kinds of Christianity as there are Christians,—that there is no fixed element in religion, and that every one has the right to elicit from the Gospel a worship suited to his character and his taste. M. Coquerel endeavours to justify this opinion (the logical issue of which would be scepticism) by retracing what he calls the first historical transformations of Christianity. He does not wish to speak only of the evolutions of Christian thought after the apostolic age, but traces his transformations even up to the apostles themselves. Nor does he find merely a development of doctrine going on in one and the same line from St. James to St. Paul, and from St. Paul to St. John; but he regards their views as altogether different one from another. In a word, we have the old theme of the Tübingen school brought up again, ingeniously treated, it is true, but without the learning which gained it so much credit in Germany some twenty years ago. To render this at all plausible, the entire literature of the New Testament must be totally remodelled, as it was indeed by Baur and his disciples. M. Coquerel not having applied himself to this work, has laid no basis for his system. Nothing could be poorer than the summary which he gives us of the teaching of Jesus Christ, in which he has forgotten only one thing, but that is its principal bearing,—i. e. that which concerns the person of the Divine Master Himself. He has ignored His divinity, as well as His redeeming work, and leaves nothing beyond some general notions such as those of repentance, pardon, and spiritual worship, which would have evaporated long ago, had they not been preserved in grand supernatural facts. Our author professes to admit the miraculous element in the Gospel, but his whole work tends to establish its inutility. The work touches on many important questions, but does not treat one of them seriously; it yields, therefore, no advantage either to theological science or personal piety, and has not earnestness enough to provoke a vigorous controversy.

Unité de l'Enseignement Apostolique. Par P. BONIFAS.

This book presents a striking contrast to that of the younger M. A. Coquerel. It is designed, indeed, to maintain the very opposite thesis. The author endeavours to prove that, if there was a development of Christian doctrine during the apostolic age, it was a development that followed always the same line, and deduced the various different types of doctrine from one divine unity. M. Bonifas does not content himself with a mere assertion, but gives a very detailed analysis of the doctrine of James, and that of Peter, of Paul, and of John. His book, written in a style at once exact and forcible, has one fault only, which is, that he seeks to make the theology of the apostles conformable to a given type of orthodoxy. Whereas all our formulas give way when we would make

them include the fulness of apostolic teaching. The book is, however, worthy of all esteem, and does honour to our young evangelical French theology.

Essai sur le Caractère de Jésus Christ. Par ROGER HOLLARD.

At the very moment of the appearance of the great work of M. E. de Pressensé, on the life of Jesus (the first edition of which, though very considerable, was exhausted within a month), M. Roger Hollard issued his little volume treating of the same subject. He had already appeared before the public, in articles inserted in *La Revue Chrétienne*, and we may say that he has made a very happy and promising *début*. In the book now before us, while fully accepting the humanity of Christ, the author places himself in the position of a contemporary of the Divine Master, who, without any preconceived ideas, would have followed Him in the days of His flesh. It is thus, by this course of reverential observation, that he rises from the human to the Divine, and his conclusion is that of Thomas, 'My Lord and my God!' The book evinces a conformity with the views of Gess and Beyerslag, but bears also a strong impress of the author's individuality. A spirit of piety breathes through its pages. It has excited much attention and well merits translation.

Valeur religieuse du Surnaturel. Par C. BOIS.

Discours d'installation. Par M. JEAN MONOD, à la chaire de dogmatique à la faculté de Montauban.

Affirmation et indépendance. Discours d'ouverture du cours de dogmatique à la faculté de Genève. Par AUGUSTE BOUVIER.

These three discourses supply a new proof of the progress made in France by the evangelical liberal school. All the three are penetrated by a living faith in the great Christian doctrines, while at the same time they leave an opening for the free researches of science. The first is a remarkable specimen of apologetic reasoning. It traces French rationalism through all its present manifestations, and, abandoning the speculative treatment of the question of the supernatural, shows by the closest reasoning, that it is not true that it matters little, with respect to piety, whether we admit or reject the supernatural; that in reality this question which some writers seek to banish into the domain of metaphysics is one that concerns Christian practice. For it is not a matter of indifference to the pious man, to know whether he is in the presence of an inert God who leaves the machinery of the universe to follow its mechanical laws, without concerning Himself at all about it, or of a God who is free, and who hears and answers his prayers; nor is it a matter of no moment whether his own freedom is real or only apparent. The discourse of M. Bois is one of the most remarkable publications that have issued from the French theological movement. We may say the same of the installation discourse of M. Jean Monod, which might have had for its motto a well-known saying of Neander's, '*Pectus est quod fecit theologum.*' The author does not admit that theology, which is the science of God, is simply a lucubration of the mind, but asserts that it must have a living piety as its first inspiration. This, however, does not prevent it from having a truly scientific character, and seeking with holy boldness under the control of Scripture to assimilate more and more completely for the culture of mind and heart, the elements supplied

by revelation. The discourse of M. Bouvier belongs to the same school, and bears the marks of a powerful intelligence and profound piety. We rejoice to find that men of this spirit are presiding over the doctrinal teaching at Geneva and Montauban, for theological narrowness would be a worse evil in the present day than it ever was before; leading to the miserable reactions of infidelity and adding force to a current that is already far too strong.

La Révolution. Par EDGAR QUINET. Paris: Libraire Internationale. 1865.

No book has, for many years, produced a more profound sensation in the political world in France, than that now before us. It has not only excited the most legitimate admiration, but has also given rise to vehement discussions. The author is one of the most famous writers of the day; he has published works on philosophy, history, and politics. In religion, he first held, vaguely, the views of humanitarianism combined with pantheism; but he appears to have almost abandoned these, and is tending now to a theism more and more respectful to Christianity, but implacable towards Catholicism. In politics, M. Edgar Quinet belongs to the advanced liberal party, but he has no tinge of socialism. He is, at present, a voluntary exile, for although the laws of proscription, under which he suffered after the events of December, have been revoked, he is not willing to return to his country until true liberty be restored there. M. Quinet is gifted with a most superb imagination, which often envelopes his thoughts as with a brilliant cloud. In his new book this cloud is dispersed, and it is with complete clearness and with masculine energy of style that he has given us a general estimate of our great Revolution. It is easy to perceive that he writes under the sinister light of the events of December, 1851, which he has never forgotten. It is not merely that he does not take the part of this *dénouement* of the revolutionary drama, he also seeks for its cause in the history of the Revolution itself, and finds it in the fatal theory of *public safety*, which played so important a part in that great hurricane. The convention wished to lay an arbitrary foundation for liberty, and the issue of its attempts was the 'Terror.' It proceeded by *coups d'état*, and the natural consequence of this policy was the *coups d'état* of the 18th *brumaire*, by which General Buonaparte followed his own method of ending the Revolution by confining the overflowing torrent within narrow banks which might moderate and limit its course. M. Quinet has shown himself justly severe to all the heroes of the days of terror; he has administered well-merited castigation to Robespierre, St. Just, and all the proconsuls who shed human blood under the direction of the committee of public safety. He denies that crime saved France, and affirms that, on the contrary, it ruined for a long time the cause of the Revolution. These opinions being new, on the part of a leader of the democratic party, are, as it were, written with a pen of iron, and all the defenders of *la Montagne* have, accordingly, crimsoned with rage. A very sharp controversy has been carried on through the press, and all the friends of the good Robespierre have exclaimed in chorus against this severe judge of the Revolution. We can thus see how the passions that belong to the old republicanism have been fermenting in the hearts of men, and how little adapted is a *régime* of public safety like that by which France is ruled, to turn the mind from these miserable theories. M. Quinet, unfortunately, leads us to suppose that there is, at least, one tyrannical measure of which he would approve — that which should condemn and banish Catholicism — the

main obstacle to the foundation of liberty. He deprecates such an inference, and an explanation of his views is to appear in the next edition, which will remove all misunderstandings. We await this explanation with impatience, for if this stigma be removed from the book, we shall characterise it as one of the most eloquent works ever inspired by the love of liberty.

Jules César. Cours professé à la Sorbonne. En 1844 et 1863.
Par E. ROUSSEAU ST. HILAIRE.

We all remember the sensation caused last year by the publication of a Life of Cæsar by an imperial author, which contained an unqualified defence of the character and acts of the illustrious usurper who, founding his power on the violation of the laws of his country, inaugurated the Roman empire. The moral view of the subject was naturally entirely absent from this book, which only justified the *coups d'état* of the past for the advantage of the *coups d'état* of the present, both the one and the other being brought forward under the flattering name of providential events. The *Jules César* of M. Rousseau St. Hilaire is an eloquent vindication of eternal morality, without any invectives, any allusions to contemporary events, or one single refutation of the imperial work. It is a wonderfully lucid narrative of the life of the usurper, as far removed from abuse as from studied and systematic defence. The actors in the drama of the fall of the Roman republic live again before us with all their distinctive features. The style is very beautiful; in fact the work is a real *chef-d'œuvre* of historical composition. Having been written originally for *La Revue Chrétienne*, it has just appeared as a separate volume, and an English translation is announced.

Nouvelle Correspondance entièrement inédite d'Alexis de Tocqueville. Paris: Michel Lévy. 1866.

To praise M. de Tocqueville would be a very useless task, since no writer of the present day has won greater esteem and admiration. He may be called the Montesquieu of the nineteenth century, only he is a Montesquieu imbued with Christian thought. In the same way as the author of *L'Esprit des lois* in the last century discovered England to France, or at any rate revealed the working of the great machine of government in England, so has M. de Tocqueville discovered America, and brought into full view that constitution so mysterious to a Frenchman, in which democracy does not leave to the state the initiating and effecting of everything that is done, but carefully guards the safety of individual rights. M. de Tocqueville is the most celebrated representative of what may be individualistic liberalism. The last volume of his correspondence shows him to us in his private life, ever faithful to his convictions, living for his views, and finally dying for them also, for we plainly see how the inauguration of the *régime* of December 2nd, 1851, affected his already delicate health. His letters reveal to us his projects of labour, his domestic affections, his friendships, his discouragements, his hopes, and as they possess great beauty of style, their literary charm is equal to their moral value. To read them is like entering the studio of a great artist where, surrounded by his sketches and designs, we are able to grasp his thought in its first spontaneous appearance. We rise from the perusal of the book filled with a respectful sympathy for the man as well as for the author, and with bitter regrets that death should thus early have interrupted so beautiful a career.

Camille. Par l'auteur des *Horizons prochains.*

For the first time Mme. de Gasparin now publishes a real novel. *Camille* is a religious novel in the full sense of the term, for the plot of the drama is laid entirely in the soul of a young Christian girl divided between her faith and her love for an unbeliever. The author does not admit that in such a situation there can be any question as to duty, and yet she is generous to her deist, giving him the charm of an earnest and elevated mind, and even of great self-devotion and charity. But he does not pray, he does not believe in a God who hears and answers prayer, he does not believe in the God of Jesus Christ. *Camille*, therefore, cannot give herself to him. Mme. de Gasparin supports her views with all the ardour of conviction which characterizes her. The little book is full of life and imagination. Nature is not made merely the frame of the picture, but is herself painted so lovingly, so intelligently, in a style so lively and so detailed, that she seems to have a share in the acting. There is real power in the descriptions of the fields and their thousand different aspects; nor less in the account of the struggles of a young girl's soul, thrown by a passion that has found her in her peaceful home, out of her ordinary serene life and her calm communion with her God. But the rock on which Mme. de Gasparin always splits is all the more obvious here, because her subject required a very gentle and delicate hand. The violent, dashing, extravagant manner in which she unveils this virgin soul, has something in it that offends—no shading, no half-tints, nothing restful or refreshing. The very brilliancy of the style tends to cause weariness, and we fancy, as we close the book, that we have suffered from an attack of fever. The faith of the heroine, of course, triumphs; but the author was not contented that her only recompense should consist in the closer union with God obtained at the price of her sacrifice, and the deep joy of learning through an unfinished letter, written by the failing hand of him whom she loved, that before his death he had found his God and Saviour. She must also have an earthly satisfaction, and accordingly the converted deist suddenly reappears, after having left sorrow-time to do its work in the broken heart of *Camille*. Mme. de Gasparin has much faith, and much talent, but we could wish that she had a little more respect for her readers.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Die Wunderthaten des Herrn in Bezug auf die neueste Kritik betrachtet. Von Prof. Dr. STEINMEYER. (The Miracles of our Lord considered in relation to the most recent Criticism.) Berlin: Wiegandt and Grieben. London: Asher and Co., 1866.

Prof. Steinmeyer, the able and acute professor of practical theology at the University of Berlin, discusses the subject of his work in the following sections:—1. The problem to be solved; 2. The method of solution; 3. The worth of the solution; 4. Jesus as a worker of miracles; 5. The miracles of Jesus. He divides the miracles into four groups, embracing in the *first* group, headed "Miracles as marks of the approach of the kingdom of heaven," such miracles as the healing of the man with the withered hand: in the *second* group, headed "Miracles as symbols of the blessings of the kingdom of heaven now offered to men," such as the healing of the leper; in the *third* group, headed "Miracles as witnesses

that the power of the kingdom of heaven is already in operation," such as the casting out of devils; in the *fourth* group, headed "Miracles as prophecies of the future prevalence of the kingdom of heaven on earth," such as the stilling of the tempest. The author examines in detail the accounts of twenty-five miracles, and tries to show the probability of their having been performed from the circumstances by which they are surrounded, and from the design they were demonstrably meant to serve. With two points in the introductory chapters we specially agree—the repudiation of all attempts to explain miracles; and the protest against the unhealthy, spiritualistic depreciation of the worth of miracles, which has latterly become too common. In some instances we think Professor Steinmeyer overdoes his task; but his book as a whole is sound and thorough.

Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments. (The Christology of the New Testament.) Von Prof. Dr. BEYSLAG. Halle, Berlin: L. Rauh. London: Asher and Co., 1866.

After a lengthened preface, in which the author defends himself against sundry attacks made on him, he treats his subject in the following sections:—Introduction; the idea of the Son of Man; the testimony of Jesus regarding Himself according to the Synoptics and John; the Christology of Peter; of the Apocalypse; of John; of the Epistle to the Hebrews; of Paul.

Professor Beyschlag's solution of the problem of the person of Christ is substantially the following. The traditional formula, 'two natures in one Person,' which was adopted at a time when deity and humanity were deemed disparate, as it were, incommensurable quantities, is no longer satisfactory, now that we have learned that the Scriptures teach the essential affinity of God and man. If man as such, is created in the image of God, if he is destined to a fellowship of nature with God, we only need to conceive of the divine idea of man as fully realized, and we have the perfect union of God and man, we have the God-man, who can say, 'He that seeth me seeth the Father.' Christ is thus divine, because he is the conscious and perfect realization of the divine idea of man; His pre-existence is that of a principle rather than of a person. This view the author seeks to establish exegetically. We, for our part, think it utterly inadequate to the teaching of the New Testament; but as the author believes notwithstanding in Christ as 'the living personal bond between God and man; the perfect unity of deity and humanity,' we commend his reasonings and expositions to the thoughtful attention of our theological readers.

Die Wissenschaft der Religion. (The Science of Religion.) Von W. TÖLLE. Vol. I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. London: Asher & Co., 1865.

Herr Tölle's aim is to win back for religion and the Church, so far, of course, as lies within the power of science, the posts which their opponents affirm them to have lost; to show that the regeneration of the peoples is possible alone on the basis of faith—that religion is the source of all true science, art and morality—that apostasy from religion is the destruction of all the ideal forces of human life and history. By religion and faith he means, be it observed, the Christian religion and faith, as viewed by an earnest and sincere member of the Lutheran Church. This first volume

is divided into two books:—I. The fundamental forms of the religious relation. II. The History of Religion. In the second book he is greatly indebted to Schelling's later writings. Whilst we sympathise heartily with the author's design, spirit, tendency, and allow that he advances much that is striking and suggestive, we think he lacks some of the firmness and logical precision requisite to the success of such an undertaking.

Selbstzeugnisse Jesu in fünfzehn Betrachtungen für die Suchenden unserer Zeit. (The Testimony of Jesus to Himself, in fifteen Meditations addressed to the Seekers of our Age.) Von Prof. Dr. HELD. Zürich: C. Meyer. London: Asher and Co. 1865.

Fifteen meditations on passages from the Gospel of Matthew, with an appendix of nine sermons, by the author of 'Jesus the Christ,' noticed in a previous number. In opposition to the position that the actual Jesus of history was first raised to be the Christ of the New Testament and the Church, by the faith or imagination of the Apostles and first Christians—a position to which, we regret to say, many amongst us are turning—Professor Held says, 'We are not only able to say what has been thought and believed and imagined concerning Jesus; but we can draw nigh to Himself, we can receive the impressions which He made on the first disciples: for we possess the very words which He spake—words whose genuineness cannot be questioned. These words compel the acknowledgment that He himself actually and verily claimed to be no other, no less, than the Christ of whom the Apostles testify.' The truth of this is established in connection with passages such as Matthew v. 1—12; x. 24—40; xvi. 13—19, and others. Those who like earnest thoughts, warmly and forcibly expressed, we commend to Professor Held, who has again given us a book fitted to do excellent service in the cause of Christ.

Allgemeines über die hebräische Dichtung und über das Psalmenbuch. (General Observations on Hebrew Poetry and on the Book of Psalms.) Von HEINRICH EWALD. Ed. 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. London: Asher and Co. 1866.

This is a revised edition of the first volume of this very eminent author's great work on the 'Poets of the Old Testament.' It discusses the following matters:—Origin of poetry in general and the peculiar characteristics of Hebrew poetry; History and species of Hebrew poetry; Rhythm and so forth of Hebrew poems; Song and music of the Hebrews; the Contents and design, the rise, the inscriptions, and the historical explanation of the Book of Psalms. Professor Ewald considers that we have four species of poems in the Old Testament—Lyric, Didactic, Dramatic, and Epic poems: the Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Solomon, and Job. The Song of Solomon he represents as a poem written expressly for the stage, consisting of five acts, illustrative of faithfulness in love, and probably played at a country festival, by three actors personating Solomon, the Sulamite and the Chorus of Hebrew women.

We differ in most matters *toto cælo* from Professor Ewald; but no one pretending to Hebrew scholarship, can afford to overlook his views even when they are palpably erroneous.

Vindiciae Lucanae seu de itinerarii in libro Actuum assertati auctore. Scripsit A. KLOSTERMANN. Göttingæ: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 1866.

A careful discussion of the various historical and critical questions which arise out of the last two chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, with reference to the opinions of such men as Schneckenburger, Baur, Zeller, and others. The result arrived at is 'Non conditum esse itinerarium nostrum nisi a totius libri auctore; et hunc quidam neminem fuisse nisi eorum illum Pauli, qui de se ipso interdum in itinerario locutus est, id est Lucam.'

Vorlesungen über die Christliche Dogmengeschichte. (Lectures on the History of Christian Doctrine.) Von Dr. F. C. BAUR. Vol. I. Abth. I. Das Dogma der Alten Kirche. 1. Abschnitt. Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zur Synode in Nicæa. (From the Apostolic Age to the Council of Nice.) Leipzig: Fues. London: Asher and Co., 1865.

Making allowance for his unchristian philosophy, and his strong bias, as well as for his Hegelian tendency to construct history, and write it on *a priori* principles, few men were more competent to delineate the course pursued by Christian doctrine than the late Dr. Baur of Tübingen. In many important respects he was verily a giant. He combined immense learning, vigour of grasp, and an eye for what was characteristic, with a style of great clearness and force. The method pursued in this work is essentially that adopted by such men as Gieseler and Hagenbach. It bids fair to be very extensive, for the first volume comprises 738 pages; but this is one of its recommendations, for we have outlines enough already. If the quotations had borne any proportion to the text, the work would have been of double value to us. The lectures, though not prepared for the press by the author himself, are unusually free from the imperfections characteristic of such publications.

Die Philosophisch-Kritischen Grundsätze des Selbstcoranssetzung oder die Religions-Philosophie. (The Philosophico-Critical principles of the presupposition of the self, or the Philosophy of Religion.) Von G. MEHRING. Stuttgart: Belser. London: Asher & Co. 1864.

Obscure as is the title of this book, its main substance is clear, suggestive, and sound. Instead of attempting to compress a vague sketch of the system expounded in Prelate Mehring's book, into the brief space at our disposal, we will describe the point of view—thus explaining the title—and give a brief *resumé* of the chapter on miracles.

The point of view is the following. Taking as his point of departure, first of all, our three spiritual activities, knowledge, feeling, and volition; and then, the self or personality in which they centre, the author seeks to show that, both negatively and positively, they 'presuppose,' or point back to a personal God. Hence the expression, 'the presupposition of the self.' Each of these activities directs beyond itself, but, *by itself*, gives little clue to the nature of the something on which it depends; but the self, the personality, unmistakeably necessitates the assumption of a personal God. Many interesting and subtle thoughts are advanced in

establishing the last point. But we must now hurry on to the chapter on miracles. We select this chapter solely because the question of miracles is a cardinal one, and a test by which to try the Christian character of philosophical speculations.

The universal prevalence of the idea of miracles, renders the question, on the one hand, more difficult, but, on the other, gives an important hint towards accounting for the phenomenon. It shows, *firstly*, that our mind is unable to rest content with the ordinary course of human life, and its relation to surrounding nature; *secondly*, that it has the inkling of a freer relation to nature; *thirdly*, that it assumes the possibility of a direct personal intercourse between Deity and man, through the medium of a peculiar superhuman use of natural objects. Miracles may, accordingly, be said to be required by, instead of contradicting, the human mind.

The term miracle describes the relation of a particular (presumed) fact, to a previously settled system of knowledge. If the fact harmonize with the system, it is termed natural; if a place cannot be found for it in the system, it is termed a miracle, or, at all events, a marvel. Many philosophers maintain that all so-called miracles will, eventually, prove to be mere marvels; that is, be brought into a higher system. Prelate Mehring, at this point, very properly falls back on the question:—*Can there be an event which, being absolutely new in itself, is and always must remain a miracle?* This possibility is involved in the nature of God, as the primal absolute personality; for it is one of the essential characteristics of personality, to be able to make a real beginning, to be a veritable *cause*. In other words, the question of miracles depends on the prior question of a living and personal, as opposed to both a deistic and a pantheistic God.

We commend Prelate Mehring's work to the careful study of those who are acquainted with German.

Die Schöpfungsgeschichte nach Natur wissenschaft und Bibel.
(*Creation according to Natural Science and the Bible.*) Von
Prof. Dr. F. W. SCHULTZ, Breslau. Gotha: F. A.
Perthés. London: Asher & Co. 1865.

A new attempt to reconcile Genesis and natural science. Professor Schultz allows that in the two very important points, the *duration* of the work of creation, and the *relation* between its successive stages, the Bible does not harmonize with natural science. His enquiry then is—how are we to treat these undeniable differences? We may not arbitrarily reject or restrict the results of natural science; we may not get over them by modes of explaining the narrative; but we must aim at gaining a better insight into the entire manner and nature of the revelation.

Many have supposed that to deny the harmony between Genesis and the actual process of creation, would force us to treat the account in the former as a myth. But there is a prior question, namely, whether a revealed representation of events must, necessarily, harmonize with the actuality, in regard to time and other like outward circumstances? Such a representation, we must remember, is not an historical account based on tradition or observation, which as such would be conditioned by the facts themselves and their relations to each other; but a picture of something which is not seen by the natural eye, and as it is in itself; but by the spiritual eye, and as it is in the mind of God. Now that

which, in the mind of God, forms an unity, and when revealed naturally, presents itself in this its unity to the inspired mind, will be split up into many parts, divided by long intervals of time and space, when it enters on actual outward existence. The man of science describes the *outward* creation, the actual history of the *realisation* of the divine ideas; the writers of the Bible describe what presented itself to their inspired intuition, in the mind of God. In support of this hypothesis, Schultz appeals to the analogy of prophecy, whose manner it was, he maintains, to set forth events which actually required decennia or centuries to their fulfilment, as happening either simultaneously or in a very short space of time. This is in brief the solution offered by Professor Schultz.

His book reviews the entire field, in an able and clear manner, and deserves thoughtful attention.

Gott und der Mensch. (God and Man.) Von Dr. H. ULRICI.
I. *Lieb und Seele; Grundrize einer Psychologie des Menschen.*
(*Body and Soul; Outlines of a Psychology of Man.*) Leipzig:
O. Weigel. London: Asher & Co. 1866.

The above treatise is a sequel to the same author's excellent work on 'God and Nature,' published in 1862. Concerning the design of the two works, Dr. Ulrici expresses himself to the following effect:—'My aim is 'to build up an *idealistic* view of life and the world, on the *foundation* 'supplied by the results of the *natural sciences*, that is, on the foundation 'of *established facts*; or, in other words, to show that the soul relatively 'to the body, the spirit relatively to nature, may not merely claim, but 'actually possesses independent existence and rule.' It would take a very long review to do anything like justice to the immense learning, the clearness of thought, and the sobriety of judgment, characteristic of this work. It is divided into two parts; one *physiological*, treating of such subjects as matter and force; the human body in its relation to psychical phenomena; the nerves and the soul; the organs of sense and their functions in their psychological significance—(Eye, ear, &c., impulse, instinct):—the other *psychological*, treating of consciousness; the soul in its conscious relations to its own body and other bodies; walking, sleeping, dreaming; somnambulism; mental disorders; temperaments, &c.; imagination; the impulses of the soul; desire, volition; the education and culture of man; the soul in its relation to God. Dr. Ulrici is, in philosophical *parlance*, a decided *theist*; and the last chapter, in particular, is in most, if not in all points, thoroughly in harmony with the Christian system. We know of no better storehouse of weapons of defence and attack against all the modern forms of materialism than 'God and Nature,' 'God and Man,'—of course from the purely philosophical point of view.

Geschichte der Neuern Philosophie. (History of Modern Philosophy.) Von KUNO FISCHER. Vols. I.—V. Mannheim:
F. Bassermann. London: Asher & Co. 1865.

The spirit and aims of this History of Modern Philosophy, part of which now appears in a second, thoroughly revised, edition, we cannot better describe, than in the author's own words. 'The task I have set 'myself is, the methodical development of the main systems from which 'we derive our light, and on which the history of philosophy lives; and 'to reproduce them in such a manner, that my readers shall clearly see

'in what problems they took their rise, how they solved these problems, and what unsolved problems they left to their successors.' 'He who understands the chief systems of philosophy, will understand the history of philosophy; he too, and he alone, will know what problems occupy the philosophical mind in general.' 'We can no more understand philosophy without tracing out the course of its development or its history, than we can understand a man, of the course and tasks of whose life, we know nothing.' The *first* volume comprises a general introduction, and the system of Des Cartes; the *second*, Des Cartes' school, Geulinx, Malebranche, and Spinoza; the *third*, Leibnitz and his school; the *fourth* and *fifth*, Kant and the critical philosophy. As each volume contains between 500 and 600 pages, it may be imagined that the accounts given of the various systems, are full and pretty exhaustive. We may add, too, that they will be found characterized by clearness; for Professor Fischer is a precise thinker and good writer.

The Introduction consists, mainly, of a brief survey of the course taken by philosophical enquiry, from the Ionians to Des Cartes. Till he comes to Christianity—which is of course a phenomenon demanding either the recognition of its own explanation, or another explanation, at the hands of philosophers—Professor Fischer's exposition of the significance and intent of the various systems that arose, strikes us as very forcible; but at that point he stumbles,—stumbles, because, like too many others of his guild, he is tainted with Pelagianism; because, he does not see that each individual man needs a particular redemption from self and sin; that this redemption cannot be effected by any mere revolution in consciousness, even though that revolution should leave behind in us the belief in the essential oneness of God and man; that what we need is the reintegration of the moral order of the world, and of our own will and heart; and that Christianity is the series of facts and influences, by which this result is produced. Of the rise and essence of Christianity, Professor Fischer seems to take, in the main, the view propounded by the late Dr. Baur of Tübingen. In the chapter entitled 'Religious Platonism: the problem of the redemption of the world,' which very strikingly and truly describes the problem at which Plotinus, Porphyrius, Iamblichus, Proclus, and Philo-Judæus, laboured, as the problem of redemption, the problem how to overcome the world, practically and speculatively, there occur the following words:—'The problem of redemption requires a *personal* solution. It is solved when a man appears, who really overcomes the world in himself; who is free from the world in the fullest sense of the term; in whom humanity recognises its achetype; in whom the redemption has taken place, the idea appeared, the Logos become flesh, and God become man. Nothing but faith in such a person can satisfy man's need of redemption.' Beautiful as these words seem, they are like apples of Sodom; for we find in the following section on Christianity, that Christ saves rather as the embodiment of a new idea, than as the all-sufficient sacrifice, and ever-living Prophet.

We have made special reference to this defect, because we are old-Priest, and King. All philosophy is vain to the extent to which it clashes with 'the truth as it is in Jesus;' and we are satisfied that the Church's belief has, in the main, ever embodied this truth.

THE BRITISH
www.libtool.com.cn
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER 1, 1866.

ART. I.—(1.) *Maine de Biran : Sa Vie et ses Pensées*. Publiées par E. NAVILLE. Paris : J. Cherbuliez. 1857.

(2.) *Œuvres Inédites de M. de Biran*. Publiées par ERNEST NAVILLE, avec la collaboration de MARC-DEBRIT. Paris : Dezobry, E. Magdeleine, et C^{ie}. 1859.

(3.) *Œuvres Philosophiques de M. de Biran*. Editées par M. COUSIN. Paris : Ladrangé. 1841.

(4.) *Fragments Philosophiques*. Par V. COUSIN. Tome deuxième, 1838. (Containing 'Introduction to the Posthumous Work of M. de Biran'.)

Stat nominis magni umbra. For many years Maine de Biran has been 'the shade of a great name,' and nothing more. Occasionally, this shade lowers vaguely and vastly upon the distant horizon of English thought,* but ere it has gathered itself into

*The following passage, which introduces the preface of Bulwer's 'Strange Story,' may be instanced in illustration of the references that allure and perplex English readers with reference to the illustrious 'Unknown.' It will also serve to whet the edge of desire in our own readers, and to indicate the course of thought our article pursues. 'Of the many illustrious thinkers whom the school of France has contributed to the intellectual philosophy of our age, Victor Cousin, the most accomplished, assigns to Maine de Biran the rank of the most original. In the successive developments of his own mind, Maine de Biran may, indeed, be said to represent the change that has been silently at work throughout the general mind of Europe since the close of the last century. He begins his career of philosopher with blind faith in Condillac and Materialism. As an intellect, severely conscientious in the pursuit of truth, expands amidst the perplexities it revolves, phenomena, which cannot be accounted for by Condillac's sensuous theories, open to his eye. To the first rudimentary life of man, the animal life "characterised by impressions, appetites, movements, organic in their origin, and ruled by the Law of Necessity," he is compelled to add "the second or human life, from which free-will and self-consciousness emerge." He thus arrives at the union of mind and matter ; but still a something is wanted, some key

distinct form, or unveiled its cloudy features, other and nearer objects have crowded it out of view. We are thus haunted by the recollection of a name and a presence which has some mysterious significance, but whose secret we have not fathomed. We purpose, in this article, to discover the secret, to exhibit in definite form and English dress, the thoughts of an eminent French philosopher, whose name has had a sort of cabalistic virtue, but whose works have, hitherto, been wholly unknown in our country. In humbler fashion, the critic's pen will thus rival the poet's, and of 'the form of things unknown,'

'Turn them to shape, and give to airy nothings,
A local habitation and a name.'

It is not in England alone, that M. de Biran has had a phantomal existence. Among his compatriots he has fared no better. M. Naville, thus introduces his admirable little work, 'M. de Biran, sa Vie et ses Pénsees' (1857),—which was issued as an avant-courier of the large and important volumes, which he published in 1859, and by which he has reintegrated M. de Biran's philosophic history and system. 'M. de Biran has now been dead 33 years. The public, however, has only had a most incomplete exposition of the doctrines of this philosopher, whom

'to the marvels which neither of these conditions of vital being suffices to explain. And at last the grand self-completing thinker arrives at the third life of man in man's soul. "There are not," says this philosopher, towards the close of his last and loftiest work, "There are not only two principles opposed to each other in man, there are three. For there are, in him, three lives and three orders of faculties. Though all should be in accord and in harmony between the sensitive and the active faculties which constitute man, there would still be a nature superior, a third life, which would not be satisfied; which would make felt (*ferait sentir*) the truth that there is another happiness, another wisdom, another perfection, at once above the greatest human happiness, above the highest wisdom, or intellectual and moral perfection of which the human being is susceptible."

'It will be seen that romance, through the freest exercise of its wildest vagaries, conducts its bewildered hero towards the same goal to which philosophy leads its luminous student through far grander portents of nature, far higher visions of supernatural power, than fable can yield to fancy. That goal is defined in these noble words: "The relations (*rapports*) which exist between the elements and the products of the three lives of man are the subject of meditation, the fairest and finest, but also the most difficult. The stoic philosophy shows us all which can be most elevated in active life, but it makes abstraction of the animal nature, and absolutely fails to recognise all which belongs to the life of the spirit. Its practical morality is beyond the forces of humanity. Christianity alone embraces the whole man. It dissimulates none of the sides of his nature, and avails itself of his miseries and his weakness in order to conduct him to his end in showing him all the want that he has of a succour more exalted."

‘ M. Cousin has pronounced “ the greatest philosopher that has distinguished France since Malebranche.” One entire epoch in the development of his theories is almost unknown. His most important works are unpublished. Hence, although his name is often mentioned, he is not much read or well-known, even in France. England and Germany have kept an almost absolute silence in respect to him. In a word, if he has a distinguished place in the history of philosophy, he has not yet obtained his rightful place in that history.’

There can be no doubt that M. de Biran has earned a seat of honour among the illustrious Masters of Philosophy. He has been enthroned by the unanimous voice of his contemporaries, who inaugurated the brilliant reign of spiritual philosophy in France. Royer-Collard, who first clearly broke the spell, and smote the ascendancy, of the fashionable Condillacism in the Sorbonne, by expounding the principles of the Scottish philosophy, avows of M. de Biran, ‘ Il est notre maître à tous ;’ and Cousin, in addition to the emphatic sentence which is quoted above, loves, in other passages, to expatiate on the subtlety and originality of De Biran’s views. ‘ Of all the masters in France,’ he writes, ‘ M. de Biran is assuredly the most original, if he is not the greatest. M. de Lamoriguiere, whilst modifying Condillac in certain points, continues his system. M. Royer-Collard belongs to the Scotch philosophy, which he would infallibly have surpassed by the rigour and natural power of his reason, if he had prosecuted those labours, which were not the least solid portion of his fame. As for me, I belong to both the Scotch and the German philosophies. M. de Biran, alone, is his own master, and is formed by his own meditations.’ (Fragments Philosoph., tome deuxième, pp. 63, 64.) And again, in his second famous preface to the first volume of his Fragments, M. Cousin attests his gratitude to his teachers at the Sorbonne—M. de Lamoriguiere and M. Royer-Collard, and then adds, ‘ Along with these two eminent professors, I had the farther advantage of knowing a man, without equal in France, for his talent of internal observation, the fineness and depth of his psychological sense. I mean M. de Biran.’ (Fragment Philosoph., tome première, p. 24.) During the late years of his life, M. de Biran resided chiefly in Paris, and when there, a reunion of his friends, among whom were reckoned all the leading philosophers of the time, assembled, every Friday, in his house. Among these were Royer-Collard, Cousin, Ampère, Guizot, Stapfer, G. Cuvier, &c. The place which De Biran held in this very select and illustrious society, is attested by F. M. L. Naville (father of the editor of the books to which we have

referred), who visited Paris in the spring of 1824, and had the honour of meeting its members in one of these gatherings. 'Whenever,' M. Naville writes, 'the conversation turned upon philosophy, as it often did, M. de Biran incontestably took the lead. Though all the scholars, who composed that assembly were still living, I would none the less affirm, without any fear of correction, that each of them had then the consciousness of inferiority, and heard the great philosopher with a respectful attention, which seemed to repeat the confession of Royer-Collard, "He is the master of us all."'

It is not, however, the influence or the renown of this obscure philosopher, which chiefly interests us in M. de Biran, or induces us, at the present time, to sketch his history and analyse his system for English readers. He still lives and moves in modern thought. With Kant in Germany, and Reid in Scotland, he was the first to assail the ghastly Materialism which had shed a Upas-blight over the whole of Europe during the eighteenth century. In France, he was the herald of a new day; the morning star who shone in the gray dawn which ushered in the sunburst of spiritual philosophy, whose radiance fired the schools and the literature of France, in the beginning of this century; and which, though clouded, has continued to be the daylight of our age.

In studying then the life of M. de Biran, we trace to their fountain-head some of the thoughts which have elevated and renewed our century. He was the child of the eighteenth century; he imbibed its teaching and spirit. He became the man of the nineteenth century, its teacher, and guide. And to trace the progress of his mind in this marvellous growth and change, to watch the first awakening of those ideas which, dawning gently in his mind, have since shone widely upon the world, is like watching the break of morning, which

'Round about

Dapples the drowsy east with spots of gray'

ere it lifts up the firmament of light above the earth. Moreover, the philosophical questions which M. de Biran more especially and most profoundly investigated, are recovering the foremost place in philosophical investigation. M. de Biran was a psychologist—not a metaphysician. He sounded the depths of consciousness, and scrutinised its facts. And the order of mental phenomena, which he most attentively and accurately observed, were those relating to the Will. Many have studied the laws and faculties of the Reason. De Biran entered another province of the human soul, and made it his own. And, in our day, many causes contribute to reveal the supreme impor-

tance of this province of our nature; for remote and obscure as it is, the seat of authority, the fount of activity, the very ground of human personality, is there. The passion for comprehensive induction, and searching analysis, the 'amor indagatoris' which forms the scientific habit of modern thought, has broken down the limits of psychological inquiry which meted off the necessary laws of intelligence and of sensation, as the proper and luminous sphere of mental philosophy, and it has tracked to the hidden source of freedom—the will, those activities of the human mind which intermix with the fixed conditions of reason and sense. Further, in the intermittent or weakened action of the will, mental disease and moral disorder are discovered to originate,* so that the pathology of the human mind, which both moralists and physicians are compelled to study, and which is the chief practical issue of a true psychology, requires, above all, an examination of the phenomena of the will. In our practical age, accordingly, this domain of Psychology, which M. de Biran explored, invites and commands especial study; and it will be well for English students to know the result of M. de Biran's investigations.

For us, however, there is another and more attractive interest in M. de Biran's life. He was a *savant*—a philosopher; his associations were purely literary. He was an adept in the atheistic materialism which ruled in France during his youth. He loosened himself from its tyranny; he laid the foundations of a spiritual philosophy. In virtue of this philosophy, he asserted the freedom, dignity, independence, and sufficiency of the human will; he became a stoic in religion. At last, in the crown of his years, he humbled himself, and became a disciple of Jesus Christ. He died a Christian. Such a career, spanning the diameter of the moral world, and resulting from no extraneous impulses, but from the free untrammelled development of M. de Biran's own thought and feeling, awakens our profound curiosity and regard. Such a history pictures what we hope will be the course traversed by multitudes, who are as De Biran

* See an exceedingly able article in 'Quarterly Review,' No. 186, on Dr. Baird's 'Hypnotism,' and other works. The following is part of the conclusion of the article:—'We have seen how largely the will is concerned in all those higher exercises of the reasoning powers, even upon the most common-place subjects, by which our conduct ought to be governed, and how important it is that the automatic tendencies, of whatever nature, should be entirely subjugated by it, &c. . . . Insanity is often to be attributed to the want of acquirement in early life of proper volitional control over the current of thought, so that the mind cannot free itself from the tyranny of any propensity or idea which once acquires an undue predominance, &c.'

was. It may also profit our readers by confirming them in the faith which De Biran was led joyfully to accept, after exhausting all systems of human speculation; and by indicating how we should address those who stand successively in the separate grades through which he passed, so as to lead them higher, till they reach, as he did, the Cross and the Crown.

I.

M. de Biran's outer life may be very briefly sketched. He was born at Bergerac, on the 29th of November, 1766. In 1785, he entered the body-guard of the King. He disported for a while amid the brilliant gaieties of the fashionable world in Paris, which hung, like the vineyards of Vesuvius, on the breast of volcanic fires. De Biran's amiability, exquisite refinement, and musical gifts, gave him a prestige and a welcome in the Parisian *salons*. The storm of the Revolution dashed the glitter of this Mayfair. In one of the *émeutes* of the year '89, De Biran was wounded in the arm, and when his corps was disbanded, he retired to the family estate and home at Grateloup, near Bergerac. This estate and home were now his own, as his parents were dead; and in this rural retirement he spent the sad years which deluged France with blood and mourning. He had the rare good fortune of retaining his patrimony and his quietude undisturbed, though as M. Naville says, 'He did not escape those troubles from which, in the bosom of an immense convulsion, no one can be exempt. Sometimes he fears that he will be obliged to close his books, go to the frontier in the ranks of the Revolutionary armies; sometimes he perceives symptoms of sinister augury in the surrounding population, and fear for his personal safety was added to his consternation and grief for the dynasty of his country. "I had flattered myself for some time," he writes, "that I should live in secure obscurity in my solitude, but I begin to lose my hopes. The revolutionists breathe tumult and discord throughout every corner of France. Their empoisoned breath is felt everywhere, and my own neighbourhood has caught the contagion. If it be so, I see not whither I can flee, and there remains for me, nothing but to learn to suffer, and if need be, to die." '—(Vie de M. de Biran, p. 13.)

This dark thunder-cloud which wrapt its lurid vapours and shed its red bolts over the whole of France, and whose mutterings broke so near to his home, left him unharmed. He endured the dread of its threatenings for years, but he did not encounter its violence; and it is very profitable for us, who look back upon the Revolution in France, and are misled by many causes to mitigate our condemnation of the havoc

which it wrought, and the sanguinary fiendishness of its leaders, to read the language of one who lived a spectator in that awful time, and whose conscience revolts against its unparalleled enormities. Distance in space softens the rugged outlines, tints the ghastly colours, and veils the black fissures of a volcanic ridge. Distance in time throws a similar aerial hue upon the epochs of stupendous crime, when the eruption of lawless human passions has convulsed and overcast society with dismay and ruin. We recognise the 'soul of good' that has been plucked from 'evil things.' We see how the slow alchemy of time, under the direction of a merciful God, converts the foul passions of men into ministers of righteousness, and we refer the unexpected harvest of good to men who have unconsciously laboured to produce it—but were themselves wholly evil. The conscience pronounces a true judgment when it confronts human actions, and knows the motives of its actors. We need not be surprised, therefore, to hear M. de Biran say—and we should rectify our intellectual or historical judgment by the immediate judgment of conscience pronounced in his words—'The precious blood shed by the tyrants of this wretched country suffices to efface the memory of all the fires kindled by the ferocious Inquisition.' He expresses constantly his profound horror at the doctrine that the public safety justifies all crimes, and transforms the most hateful outrages into righteous acts. For him, as for M. Royer-Collard, 'these men, who have since been transformed into fantastic and providential Titans, remained *la canaille pure et simple*.'—(Royer-Collard in 'La Galerie des Contemporains Illustres'.)

It was during this mournful solitude that M. de Biran betook himself to the solace of study. Though mathematics, physical science, and the classical writings of antiquity engaged his leisure, the study which fixed and engrossed his attention was the study of himself. His physical temperament gave him a strong bias to introspective habits of thought, and also inclined him to give an unfeigned and unhesitating adhesion to the reigning philosophy of his time. Unless, indeed, he had achieved the task of complete insulation from the surrounding atmosphere of belief, which Descartes nobly struggled, but yet failed, to accomplish, this adhesion was an inevitable necessity. Condillac's Sensationalism was then the universal, unquestioned philosophy of France. Some refinements or variations in points of detail distinguished its several expounders; but its principles reigned without contradiction. No young thinker could, therefore, escape the circumambient opinion of his age; and M. de Biran's nature made him specially prone to the contagion. The

seductive fallacies of Sensationalism appealed to experiences of which he above most men was acutely conscious. He had a nervous temperament, which made him sensitive as a burnished mirror to the play of light and shade, and the breath of dry or humid air. Thus, as M. Naville says, 'Throughout his life, he feels in the highest degree all external influences. A change of the wind modifies his dispositions; the state of his mind varies with the degrees of the thermometer, it varies no less with the different states of his body. It is incontestable that this delicate temperament exercised a mighty and vivid influence upon the direction of M. de Biran's studies. A constitution so mobile and so feeble contributed greatly to fix his attention upon those interior facts of which the mind is the theatre.' And this temperament which thus turned his mind to contemplate himself, and his changing impressions, contributed no less to the subtlety and depth of some of his observations of the phenomena of consciousness. His distinguished friend, Cabanis, the illustrious physician and ideologue, who was recognised, with De Tracy, as the authoritative expounder of the popular philosophy, only wrote the truth when he thus addressed M. de Biran in 1803:—'Nature has given you a mobile and delicate organization—source of those fine and manifold experiences which shine in your works, and the habit of meditation which they have made a necessity to you, adds further to this excessive sensibility.'

This extraordinary quickness and acuteness of sensibility gave, moreover, great verisimilitude to the sensational theory, which he heard resounding unchallenged on every hand. For what is that theory but the predominance and exclusive consideration of one order of mental phenomena, pressed even to the denial of every other? Every faculty, all knowledge, the desires, the will, and the conscience, are thus considered to be the result of sensations, impressed upon us by the external world. And who so likely to adopt this theory as one who felt his mood, his wishes, the fluctuating current of ideas in his mind, to be dependent upon external and uncontrollable causes? We need not be surprised, therefore, that the first philosophical work which M. de Biran composed was avowedly a profession and application of Condillac's doctrine. This work, entitled '*Memoire sur l'habitude*,' was written upon a thesis which the Institute of France had announced for competition, viz. '*The Influence of Habit*.' By the unanimous vote of the members of the Institute, M. de Biran's essay received the prize, and was accordingly crowned in 1802. It was published in the following year.

This work was the fruit of long meditation in his dreary solitude. This solitude had, however, been happily broken long before its composition. Calmer days gleamed on France. In 1795 M. de Biran was appointed administrator of the department of the Dordogne; and in 1797 he was sent as deputy to the council of 'the Five Hundred.' Owing to the energy with which he combated all revolutionary tendencies, his election was annulled in 1797, and he was again restored to his country home and quietude. But he returned thither in happier circumstances than before. There was peace in the country, and having married in 1795 a woman whose love brightened and sustained his spirit, he entered with joy upon the tranquil pleasures and labours of a country life.

It was in the leisure which M. de Biran now enjoyed, and after his mind had been invigorated and matured by these active political experiences, that he wrote his first work.

We have said that this work was based on the principles of the current sensational philosophy of the day, which had an especial attraction for M. de Biran; but even in it there are the first traces of those divergencies which soon widened into strong contrasts, and open antagonism: the cracks are seen that deepen into chasms. Even in the beginning of his philosophical speculations, as they are made known to us in the selections from his 'Journal Intime,' with which M. Naville has favoured the public, we see him revolt from some of the coarsest and extreme formulæ of Sensationalism. Thus in the year 1794, whilst he affirms on the one hand that 'whatever may be the mechanism by which we have ideas, it is demonstrated that their origin is in the senses,' and that 'temperament is the cause which unites or rather which identifies what we call the physical and the moral in man;' on the other hand, he protests energetically against the precise formula of Cabanis, that 'thought is the secretion of the brain.' 'No paradox,' M. de Biran says, 'need astonish us on the part of him who dares to say with assurance that we should regard the brain as a special organ, whose function is to produce thought in the same way as the stomach and the intestines are intended for digestion, and the liver to secrete bile. To say that the brain secretes thought is truly the greatest absurdity, the greatest impropriety of language that is conceivable.'*

A similar hesitancy and vacillation throw cross-lights over his 'Memoir on Habit.' He refers to the principles of the

* It is remarkable how Karl Vogt, of Geneva, the most prominent of the scientific men, who are now giving emphasis to Materialistic doctrines, has commented and expanded Cabanis' definition in words

sensational doctrine as lying beyond cavil or doubt. All our faculties accordingly, in their primary origin, he considers to be derived from sensation, or the faculty of receiving impressions. The power of movement upon which he insists so much, is to be distinguished from that of 'feeling,' only as the branch is distinguished from the stem. But whilst there is this avowed identity, arising from the acceptance of commonly-received notions, the mixture of foreign principles ferments discordantly with them. For example, he protests against confounding under the term sensation, two different orders of facts, passive sensibility, and the activity which causes motion, because the term 'sensation' preserves always, from its primitive signification, a meaning essentially passive. There is movement, De Biran shows, not only in those muscular motions that are perceptible, but in others. 'I move,' he says, 'when I stretch my arm, or change my posture, but I move also when I fix my look, or hear attentively, and even in solitary meditation, in the midst of apparent repose, I recognise whenever I fix my attention, the employment of motive force applied to the organs of the brain. There is movement, in a word, wherever there is a consciousness of effort.' This consciousness of *effort* is, indeed, according to M. de Biran, the chief fact to be observed in the analysis of mental phenomena. The sense of personal existence, even, is drawn from it, for 'effort' supposes a subject which determines the movement, and an object which resists. Now, to separate all impressions from the 'self,' which feels them, is the fundamental condition of all knowledge. 'But the faculty of perception, *i.e.* of distinguishing our different impressions from one another and from the "self" which feels them, is not an attribute of the purely sensitive being, but depends absolutely upon the voluntary power of movement. There is no ground for treating sensation in a general and abstract manner, in order afterwards to deduce the phenomena of intelligence from its transformations, because sensations properly so called remain always "simple modes," which could never transform themselves in any way. In supposing the mind to be identified with its modifications, Bonnet and Condillac make it impossible to lay any real foundation for personality; for personality supposes a subject which distinguishes itself from its modes, instead of identifying itself

nearly synonymous with those which M. de Biran uses in order to heap reproach and condemnation upon it. Vogt loudly proclaims, 'that the brain secretes thought, as the liver secretes bile, and the kidneys secrete urine.' (See his *Vorlesungen über den Menschen, seine Bildung in der Schöpfung und in der Geschichte*. Giessen, 1863.)

‘with them.’* In like manner, De Biran shows that unless we distinguish the activity of the mind from mere sensibility, there can be no memory, and no natural signs or language. The active mind, on the contrary, recognises its own identity, whenever it acts, and the reproduction of the same acts gives a solid basis for our ‘recollections.’ ‘For example, when the hand ‘resumes or tends to resume the same form which it had when ‘it touched or embraced a globe, the individual finds himself ‘in almost the same active state as that in which he has been; ‘he perceives—he still touches, so to speak, by thought, an ‘absent globe.’† This power of reproducing states of consciousness, which have formerly existed, together with the ability of recognising their identity or resemblance, becomes the basis, of natural signs which are simply these free reproductions or copies of former movements, and of the conventional signs of language.

This distinction between the active and the passive elements which M. de Biran traced even in these impressions on the senses that are the most passive in appearance, was justified and established by a fundamental observation on the force of habit. Constant repetition produces exactly opposite effects, according as one or other of these elements prevail. Sensations of smell, taste, cold, and heat, grow fainter with long continuance, and are almost lost at last. On the contrary, when activity of the mind is exercised in the functions of the sense, the more frequently the act is repeated, the more easy, accurate and clear our knowledge becomes. ‘We cannot, therefore,’ he concludes, ‘deduce these two classes of impression from only one and the ‘same faculty, for then we must suppose that this faculty ‘becomes, at the same time, more inert and more active by the ‘same cause of habit.’‡

The discordance between the nascent thought of the solitary thinker, and the reigning philosophy which he professes to accept, comes into open light in a striking paragraph, where the origin of the idea of cause is discussed. In most explicit terms, M. de Biran drives the sensational doctrine to the extreme consequences to which Hume inevitably leads it. ‘The ‘idea of cause,’ he affirms, ‘is an effect of imagination, and ‘includes no other relation than that of habitual succession; ‘and the proposition, *There is no effect without a cause*, has the ‘same logical value as the other proposition—the sun goes from ‘east to west.’§ Yet at the bottom of this very passage there

* Œuvres Inédites, Introduction, pp. 20, 21.

† Œuvres Phil., Ed. Cousin, p. 51.

‡ Ibid, p. 74.

§ Ibid, p. 129.

is a note explaining that 'the idea of cause comes to us, in its origin, from the exercise of our own activity, and transports itself from the "me" to nature.' M. Naville may well comment upon ~~this flagrant contradiction~~:—'We must choose between these discrepant statements. If the notion of cause is nothing else than that of succession, then the belief in our own motive power is illusory; if the notion of cause founds itself upon a fact of consciousness, it is not simply a result of imagination. M. de Biran will not be slow in making his decision. The point of his departure, and the future reserved for his thought, meet openly, and collide in the passage that has been quoted, and it would be difficult to discover a more curious example of indecision in a philosopher divided between his own real tendencies and a doctrine which he thinks he accepts.'—(Introduction, page 25.)

This confusion of two struggling principles was soon ended. The alien principle which had grown up unconsciously in the bosom of thoughts that were rooted in the popular belief, but which drew its life from M. de Biran's own meditations, gained the ascendancy. And in this victory the death-blow was struck at the doctrine which reigned in France, without any rival, for half a century. France was not dependent, as has been supposed, upon Scotland or Germany for the revival of a spiritual philosophy. Royer-Collard and Jouffroy, who transfused the Scotch philosophy, and Cousin, who transfused the German philosophy into French literature, were preceded by M. de Biran, who, without any adventitious guidance, pursuing the development of his own original and profound thought, established the indestructible bases of that noble spiritual doctrine which these other thinkers constructed, and which they furnished richly with foreign spoils. The Institute proposed for competition the following subject:—'In what way may the faculty of thinking be analysed, and what elementary faculties are to be recognised in it?' M. de Biran again entered the lists, and again his essay was crowned. This essay, entitled '*Memoire sur la decomposition de la pensée*,' was a declaration of war against sensationalism; and, as M. Cousin says (*Fragm. Philos.*, tome deuxième, p. 65), 'It singularly honours the judges and testifies to their sincere love of truth, that they crowned in 1805 the new memoir, which, under the most polished expressions, announced to them an adversary.'

The doctrine, which was now articulately formed in M. de Biran's mind, and which he expounds and argues in his second memoir, henceforth occupies his whole mind for years.

In 1807 he forwarded a '*Memoire sur l'aperception imme-*

* diate,' to compete for a prize offered by the Academy of Berlin, which only failed to gain the prize because it had been sent anonymously. In 1811, his 'Memoir upon the relations of 'the physical and the moral in man,' gained the prize offered by the Academy of Copenhagen. These essays applied, illustrated and established by new observations the leading ideas of his system. In like manner, having founded a society at Bergerac for scientific investigations and discussion, he contributed to it important papers, which had the same object in view.* And when he again resumed his residence in Paris, and became the centre of that brilliant corps of *savans* and professors, who, by their enthusiasm, erudition, and eloquence, overwhelmed the effete theories of Materialism; and won splendid triumphs in the service of spiritual philosophy upon many fields of science, history, and pure speculation, De Biran was still deepening the foundations and enlarging the scope of that system which in his country solitude he had conceived and fixed in its grand outlines.

The results of all these long meditations and ample research were gathered into an important work, in which he proposed to combine the substance of all his preceding essays, and 'to exhibit 'at once the bases and the applications, the fundamental ideas 'and the details of his doctrine.'—(Introduction, page 53.) This great work, which he called '*L'Essai sur les Fondements 'de la Psychologie*,' was lost to the public for nearly forty years, but has, at length, been published—giving occasion for our article.

The circumstances which brought M. de Biran to Paris, and retained him there till his death, exhibit a striking contrast between the opening years of his manhood, and its close. He was embroiled in the fierce politics of the finale of Napoleon's reign, and of the Restoration. After holding official position in his native department, he was unanimously elected member of the *Corps Legislatif* by that department in 1809. In 1813, when Napoleon felt the first shock of his coming doom, in the swift reverses that followed his unexampled career of victory, and when he appealed for the assistance of all the powers of the state, the *Corps Legislatif* seized the opportunity to make known to Napoleon the woes and wants of the country. M. de Biran was one of the famous commission which demanded from Napoleon before levying 300,000 fresh soldiers to repel the armies that assailed the empire on every side, solid guarantees for the peace of Europe and the liberty of French citizens. It was in answer

* One of these papers was published in Cousin's edition, under the title 'New considerations upon sleep, dreams, and somnambulism.'

to this commission that the Emperor declared with sublime arrogance, that 'He alone represented France,' and that 'the nation had more need of him than he had of the nation.' M. de Biran before this, had been a Royalist. The fascination of military glory had not blinded him to the miserable thralldom and impoverishment of his country. He felt the heel of the oppressor, and saw the arid waste it stamped upon the fair provinces of France. He groaned for liberty. Like many others, he welcomed, therefore, the deliverance promised by the allies, and dreaded a new triumph by Bonaparte which should rivet his tyranny upon the French people, if not on Europe. The short sketch of his life given by E. Naville, reproduces the enthusiasm of the first restoration, the flight, and agitation of 'The Hundred Days,' and the relief, even to Frenchmen like M. de Biran, when the news of Waterloo dispelled the nightmare-vision of a triumphant Empire. 'The restoration of Bonaparte's empire meant to him the Revolution taking its course, war without, oppression and suffering within. It was, in fine, the degradation of the French nation, which forgetting so many recent experiences, delivered itself to its oppressor.'—(*Vie de Maine de Biran*, page 55.)

From the commencement of the reign of Louis XVIII., M. de Biran held a seat in the Chamber of Deputies, and in 1816 he was made Councillor of State. He took indeed little part in the stormy debates of the period, being ill qualified for public discussion by his excessive sensibility; but he suffered the more from the excitement of these debates and the keen interest he took in political subjects. Still his chief interest was in his study. When he entered it, the tempests of the outer world were forgotten, and he searched with a luminous eye that quiet inner world of the mind whose mysterious depths he had watched so long. Nor could his original and spontaneous genius rest contented with past researches and acquisitions. The vivid controversies of the philosophical *coterie*, which assembled weekly at his house, and the stimulus of wide philosophical reading, revealed to him grave defects in his system of psychology. But more than controversy or reading, or even original speculation, M. de Biran's heart asserted its incompleteness, and urged him to higher truth than he had yet discovered. The commotions of public life swept away the gossamer tissue of his stoical dreams.

Happiness had been the vain pursuit of this philosopher. When in the flower of youth he credulously believed that the senses were the source of knowledge, he imagined them to be likewise the spring of our happiness. Happiness was then, in

his own language, 'le calme de mes sens.' When he discovered the activity and recognised the authority of the will, he ceased to be Epicurean, and became a Stoic. Happiness was then centred in the absolute control of the will, subduing the senses and the world to its lordly jurisdiction. But the will was frail. Pain was real. Man could not be a law to himself, the sole object of his own existence. The will of man must fix itself upon an unchanging Almighty Will, to find a firm resting-place. It craves the succour of a heavenly grace to fortify its weakness, and enable it to realize its own ideal of sovereign perfection. Thus was Maine de Biran led to believe in God, and to accept the grace of God offered in Jesus Christ. This 'grand self-completing thinker,' as Lord Lytton calls him, did not, however, raise a wall of separation between his religion and philosophy. The science of man embraces his entire nature. No true philosophy can renounce or ignore those problems of human experience, which Christianity solves. Nor does Christianity renounce the services of true philosophy, whether in presenting clearly the defection, incongruities, and needs of our nature, or in showing how it meets at all points this deranged and mutilated nature, touting its jangled notes into harmony, building up its ruins into their primeval grandeur, and crowning it with the glory of Divine grace.* Ac-

* M. Naville's observations are worth quoting: 'That the Christian doctrines are taught from without, and impose themselves authoritatively upon the faith of man from the moment that he believes in the divinity of their origin; this is not, and never can be, seriously questioned. But these doctrines respond to necessities of the heart and conscience which may be directly observed; and besides, they produce in the soul which accepts them, effects which are also immediately observable. To refuse then the examination of facts of this order, would be to pursue a course analogous to that of a philosopher who might pretend to study the human mind in its absolute purity, without making mention of any of those phenomena which result from its relations with other existences. Such a study can only be in reality a vain and sterile abstraction. If these religious truths produce in the soul particular effects; if man is placed by faith in special states; if he finds in the evangelical promises consolations which he does not find elsewhere; if he receives in prayer a force which otherwise was wanting, would not a science of man which was silent on facts of this order, be strangely mutilated? It would indeed be a poor philosophy which should condemn itself to observe silence upon the most elevated development of human life, on the ground that these developments were connected with truths which reason had not discovered. On the other hand it would be wrong to proscribe philosophy on the ground that religion resolves all the great problems of existence, and leaves outside its domain only those researches that are useless and dangerous. Faith is not science, and conscience may have found peace, without the desire of knowledge ceasing to excite the intellect. The development of soul, enlightened

cordingly, M. de Biran attempted to reset and complete his philosophy according to his new experience and enlightenment: he purposed to form a Christian philosophy, from a psychological point of view; and in doing so he needed to modify profoundly the former exposition of his doctrines. He therefore commenced a new work, '*Nouveaux Essais d'Anthropologie.*' This work, till recently, was unknown, as was also the noble development of his doctrine which was contained in it. Cousin, in his Introduction to the Collected Works of M. de Biran, which he published in 1841, makes no reference whatever to it, and was manifestly ignorant of the expansive heavenward reach, whither the powerful sweep of De Biran's genius lifted him ere his death. Unhappily this magnificent work, though its general plan is preserved, is only a torso—a fragment. It is the broken pillar which guards his grave. The progress of this strong independent thinker, who shines solitary like a star, and whose course had risen ever upward from the earthly mists of the horizon, seems at length when near the zenith to be arrested, but it is only because the dayspring from on high had visited him. The night of time in which we saw him, had passed away. The heavenly gates were unrolled above him, and his further progress is in the light beyond. In the month of October 1823, M. de Biran drew up the plan of his new work: nine months afterwards he was dead.

II.

The exposition of M. de Biran's '*Essai sur les Fondements de la Psychologie,*' introduces us to the subtle observations and analyses which he made in the realm of consciousness, and by which he overthrows the sensational doctrine. Let M. Cousin give the key-note of the exposition.

'The reigning philosophy engendered successively all its faculties, as well as all its ideas, from sensation, which it explained by the excitement of the brain, produced by impressions made upon the external organs. Man was thus nothing more than the result of organization, and all the science of man an appendix to physiology. M. de Biran has demonstrated that all this is a mass of hypotheses, and that in returning to observation and experience we find among the real facts which must constitute a true science of man, one fact as real as the others, which mixes itself, indeed, with sensation, but is not explicable by it, which has organic conditions, but which is

'and justified by the communication of a superior and divine life, far from raising an obstacle to the study of man, furnishes him on the contrary with the object of his richest developments and his loftiest thoughts.'—(Vie de M. de Biran, pp. 108, 109.)

distinct and independent from our organization, viz., activity ; and he has distinguished this activity from all that does not belong to it. He has traced it to its source ; he has followed it in all its developments ; he has restored its place in the intellectual life ; and from this "ensemble" of observations and ideas has produced a theory more or less extended, but profound,—most true in itself, indestructible in its bases, and which a complete philosophy must comprehend and fit in its proper place.'—(Fragm. Philos., tome deux., pp. 66, 67.)

M. de Biran sought in consciousness that element which was the necessary condition of consciousness itself, which, therefore, is the condition of all knowledge, and which, as consciousness is the essential characteristic of the sentiment of personality, becomes the condition of that sentiment of the knowledge of oneself. A man may exist without consciousness, without therefore knowing of his existence, as in swoons, or deep sleep ; but he knows himself—he says 'I,' only by reason of the exercise of his own activity. For man truly to be, is to act. The exercise of activity is then the condition of personality, of consciousness, and of all knowledge. According to the theory of Condillac, the mind is identified with its sensations, its own modifications ; but in this case, if the mind be only these sensations, it cannot know itself as separate from them, for it is not separate ; or know *itself* at all, for the mind does not exist ; nor can it distinguish these sensations from one another, which is necessary even to the knowledge of the sensations, because it has no existence, and, therefore, no power apart from them, so as to discriminate and co-ordinate them. All knowledge requires that the subject distinguish itself from its perceptions, and that it discriminate them from each other.* Now, the mind is thus conscious of

* The following extracts verify the analysis we have given of De Biran's system, in drawing up which we have been greatly assisted by M. Naville's general introduction. 'Without the sentiment of individual existence 'which we name in psychology consciousness (*conscius sui compos sui*) 'there is no fact which can be said to be known—no knowledge of any kind ; for a fact is nothing if it is not known ; i.e. if there is not an individual and permanent subject which knows.'—(p. 38.) 'Hence the *moi* can only know itself in an immediate relation to some impression which modifies it, and reciprocally any object or truth whatsoever can be conceived only under a relation to the subject which perceives or feels. 'Hence the "primitive duality," an expression which a philosopher has used to characterise the fact of consciousness, so as to signalise the absolute indissolubility which must exist between the two elements which compose it, and which the human mind by no effort can conceive apart. 'We cannot know ourselves in individual personality without feeling ourselves to be causes relative to certain effects or movements produced in the organic body. The cause or force actually applied to move the body is a force in action which we call the *will*. The *moi* (or self) identifies

itself, and in distinguishing itself from its modifications, it at the same time distinguishes them; but the mind is thus conscious only in its activity. Further, Condillac styles all our faculties and ideas transformed sensations; thus, *attention* is a sensation so strong as to become exclusive; *memory*, a sensation which persists in the absence of its object; *will*, a desire which is the trace which agreeable sensations leave behind them. 'Granted!' says M. de Biran, 'but if these be all transformed sensations, what transforms them? Their nature is changed, what changes it?' As Kant conceived the revolution which he proposed to introduce into philosophy to be analogous to the discovery of Copernicus, so M. de Biran compares his work to that of Lavoisier. By discovering the generative principle of acids Lavoisier has transformed chemistry. M. de Biran professes to have discovered the generative principle of mental phenomena in the activity of the will. His system is to show the combination of this principle in its different modes and degrees with elements of another nature.

But this continuous activity, which is the fundamental fact of human consciousness, because it is the condition of consciousness and of personality, is not the mere sense of energy, or an abstract, absolute force which knows itself to be only force. On the contrary, it is force or activity exercised relatively, or towards and upon something. It is *effort*,* and the knowledge of our activity is immediately and indissolubly connected with a resistance. We only act by effort upon that which resists, and

'itself completely with this acting force. But the existence of this force is a fact for the "moi" (or self) only when in exercise, and it exercises itself only as it can apply itself to a resisting or inert object. Force is then determined or actualised in relation to its term of application only in the same way as that term is determined as resisting or inert only in relation to the actual force which moves it, or tends to impart movement to it. The fact of this tendency is what we call effort, or action determined, or volition; and I say that this effort is the true primitive fact of our consciousness.'—(p. 47.)

* This thought is allied to that profound observation of Leibnitz, which is exercising such influence in the schools of science and philosophy in our day. 'To conceive and illumine the idea of substance, we must mount upward to that of force or energy. Action or acting force is not the naked (or abstract) power of the school, we must not understand it, indeed, as the scholastics, to be a simple faculty or possibility of acting, which, in order to take effect or to be reduced to action, would have need, of excitation from without, as it were, of a foreign stimulus. Veritable force encloses action within itself. It is *ἐντελέχεια* a mean power between the simple faculty of acting and the act determined or effectuated. This energy contains or includes effort.'—Opera Leibn., ed. Dutens, tom. ii., p. 18. (De primæ philosophiæ emendatione et notionis substantiæ.)

which makes the action real. Consequently, man feels and knows an essential duality in his nature. Even in actions that are not visible, and even if man were not cognisant of his sensible body, by the senses of sight and touch, he yet has the immediate and purely internal consciousness of an organism which resists his effort. In this consciousness 'the sentiment is inseparable from that of his existence, the soul and the body manifest themselves at once and indivisibly.'*

M. de Biran, however, most carefully guards himself from refining upon his observations of the facts of consciousness; consequently, he asserts that the two terms of this fundamental fact of effort, which is the condition of consciousness, have no absolute existence. They are constituted by their relation to each other; they are, therefore, simultaneous in time; and if one disappear, the other vanishes too. And hence M. de Biran impugns the philosophic dogma that we have an immediate consciousness of the existence of the soul, abstractly or absolutely considered. The fact, of which we are conscious, is the act of the soul (the *moi*) in relation to an object; and upon this fact he builds his system.

According, therefore, to M. de Biran, all the principles which underlie and regulate human thought are derived immediately from this primary fact.

'The idea of *force* has its manifest type in effort itself. The idea of *substance* is derived either from the two terms of the primitive duality which remain the same throughout all variations of existence, or more particularly from the resisting term. The idea of *causality*, is only the expression of the relation which constitutes the primary fact. The "*moi*" (or "*self*") indivisible, in contrast with its variable modifications or sensations, is the basis of the idea of *unity*. The permanence of the relation of the two terms of the primary fact is the source of the notion of *identity*. It is in the essential activity of "*self*" that the idea of *liberty* has its sole foundation. Finally, the first origin of the conception of *space* is found in the interior and immediate consciousness of our own body and of its different parts, whilst the will, with its succession of acts, each of which is done singly, gives the first origin of the idea of *time*.'—(Introduction de l'Editeur, page 58.)

The necessary and fundamental notions of the human reason he carefully distinguished from 'general ideas,' which are but

* It is worth noticing the coincidence between M. de Biran's thought and expression with that of the Scotch school in the doctrine of perception, according to which the knowledge of the perceiving subject and of the external object perceived (which is, as Sir William Hamilton accurately defined it, that part of the nervous organism affected) are given together and indivisibly in one act of consciousness.—(Introduction de l'Editeur, p. 56.)

abstracts or comparisons derived from the objects of observation. These two classes of ideas are wholly confounded by the sensational philosophy, and even Kant, in his categories, inconsistently places them on the same level. But M. de Biran shows that general ideas vary according to the objects which give them birth; whilst those notions which lie at the base of every mental act are immutable, and the ground of their universality and necessity he conceives to be their inherence in the fundamental fact of consciousness. The activity of the 'subject' (the '*moi*') being the constant and indispensable element of all knowledge, those notions in which this activity manifests its own nature, abide unalterable, and rule everywhere and always in human consciousness.*

The most original and peculiar section of M. de Biran's doctrine, however, consists in his illustration of the duality of our nature. The subject (the *moi*) is not the whole of man. He accepts and applauds Bôerhave's terse definition: '*Homo simplex in vitalitati, duplex in humanitati.*' Man in the reality of his existence is constituted only by the combination of the 'subject' with a foreign element, and M. de Biran thus distinctly states the object of his philosophical studies to be

'The consideration of the "subject" in its diverse associations with the different kinds of sensation and ideas which can be the object of a psychological analysis. I would thus seek to distinguish clearly the characters and the products of the two living forces which enter into the composition of man, and which, though wholly united in the actual mode of our existence, are no less essentially two, and will never be reduced to unity, without falsifying the true principles of the science of man, and giving the lie to his nature.'—(Vol. I. pp. 133, 134.)

This careful investigation forms the contents of the second and largest volume of the '*Essai.*' Very briefly with the assistance of the admirable introduction which M. Naville has furnished us, we shall note the distinguishing features of this remarkable volume. The foreign element which combines with

* 'The sentiment of the *moi* is not adventitious to man; it is the 'immediate product of a force which belongs essentially to him, and whose characteristic is to determine itself by itself, and in as far as it determines itself, to perceive itself immediately, both in its free determination and its products—in the cause and in the effect, which, bound indivisibly to one another, constitute the fundamental relation or the primitive fact of consciousness. Hence the notion of causality, and likewise of substance, and a whole system of notions which are clearly derived from the consciousness of the *moi*, and which are no more than itself, the products of an external experience or of impressions received from without.'—Vol. i., p. 133.

the active force of the subject is an unconscious life. It is that life of which physiology studies the organic condition.

'It is composed of impressions without consciousness, and of reflex movements that are likewise unconscious. It is the life of the animal, an obscure life in which Being becomes, in fact, the modifications from which it does not distinguish itself. In it is to be found, in a manner, the brute matter of the phenomena of the human mind; *affections* which will become agreeable or painful sensations when consciousness is awake; *intuitions*, or organic images, which will serve as the bases of external representations; *instinctive movements*, of which the will will lay hold; *instincts*, blind appetites, which will be the source of desires. . . . At the moment in which consciousness awakes in the mystery of a first effort of will, the personal force finds a pre-existing material in the bosom of which it develops itself. It acts upon this material, it takes possession of it, it does not emanate from it.'

When, therefore, the consciousness of man is awaked, which is the result of the first effort of activity of the mind, this inferior life continues to subsist with its own laws. What man habituated to observe himself does not feel perpetually arise that life which is in him, without being truly himself that life which is the source of desires which reason does not avow, of joys and sorrows which spring from the spontaneous play of the bodily organs, without any exterior cause; of images, finally—phantoms which come of themselves unbidden upon the interior theatre of the mind?

Reason and the will control in different degrees these foreign elements; but immediately the activity of the mind is suspended or weakened, the inferior life resumes its empire. It is the struggle and combination of these opposite principles which give to M. de Biran the key to the complicated and diverse mental states which appear in man; and starting on this ground, M de Biran recognises in man four 'states,' markedly different, and to which he has given the name of systems.

'The "*système affectif*" is the life common to man and to the animal. It is the *ensemble* of the impressions and of the instinctive movements which result from the organized forces of the body. This life, contemporaneous with existence, precedes the 'awakening of the conscious person.' Till the light of consciousness dawn, it rolls on darkly, and leaves no trace in memory. Its phenomena can be observed only from without, and by their effects on the organization.

It is in the cloudy darkness of this primitive life that the activity of the subject first strangely pulses, and with that activity consciousness begins; and the simple degree of effort

which suffices for this awakening of consciousness characterises the second system,

'*Le système sensitif*.' In this state the mind is, as it were, only the spectator of phenomena which it does not produce. It is aware, however, of its own existence as separate from what is felt, and the sentiment of personal identity arises; with knowledge there is memory. The modes of feeling of which we are conscious are attributed to some cause producing them, because the idea and principle of causality is contained and manifest in the activity of the subject from the occasion of its first exercise. The entire subordination, however, of this activity to external impressions distinguishes the second system from the third, '*le système perceptif*.'

In this system the effort of the subject is more distinct, concentrated, and intentional. In it there is the effort of *attention*. The organs of the body are controlled and directed upon separate objects. Sensations thus intensified and combined become perceptions. In the state characterised in the second system, the dull sensations of which we are conscious are assigned to some indeterminate cause that is not self, but the capital fact of the third system is the judgment of exteriority, which distinctly recognises external bodies. It is by the faculty of 'touch' principally that this knowledge is gained. In the exercise of this faculty, the result of an express activity, strange bodies manifest themselves in their proper nature, giving external resistance to our effort. It is by the attention of the will, moreover, that power is given to subdue the instinctive force of the passions. In the sphere of mere sensation, no power asserts itself to break their sway, or to resist the preponderance of the strongest. But 'attention has the privilege of giving to the ideas upon which it is fixed, a vivacity proportional to its intensity. By this means, our personal activity interferes in the struggle of our desires, opposes ideas which it has quickened and fortified to the immediate stress of the passions, and thus gives man another rule of conduct than that of his instincts.' Nevertheless, in this '*système perceptif*' the mind receives its occasions and stimulus to activity from without. No other knowledge, accordingly, is possible than that which is derived ultimately from the senses, such as the qualities and relations of external objects, and the general ideas which are derived from them.

In the fourth system, '*le système reflectif*,' the mind withdraws itself from all adventitious elements and contemplates itself. It then finds in itself all those intellectual notions which cannot be derived from sensation. This reflection gives finally to the mind the clear consciousness of its own power of acting, and

this consciousness, combined with the idea of time, makes possible the predetermination of our future acts, which is the complement of our moral liberty. Notwithstanding that these notions are inherent in the fact of our activity, which begins with the first gleam of consciousness, yet they are not at first distinctly revealed to us. External impressions engross our attention. Our sense of the objects they reveal, veils the knowledge of our own power, and the laws and use of language rend the veil, and disclose to us our own nature, only when the '*système reflectif*' manifests itself. Very zealously, however, M. de Biran guards himself against one misapprehension, which he conceives to have vitiated many philosophical systems. It is not the mind itself in an absolute state, which is an abstract conception, and wholly unreal, that is known in this highest and last system of human experience. 'In the act of reflection, what appears in an absolute form is the "*moi*" (or self.) But to exist, for the *moi* (or self), is to feel the body. The error of metaphysicians is to imagine that the connection, or the relation of the soul and body, is the great mystery of humanity. It is their separation, real or possible, which is the mystery. As for the connection, it is given immediately by the fact of consciousness, since it constitutes the subject which is thus conscious of itself.'

These four systems sum up the whole life of man. The character and value of every individual depend on the preponderance gained by one or other of the two elements which constitute his nature. At the two extremities of the scale, we find, on the one hand, the free and personal force of man subduing nature; on the other, nature reclaiming all its empire, subjugating the spirit to its laws, and reducing man to the animal. The moral doctrine, accordingly, which issues from this doctrine is plain. To subdue the passive elements of our nature, and continuously to narrow the circle of their influence by the incessant exercise of our freedom, and by the complete possession of oneself, to raise oneself towards the regions of reason and of peace, which the passions would darken or trouble—this is the proper destiny and chief end of man.

Such are the main outlines of M. de Biran's system of psychology, in which it will be seen the leading principles are, (1.) the separation of the two elements in our nature, the one active, conscious—the seat of intelligence and of will, and the other passive, unconscious, which is yet the source of impressions and of appetites; and (2.) their combination, so that they act and react continually upon one another. It will be easily inferred from these principles what explanations M. de Biran

gave of the abnormal states of the mind in insanity, and of the phenomena of sleep. In both cases alike he conceives the activity of will to be more or less completely suspended. The inferior life, and that passive imagination which depends wholly on the sensibilities is then allowed to follow its course, and to substitute the images and impulses that spring from the organization, which in cases of insanity, is disordered in the place of the regular products of the intelligence and of the reflective acts of the will. 'A certain state of sensibility determines, when we are awake, our humour, our feeling of existence, and those reveries which the effort of the will restrains. When the activity of the will ceases, the reveries of the day become the dreams of sleep. The mysterious vital force which is united to the being who is conscious and free, resumes all its power, and rules alone the nature and order of the phenomena.'

M. de Biran gains, moreover, elevated and clear ground for the criticism of the various modern systems of philosophers. He did not embrace within his horizon the ancient world of thought, for his scholarship was limited; but within the range of his vision the Ithuriel-glance of his criticism pierces keenly and brightly. Resting, as he does, the whole science of psychology upon the basis of fact, as observed in consciousness, he divides all modern systems according to the two grand faults which they respectively exemplify into (1.) the *à priori*, and (2.)—the *à posteriori*. Under the first he classifies the systems of Descartes, Leibnitz, and Kant. Under the second, the systems which are founded upon Baconian principles, and which, by a process of logical and just development, ended in Condillac's 'Comparative Grammar,' in De Tracy's 'Ideology,' and Baron Holbach's 'Système de la Nature,' in which materialism pronounces its 'dernier mot.' The fault of the former he conceives to be that, instead of merely observing and analysing the primary fact of consciousness, they abstract one element of the analysis, and realise or formulate it as a logical conception, from which the system is derived by a logical process. He accordingly impugns Descartes' title as the founder of 'Experimental Psychology.' His celebrated aphorism, 'Je pense, donc, Je suis,' M. de Biran accepts; but their agreement ends there. Instead of analysing the elements of this fact 'Je pense,' Descartes, according to M. de Biran, abstracts the element of 'thought' from the 'moi,' the active 'self' which thinks. This abstract conception of thought he then realises as the *mode* of a thinking substance, and from its nature, logically considered, he deduces in geometrical fashion the ideas of

'the infinite' and of 'God,' and from the idea of God the explanation of man and the universe.

There can be no doubt, that Descartes is justly open to this criticism, which the development of Cartesianism abundantly verifies. If thought be the mode of a substance, then God is a substance of which thought, as well as extension, is only a mode. But the infinite and universal substance must contain all substances, as the whole contains its parts; and all thought, as well as extension, are modes of that one substance in its several parts. This is the doctrine of Spinoza. Again, if thought is only the mode of a thinking substance, how can the knowledge of the outer world, or any ideas from without, be conveyed? The thought of the mind is the mode of its being, its inalienable property, existing in itself and by itself for ever. How communicate or add to this mode of a thinking being, what is not itself, and what it cannot, as a mere mode of being, acquire or receive? Hence Malebranche's doctrine of intervention, in which the soul sees all things in God. And further, this idea of soul as a substance, regarded objectively, led naturally, in Gassendi and Hobbes, to materialistic conceptions of the soul. Now De Biran affirms, that the fault which vitiates the fundamental doctrine on which these manifold systems are based, is their departure from the fact of consciousness, which gives only 'force conscious of itself,' and in which the notions of soul as a substance, and thought as a mode of it, are not given. A cause which knows itself in the exercise of its own activity—this is the revelation of consciousness concerning the nature of the mind; and as this activity has an object, or term, to which it is applied, this object is known by the same title as the subject. The duality and the relation of both terms are given in this primary fact, which it is the part of a sound psychology to analyse faithfully. If thought be thus the act of a cause which is conscious and free, Spinozism is struck at its roots. If thought, by its very nature, is active, and relates itself to what is external, the need of Divine intervention to reveal what is external is removed; and a cause which acts consciously and freely is not amenable to materialistic explanations. To this criticism we wholly subscribe; we demur, however, to a limitation which De Biran imposes, unnecessarily, to his doctrine, and which he yet frequently overleaps. He says, we are conscious only of this *activity* of the 'moi' or self. Now, in a sense, this is self-evident, for consciousness is mental activity, and we cannot be conscious when we are not conscious; but the question which has been raised, and discussed more

fully since his time, especially by M. Jouffroy, is of vital importance. Are we conscious only of the *act*? and do we, by a mental necessity, refer the act to a cause producing it, of which we are not immediately conscious? or are we immediately conscious of the cause itself—the soul in its action? Whether ontology is a possible science or not depends on the answer given to this question. Acts are phenomenal as well as modes. If we only know these immediately, and are simply compelled by an inevitable law to refer them to a cause or substance, which is unknown, then the immediate knowledge is wholly phenomenal. Our knowledge of real existence, cause or substance, is inferential, and a matter of faith. Now, M. de Biran in explicit terms pronounces for this latter view, whilst the genius of his whole philosophy, and the conclusions he accepts, are drawn wholly from the former. We unhesitatingly pronounce for the former. We are immediately conscious, not only of the effect, the *act*, but of the *cause* acting.* And to vindicate our position, we

* The doctrine is argued with consummate force by M. Jouffroy in his essay upon 'La Distinction de la Psychologie et de la Physiologie.' In that essay he shows the insufficiency of many of the arguments in proof of the spirituality of the soul. They proceed upon the hypothesis that our ideas of the body and of matter are perfectly clear, and hence they start from the assumption of the reality of the body, in order to establish the reality of the other term—the spirit. Jouffroy, on the contrary, maintains that what is clear to us is spirit, and what is obscure is body. Without detailing the observations and analysis of his argument, the object of it is to re-establish consciousness in all its rights, to show the fact that it does not reach in us only the acts and modifications of the personal principle, but that it reaches that principle itself. M. E. Caro has put the gist of the controversy very forcibly (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, 15th March, 1865, pp. 366, 367). 'When I say that I am conscious of my thought, my volition, my sensation, it is the same as if I said that I am conscious of myself thinking, willing, and feeling. Otherwise, how could I know that the thought, volition, and sensation are mine, that they emanate from me, and not from another cause? To recognise a phenomenon which I cause, or to recognise the cause which is myself, is the same thing. Then the internal or psychological fact is not the whole of that which consciousness gives me, for that fact is given by consciousness at the same time as the act of a cause which I perceive. This is the essential feature of the order of phenomena, and this character establishes immediately the distinction between psychology and physiology, because all acts which are thus marked belong to one of the sciences, and those that are not belong to the other. It founds, likewise, the most solid proof of the spirituality of the mind. Indeed, since at the time that I am conscious of the cause which is myself, I am conscious of all the acts that emanate from it; and since these acts comprise only a certain number and series of phenomena, it is demonstrated by this, that the others, the physiological phenomena, are derived from another principle which co-exists in man with his true

have only space to adduce two arguments. (1.) The argument which Hume makes the *point d'appui* of his assault upon the principle of causality, is incontrovertible. M. de Biran has shown how he misapplies it, and how, when rightly applied, it recoils upon himself.* Now we venture to apply it to

'self, and that, therefore, there is a duality of principles, of lives, and of ends, in human nature. What is the principle of the physiological life I do not know, and I probably never shall know, save by obscure inductions. The vulgar call it body. The *savans* will call it "vital" or "animal" force. It is of small significance what name is given to it. Its nature is purely hypothetical, and this is the important point to establish. It is, indeed, the very obscurity of this principle which distinguishes it from the rational principle—from the cause which I call myself. Physiology attains only facts, material results, and supposes a cause for those facts. Psychology, on the contrary, has the privilege of supposing nothing. In the phenomenon of consciousness, it lays hold of the *moi* (or self) as its cause, that is to say, as a being which is one and simple, for every cause is, by its definition, essentially a simple unit. Spirituality is not the result of an induction, it is a fact. We have immediate knowledge of spirit. To gain this knowledge we have only to observe ourselves loving, thinking, and willing.' Such is the last result of that great work of mental analysis and close ratiocination, 'De la légitimité et distinction de la Psychologie et de la Physiologie,' contained in the *Nouveaux Melanges*, pp. 164, 205. It will be seen from this passage that Mr. Veitch is wrong when he affirms, (*Life of Stewart*, vol. 10 of collected works, page 105,) 'The question as between M. Jouffroy and the Scotch school is thus reduced to a mere question of nomenclature. The point of difference is simply as to whether the fact, on its absolute and incomprehensible side, can properly be said to be an object of knowledge or science. M. Jouffroy inclines to the affirmative. Stewart, as well as Reid, prefers speaking of existence on its incomprehensible side, such as the object of belief, conviction, faith, rather than of knowledge and science.' This passage somewhat misrepresents both parties in the debate. M. Jouffroy does not believe that we know 'existence' in any sense absolutely. He denies this knowledge even of the mind. We only know it relatively as acting, and as manifesting its nature in its acts. To conceive abstract existence apart from qualities or properties is impossible. But the question with regard to the mind is, Do we know the cause itself which acts, or simply the actions from which we infer an unknown cause? No matter what the fixed and assured conviction with which this inference is held, a wide chasm is placed between those who hold that we have immediate knowledge only of mental phenomena, to which, by an inevitable law of belief, we must assign an efficient cause—the mind, and those who hold that we are conscious of the active cause itself in its activity. Messrs. Reid and Stewart speak merely of a conviction, of the existence of the mind and of its unity, accompanying the consciousness of phenomena, but never that the existence and unity of the mind are themselves given immediately in consciousness. As we have said in the text of the article; by no deduction directed by the laws of reason, can the unity of the mind be absolutely demonstrated; and further, the fact of this unity is involved in the possibility of this deduction, for otherwise, what tenure holds the premises and the conclusion together?

* 'Œuvres Inédites,' vol. i., pp.258—276.

M. de Biran's doctrine. It is variously expressed by Hume:—*e.g.* 'When we know a power, we know that very circumstance in the cause by which it is enabled to produce the effect; for these are supposed to be synonymous. We must, therefore, know both the cause and the effect, and the relation between them.' 'Were it—*i.e.* the original power—known, its effect must also be known, since all power is relative to its effect. And *vice versa*, if the effect be not known, the power cannot be known or felt,'* If then, according to this incontestable principle, the effect be known as effect; if the activity be known as the activity of the 'moi,' the cause—the 'moi'—must be known in that relation. The original power is not inferred, but is known immediately in its effect. (2.) If the effect alone,—*i.e.* the act—is known, whence our knowledge of the unity and identity of 'self?' Acts are manifold. Continuous activity—the phrase which M. de Biran uses—is but an unbroken succession of acts. But self (the 'moi' of M. de Biran) is known to be one and indivisible. The belief of a cause abiding, absolutely, one and the same, cannot by any law of reason be inferred from a variety of successive acts, though these acts be unintermittent. Therefore, this deepest primordial knowledge of the unity and identity of 'self' must be given immediately in consciousness; otherwise it has no origin whatever. And, further, this unity and identity of self lie at the basis of all reasoning, and are necessary to give coherence and value thereto. To reason from phenomena to the one primordial cause is a suicidal process, and impossible. For, how shall the premises and the successive acts of the mind, employed in a deduction, be held together till the inevitable conclusion appear, if there be not unity in the mind, which thus passes from one to another, and links both in a unity which it communicates from itself? To infer that the spiritual cause continues one and identical, assumes a mind one and identical, which makes the inference, else how are the two successive thoughts given in the premises brought into any connection whatever with each other? They are separate as grains of sand. What fuses them into the unity of an inference? To pass from thought to thought implies a unity previous to and abiding with the succession, and which, moreover, binds the sequences into a unity, which of themselves they do not contain, and cannot reveal or prove. It is not then the act or the activity of the mind which is known and imputed to a 'one' cause. It is the 'one' cause which is directly revealed in consciousness, acting variously in different relations. And this immediate consciousness of unity, continuance, and identity,

* 'Hume's Essays,' Ed. 1768, vol. ii., p. 80-2.

forms our notion of substance. ('Being' as distinguished from 'becoming,' τὸ ὄν as distinguished from τὸ φαινόμενον.) In the case of mind, this substance is given in consciousness at the same time as a cause which is conscious and free.

Leibnitz corrected the geometrical procedure of the Cartesian philosophy, and showed that the fundamental fact in consciousness, and also in the natural world, was 'force,' the activity of which could not be determined as geometers determine the modes of abstract substance. But M. de Biran profoundly touches the spring of the errors which again flowed from Leibnitzian doctrine, in that Leibnitz, he affirms, regards 'force' as a 'realised abstraction.' Mere force regarded thus absolutely must develop itself according to its law. Every being is such a force, the body and the soul are such forces, and the agreement of their respective actions, which are self-developed, is the result of a pre-established harmony.*

Now, M. de Biran shows that we have no consciousness, and therefore no knowledge of force thus abstracted from all relation, and self-developing, and that in formulating his doctrine, Leibnitz has passed from the region of facts into that of hypothesis. We know the primordial 'cause' within, not absolutely, but relatively; we know it as it acts, and as it is resisted and thus acted upon. In the fact of consciousness, therefore, that mutual relation and influence of the soul and body are given which Leibnitz ignores, and which he afterwards seeks to replace by the theory of forces absolutely independent concurring in their independent movements by reason of a predestined arrangement, which is a necessity—a fate. In its ultimate logical issues this system, resting on the idea of active force, ends in fatalism as certainly as the Cartesian, which is founded on the idea of mere 'sub-

* 'Dans notre corps tout s'exécute conformément aux résolutions de 'notre volonté.'—(Preface to Theodice, p. 476. See also *passim* in 'Nouveaux Essais,' pp. 108, 127, 132, &c. Edit. Erdmann.) It deserves, however, a more careful appreciation of this great thinker's works than they have yet received in our country to determine the mode and measure of the influence which the 'Monads,' principles of active force, exercise upon each other. M. Cousin affirms, and no philosopher has honoured Leibnitz with more reverential and painstaking study, that 'According to monadology, all the monads act upon and influence each other. But 'what is the nature of that action?' It is on this point that we need to understand Leibnitz. The action of one monad upon another cannot, indeed, go so far as to change the nature of that monad, that is to say, its proper activity, which, according to the system of Leibnitz, it must do 'if it become the cause of its determinations. It is not the cause of its determinations, but only of its perceptions, or, as we should now say, its sensations. The determination of a being which is a real cause belongs only to itself; but its sensations are otherwise; they come from without, and are 'the effect of other beings or of exterior causes.'—Fragm. Philos., p. 80.

stance.' And for the reason that M. de Biran adduces, both systems make certain abstractions their bases, and are thus drawn away from the sphere of observation and of reality.

M. de Biran had not sufficiently mastered the peculiar principles of the Kantian philosophy to give equal value to his criticism of it, and the criticism of the *à posteriori* or sensational doctrine has been already described. The teachers of this philosophy assume 'the "moi" to be present in the first idea of sensation, but they make no study of that *moi*. They inquire into neither its origin nor its nature; and consequently misapprehend 'wholly the part taken by the subject in the fact of consciousness.'

III.

The philosophy of M. de Biran has been rapidly, and, according to our ability, accurately sketched; and our philosophical readers will endorse our opinion, that it is original and peculiarly suggestive. Its three characteristic principles have become three foundation pillars of modern spiritual philosophy. Briefly stated they are, (1st.) The activity of the mind is the indispensable condition of all knowledge; (2nd.) This activity proceeds from the free, self-determining will; (3rd.) The sentiment of personality is associated with and derived from the will. We accept these principles: but now we venture to point out the defects in M. de Biran's doctrine, which, with the imperfection that attaches to all human work—be it speculative or artistic, loses in comprehensiveness what it has gained in depth. For the most part, however, its defects are deficiencies to be supplied, not errors to be confuted.

1st. A study of his works shows more clearly than our abridgment, that the duality which M. Biran discovers as the fundamental fact of consciousness, and the true source of knowledge and life, is a duality between the will, and the body regarded as the term of resistance to its action. Hence the phrase 'muscular effort' that recurs continually in his pages; and which he considers to be the effort of which we are conscious, even in recollection and abstract thought. The will acts then upon a localised part of the brain, and it is this action, with its conscious duality of force and resistance, that constitutes the whole of our mental activity in thought.*

Being trained in the school of Sensationalism, in which impressions from the organs of sense are regarded as the only

* It must be confessed that this 'self-completing thinker,' towards the close of life, has himself noted the defect we indicate. Indeed, so unfettered and ever-germinating is his genius, that apparently only time was wanted to have observed and filled up every one of the 'lacunæ' now gaping in his system.

origin of our knowledge, he made a great advance when he recognised an active transforming principle in the mind of man, as the condition at once of receiving these impressions, and of changing them into the various knowledge of man; but he misapprehended entirely the nature of will when he gave it the power of so acting upon the organs of sense, as to convert their impressions into mental knowledge. Take the lowest order of knowledge, viz., the mere consciousness of sensation. M. de Biran asserts the body to be the organ of an animal life. This life he considers to be wholly unconscious, and simply the result of the play or affections of bodily organs, but yet is the seat of those instincts, images, impressions, which, as soon as the activity of the will is turned upon them, however feebly, are at once drawn into the region and light of consciousness, and become desires, perceptions, and sensations. Now of what can the material body be truly said to be the seat? If it be material, then only of the affections proper to matter. Can, then, instinctive desires or representative images be considered, in any sense, affections of matter, needing only to be brought into the focus of mental activity, in order to be drawn into the view of consciousness? Or can the will, by force of attention, or by any exercise of its activity, be conceived to change the beating of the tympanum, into sound, the irritation of the retina by the waves of light, into colour, the pressure or scission of a sensitive nerve into pain, or the distension of the blood-vessels of the stomach, into the appetite of hunger? M. de Biran did well to assert the need of a transforming principle to change external impressions into mental perceptions; but to assert that mere volitional activity has this miraculous power, sounds so monstrous as to be absurd. Instincts, sensations, representative intuitions or perceptions cannot be conceived to exist out of consciousness. They must be felt or known in order to be. They do belong, therefore, to that immaterial being which we name the 'soul.' To suppose an intermediary substance styled 'an organic soul,' 'a vital force,' only doubles the difficulty, and in no sense relieves it. The communication of the material impression to this *tertium quid*, and again, the communication to the mind in consciousness of a prepared and semi-mental impression, of which we can have no possible cognisance, is quite as difficult to understand as the immediate but inscrutable connection of the soul and the body.

It is true, however, that there are elements of consciousness, which we learn by observation to be immediately dependent upon bodily, i.e. purely material conditions. All that we can affirm of this mystery is, that the soul has this connection with the body, and the capacity proper to it, of receiving

certain impressions or effects, felt and known in consciousness, from certain bodily causes. But this causal connection being allowed, it is plain that the effect no longer depends on the will. It is not the activity of 'self' that produces the sensation of hunger, when the stomach is empty. That such a necessary, and therefore involuntary, connection is established between the soul and the body may be absolutely demonstrated from another consideration. If there be a schism between the conscious and unconscious life of man, which the conscious activity of 'self' alone overleaps and annuls, and if but for this activity going forth spontaneously into the dark realm of matter, the two lines would flow on together, separated by an impassable gulf; how, we ask, is this activity provoked or incited, to direct itself towards the phenomena of the body of which there is not the faintest consciousness or knowledge? How is the existence of such phenomena revealed or intimated to that 'self,' whose activity brings them forward into its own clear light? Plainly, phenomena absolutely unknown could never attract or direct the activity of the soul. If, then, knowledge is dependent upon the predeterminations of the will, the will cannot be determined by nothing. What is not known, for us *is not*, and therefore the knowledge of these phenomena is for ever impossible.

When, however, we assert that the sensations derived from the body do not depend immediately upon the will for their existence, but upon a capacity of the soul to receive impressions from the body, we do not prejudice another and different question: viz., how far this capacity of the soul, which acts according to its own law, and not according to the dictates of the will, is, either conditionally or derivatively, dependent for its vitality, freshness, vigour, or even the possibility of its exercise upon the primordial force of the will. We leave it an open question, whether the energy of the will at the first dawn of life, streaming through all the departments or functions of the soul, does not first quicken them to action, and afterwards sustain them therein. This may be conceived, though the action of every mental faculty be determined by its innate law, and not by the arbitrary pleasure of the will, as the flowing blood quickens and sustains various glands and organs to act according to their own specific nature.

Can the mind operate in any of its functions, even the lowest, that, viz., of sensation, without the activity of the will diffused through it? We incline to answer, as M. de Biran would have done, in the negative. There can be no consciousness without the sentiment of personality, no feeling of existence without the feeling of 'self' existing. Using Descartes' expression, 'Ego cogito,' the 'cogito' is not conceivable without the 'ego;'

and the consciousness of the 'ego,' 'self,' 'personality,' is impossible, apart from the activity of the will. To be, as M. de Biran says, is to act. If I am conscious, there is the feeling that I am, a cause acting in that consciousness.

The relation, however, of the will to the mind, not simply as a commanding but a vitalising force, has never yet been psychologically examined. We do know, that within the realm of consciousness the energy of the will does give intensity, vividness, and endurance to those sensations and instinctive appetites, which depend for their origin in bodily states; and this appears to show that the capacity of the soul to receive these conscious impressions depends at least for the measures of its sensitiveness upon the action of the will.

A duality, however, is now disclosed in human nature, which is not simply that of mind and body,—as spirit and matter, the one acting and the other resisting in muscular effort; but the duality between that passive life in the soul which is derived from the body, and that active life of the will which is self-derived. It has been said by a French philosopher, 'The spirit develops itself in a living animal, and not in an organized machine;' and Xavier de Maistre, has put the same thought into striking phrase, in his little work, '*Voyage autour de ma chambre*,' whose charming fantasies are the transparent veils of profound truths: 'We, indeed, perceive vaguely that man is double, but this is, we say, because he is composed of soul and body, and the body is accused of I know not how many things, surely most erroneously, for the body is as incapable of feeling as of thinking. It is the *beast* in us on which the fault should be laid, that sensible being, perfectly distinct from the spirit, *veritable individu*, which has its separate existence, tastes, inclinations, will, and which is above the animals, only because it is of a higher order and is provided with more perfect organs.' Now, we do not for a moment wish our readers to suppose that a duality, which extends even to separate personality, exists in the consciousness of man. No! that consciousness is one. Its first abiding knowledge is of itself as *one*. But in this consciousness there exists an animal life, which the will of man subdues into order, or by which it is subdued into helplessness. And here again the truth becomes clear, that this life, though (in the sense we have explained) derived originally and inscrutably from the body, does not subsist therein, but in the mind. Memories, desires, a host of feelings, whose first existence in consciousness was occasioned from without, break in upon the mind when no outward sense has been affected, and no bodily state has been changed. And these

phenomena, too, thus subsisting in the mind, have no longer the accidental connections of space or time, according to which they first present themselves in consciousness; and according to which, if M. de Biran's theory were correct, they would invariably occur, but they partake of the higher order of the law of mind, to which they belong. The laws of association that link them together in the wildest caprices, and revelry of dreams or madness, are mental laws:—laws of relation which have no existence save that which the mind has imposed on them.* Existing in the mind, and obeying mental law, rising up in wayward fitfulness, or evoked and arrayed by a rational purpose, glancing lightly and rapidly over the stage of consciousness, like evanescent shadows which are instantly forgotten, as in dreams and reveries, or dominating there with a fixed, involuntary, and awful presence, as in madness, or passing and staying, and gathering or losing force according to the direction and effort of the will, as in well-disciplined minds, they belong to that dark, haunted region to which Sir Wm. Hamilton, with a kind of lingual contradiction, gives the name of 'latent consciousness,' the region of 'insensible perceptions,' of which Leibnitz speaks — (pp. 223, 224, Ed. Erdmann)—where, indeed, the real springs, the vital forces and habitudes of our nature, all abide, and to which consciousness is but the illuminated dial-plate. It is, however, this original dependency upon our bodily organisation, of certain of these phenomena which abide in the mind, and appear in consciousness, which explains in some degree the important truth which M. de Biran acknowledged, but the grounds of which he did not discover, viz., that the mind does not find or own its personality in them, but in that active self-derived force, the will, which has command over them, and which abets or weakens them according as it attends to and favours them or neglects and resists them. 'They are *in* me, but not *of* me,' 'They are not I.' Such is the universal feeling of man, which finds a voice in every human language, and a response in every human soul. Man finds and recognises his true 'self' in the will, which is the self-originating and self-acting principle of man. How it is that this principle, which man calls 'himself,' is woven into intricate vital relations with our animal nature, which contrasts with it in its origin and nature, and yet is to be ruled by it, in order to build up the harmony of our intellectual and moral nature, is verily a great mystery; but man's authority and responsibility are constituted thereby.

* The general laws of association to which for convenience sake we may give alliterative titles, are causality, congruity, and contiguity. We refer in the text, of course, to the laws of relation which are included under the first two categories, the relationship of contiguity may be said to be in part empirically derived.

As M. de Biran erred in attributing to will this transforming power of converting material impressions into conscious feelings, he erred no less in attributing to the will, or, as he described it the activity of the 'moi,' those rational principles and laws, which do not certainly inhere in the nature of the will, and as certainly are not created by its free and arbitrary determination. The formal laws of thought which the science of logic expounds, are necessary, and are wholly independent of the human volition. No man can alter at discretion the great principles of 'Identity,' 'Contradiction,' 'Excluded Middle,' and 'Sufficient Reason,' which lie at the base of all reasoning, and all human intercourse. Two and two make four by no pleasure or device of ours, but by an absolute law of intelligence, which we accept and can by no possibility disavow. No man, accordingly, claims as his own a truth revealed by these laws. He discovers it; he does not invent it. It is no more his own than Uranus belonged to its discoverer, Sir William Herschel. And as certainly as the planet, when discovered, was seen by all other seeing eyes, so a truth discovered is seen by other minds. It becomes a universal possession. We thus learn that as the self-acting principle in man, with which he identifies 'himself,' is associated mysteriously with a nature which depends upon matter, so likewise it is associated with a rational nature equally independent of himself as to its laws, and which as it depends not on him, must depend on that creative intelligence whose laws are mirrored in the finite mind. Man thus stands the mediator and interpreter *both* of the world of matter, and of the Divine Intelligence, in whose consciousness forces dependent upon each of them meet; while he is constituted by his Creator, to be *himself* an active cause, connected with and using both of them, and summing them up in his compound nature, yet separating himself from them in his own proper activity and responsibility. Marvellously, indeed, the will of man interlaces its free movements with the 'rational order' in his mind, never destroying its process, yet bending and shaping the results of that process by an influence which originates with him, and for which he is accountable. He acts upon the lower nature of sensation and instinct. He acts, too, upon the higher nature of reason. Yet the individual sensation which no one else feels but himself is not his, nor derived from him. He receives it, endures or enjoys it, but it is alien to his true self. Nor can he any more claim the rational law, which belongs equally to all men, to be himself, or derived from him. He acknowledges it and obeys it. But its origin and true nature are divine.

Much less, then, do the fundamental notions, which are the basis not of judgment or reasoning, but of all thought—the a

priori principles, which are the very foundations of intelligence, and which give subsistence and reality to every conception, come from the activity of the will. M. de Biran, as we described, saw them typified in the consciousness of 'self,' and hence he ascribed their origin to it. These notions are those of unity, identity, personality, cause, substance, space, time, the infinite and the eternal. Now, it may not be denied that it is in the consciousness of 'self' that many of these notions primarily manifest themselves; but the origin of them is not thus explained. Whence come the notions of 'one,' 'the same,' 'cause,' which we immediately recognise in ourselves? To explain that which is, to conceive and know its nature, there must be in the mind those notions which that knowledge and explanation fundamentally involve.* 'Activity' is not knowledge. The will is not reason. Reason may, indeed, discover the nature of the will. Nor can the will ever understand its own nature till reason thus discover it.

Further, we ask whence the universality and absoluteness of these notions, and whence the objective reality—the fact of certitude, connected with them, in which we see them to be not merely notions of the understanding, but principles of belief? Here M. Cousin shall be the critic of his master. What shall we say, M. Cousin inquires, when we have to explain by the will not only ideas but principles, and again, principles marked by the characters of universality and necessity, such as that of causality? The principle of causality is incontestably universal and necessary, but it cannot be that the perception of a cause that is entirely individual and contingent should be its source. Moreover, it is the principle of causality alone, and not the simple notion of our own individual cause, which leads us out of ourselves, which makes us conceive exterior causes, and from these limited and limiting causes, rise to the infinite and indestructible cause. Suppose that we had the consciousness of our own causative force, but that we could feel and perceive a sensation without referring it to a cause, the exterior world would never exist for us. Without doubt, the principle of causality would never reveal itself, if a positive notion of an individual cause were not previously given us in the will; but an individual and contingent notion which precedes a necessary principle does not produce it. And yet further, according to the induction

* These notions, indeed, are not innate in the sense that they shine there in a pure abstract form, apart from and previous to experience. They are only known to us in the phenomena of experience. This secret light ignites at the contact of sense, but they are the light by which the objects of sense are capable of being known—the master-light 'of all our seeing.'

by which M. de Biran proposes to expand and transport the causative force of 'self' out of self—for he has no ground for believing in any other kind of cause than the voluntary cause of consciousness—what follows? All idea of an involuntary cause is impossible. Not only are there forces in nature, but all forces are voluntary, like that of our own will. 'The magnet does not only attract the iron, it wills to attract it. It could, then, not will to do so. Fate disappears, and liberty alone subsists. So much for external nature. And again, the God of this induction is a God personal and providential; but of what sort of personality, of what sort of providence? A personality full of miseries like ours—a providence necessarily limited and narrow, vain shadow of that eternal and infinite Providence which the human race adores, and whose omnipotence equals his wisdom, and who embraces in his counsels all times and all places. A God, of which "self" is the type and measure, cannot be a partaker of omnipotence, eternity, and infinity.'

Let it, however, be confessed, that again M. de Biran fails not to descry the defect of his system, and partially to amend it. His thought is never fixed. 'More light' is his quest, and he has his reward; and though time was awaiting to mature and order his new views and build up an ampler system, we may gather the fruit of the seed he planted. His intercourse with M. Cousin and M. Royer-Collard, and the studies to which he was introduced by them, led him to acknowledge in man a principle of faith, which, like his contemporaries, he names '*reason*,' or *the faculty of the absolute*, which reveals realities, and puts us in relation with what is universal and necessary. The certitude of objective reality imposes itself authoritatively upon us, and we are no more at liberty to doubt it than we are to question the phenomena which observation reveals to us. How, is it asked, do we know that our knowledge answers to the reality? M. de Biran answers, By the absolute necessity which we confess of believing it. And this faith in the order of rational truths, opened to him the way to that religious faith, in which his life, aspiring and growing towards the light, was consummated. His language is explicit and striking.

'The cause of existences, which is the proper object of the reason, can only be conceived by it as necessary, the absolute, eternal, and immovable, for it is that alone which constitutes the object of reason. All the necessary truths which our spirit knows, but does not make to be such, have the essential character of eternity and immutability. They were before the spirit conceived them. They remain the same, even when the spirit ceases to perceive them. They would be, even if no finite intelligence formed like ours should apprehend them.

How and where then could they subsist if there were not an infinite, unchangeable being, in whom they subsist as attributes in the subject, in whom alone they can be always and perfectly understood?—(Vol. 3, Fragment relatif aux fondemens de la morale et de la Religion.)

This movement of M. de Biran's mind occurs in his later years, and leads us to the last development of his thought as sketched in the new work which his death has left us only as a fragment. Ere we turn to it, we must, however, state one other and grave defect in De Biran's system of psychology, as this flaw ran upward into his religious doctrine, and was the cause of its imperfection. It is strange, that he who analysed so closely the phenomena of the will should not observe the 'law' of the will, the moral law. Whether this law originates in a moral nature, distinct from our rational nature, or whether its source lies in the 'reason,' which is the source of necessary truth, as modern philosophy seems to judge, we do not inquire. The reality and authority of this law is our question.* Is duty to be confounded with interest or desire? Does not the moral law manifest itself in consciousness with so great a clearness and certainty, that it is impossible to mistake that authority and sense of obligation which attach to it, and distinguish it from

* M. Naville has written a striking passage upon the work of Kant in re-establishing in modern thought the sacred authority of the moral law, which we cannot forbear quoting.

'Socrates and Kant offer more than one trait of resemblance, but, on the other hand, what profound differences! The doctrine of the one is that elevated but undecided morality which sometimes seems only to distinguish duty from utility, in order to confound it with the beautiful. The doctrine of the other is a precise affirmation of the absolute and obligatory law. Kant, doubtless, was not a Christian in the full sense of the word, but we cannot overlook the manifest traces of gospel truth and influence in his works. His work was immense, but what was it in reality? Descartes still placed morality at the end of philosophy, and thus submitted its bases to all the revolutions of metaphysical discussion. Kant has placed it at the head of science. He demonstrates not only that duty, being a primary fact, is placed beyond the sphere of discussion, but that the moral order is the foundation of the entire structure of belief, the basis upon which those intelligences may repose, in order to recover certitude, who have lost it in the quarrels of the schools. But whence comes this great thought, of which we are possibly far from having acknowledged the full value, and drawn all the consequences? The noblest genius of antiquity said that virtue is knowledge, and that the lights of the understanding must reform the will. In reversing the terms of this proposition, and showing that the ground of solid convictions lay in fidelity to the moral law, Kant has only translated into the language of the schools the declaration of the gospel. It is the gospel which declares "whosoever doeth evil hateth the light." (John iii. 20.) It is Jesus Christ who uttered that memorable saying "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." (John vii. 17.)'

all other mental phenomena? 'How,' asks M. Debruit, 'confound a law with a desire, an instinct with what is most opposed to instinct, that which does violence to the will with that which draws it down a slope which is always pleasant and always easy? We are astonished to find nowhere in M. de Biran a clear view of the moral law with its standard of obligation. It is indeed this defect which forms at once the vice and the character of his philosophy on this important subject.' What then, without the law of the will which enforces obligation and awakens the corresponding sense of responsibility, shall determine its free action? Some law or principle of action it must have. The Stoics make it to be simply the subjugation of all sensual and instinctive desires, and the ignoring of all outward circumstances and relations whatsoever, so as to keep 'self' disdainfully removed from everything that may assault its peace or fetter its freedom. M. de Biran, though he admired this implacable iron egoism, could never explicitly accept it. He could not deny the reality of pain, or the sweep of surging passions, or the pleasures of society and of agreeable sights and sounds. He tempered, therefore, his iron stoicism with epicurean unguents. The law of the will was to seek happiness in things within our power, and to reduce as far as possible the domain of necessity by the exercise of our free activity. Here the error which blinded his penetrating judgment is tracked to its source. If, on the one hand, the activity of the will be the condition of knowledge, on the other hand, we cannot conceive of any conscious determination, any reflective act of the will, without some aim or object that is known, and is present to the mind in its volition.

Even if it be granted that happiness is to be the law of the will, that happiness must be known in order to control and determine its activity.

M. de Biran contested the fatalism which sprang from the sensational theory, and which made man the puppet of outward impressions,—a subtle and perfect organism, that breathed the music of its thoughts at the play of passing winds, be they soft or loud. He never comprehended the fatalism of the higher necessarianism which enchains man by the united force of rational motives. He asserted our freedom against the tyranny of sense. He did not guard our freedom by the sacred sanctions of duty, or exhibit that feeling of responsibility which renews the mastery of any motives in confessing our obligation to that Divine Law, which will yet only have a free obedience. This law of conscience is the broad arrow, the signet-mark of our Divine Sovereign, stamped upon our will, which attests and vindicates our true freedom.

IV.

We cannot do better than introduce the concluding section of our article by the following extract from M. Naville's '*Vie de M. de Biran*,'

'M. de Biran was led to ignore the received distinction between religion and philosophy, and to conceive the plan of a single science which would give facts of a religious order their place. He was then led to form the project of a Christian philosophy, from a psychological point of view. He must accordingly modify very profoundly the former exposition of his doctrines. The essay upon the foundations of Psychology had remained in his portfolio since 1813. In this essay he had carefully distinguished two of the constitutive principles of our nature, viz., an unconscious life with its special laws, which was removed from any intervention of the will, and a life distinctively human, whose characteristic is consciousness, and whose agent is the will. The proper destiny of man appeared then to accomplish itself in the triumph of the will over the laws of an inferior existence. Now, without laying aside the bases of that analysis, he found it insufficient. In fact, a new element, the relation of man with the Spirit of God, had appeared to him, and that element required such a position as necessarily modified the entire economy of the preceding philosophical construction. The assistance of Divine grace being accepted as a fact, two consequences of equal importance resulted from it—first, that the will does not triumph alone in the struggle against the passions, but needs to be sustained by a superior force; second, that the last end of the will is not to possess itself and to rejoice complacently in its triumph, but to yield itself wholly to God. Indeed, God, since he is the support of the soul and the force of its feebleness, becomes, consequently, its only legitimate end; as the will only sustains itself by grace, it owes itself to God from whom the grace proceeds. At the time of the preparation of the Essay upon Psychology, M. de Biran said with Fenelon, "We have nothing of our own save our will. Nothing besides is ours. Maladies destroy health and life. Riches are snatched from us by violence. The gifts of the spirit depend on the state of the body. The only thing which is ours is the will." From this time forth he adds, with the same author, "Hence it is the will of which God is jealous, for He has given it to us, not that we may keep it and become the proprietors of it, but that we should restore it in its integrity to Himself as we have received it, and without holding any of it back." The triumph of the will over sensible nature, which was formerly the term and the aim of human development, appeared now to be only a means; the abandonment of the will to God became the final aim. The essay accordingly had passed over in silence the capital truth in which the legitimate destiny of the human creature is resumed.

'This new consideration presided over the plan of the "*Nouveaux Essais d'Anthropologie*." Such is the title of the last work in which M. de Biran undertook to develop his thought. This work, divided

into three different lives, the sum of the facts which our nature, when regarded in the successive degrees of its complete development, presents. The first life, or *animal* life, is ruled by the impressions of pain or pleasure of which the organized body is the occasion. This life is the seat of the blind passions, of all that is unconscious and involuntary in us. It is the state of the young infant, before the first awakening of consciousness. It is the state into which we relapse, whenever we abdicate the government of our destinies, and accept the yoke of those instinctive tendencies which constitute our temperament. The states of sleep, of mental alienation, and others analogous to them, find their place here. The second life, or *human* life, commences at the appearance of will and of intelligence, whose condition is the exercise of the will. Ideas and language are added to instincts; personal force enters into combination with those instincts, struggles against them, or abandons itself more or less to their impulse. There is conflict between two powers of a different order. The inferior desires subsist, and make their dominion always felt, whilst the reason catches the glimpse of a more elevated sphere, and a better existence. The third life is the *spiritual* life. The will, instead of seeking a *point d'appui* in itself, yields itself to the superior influence of the Divine Spirit. Conflict ceases then. When man identifies himself, as far as possible, with the eternal source of all force and light, he finds joy and peace in the consciousness of his intimate union with his God. The animal nature is vanquished, the triumphs of the Divine life assured. Effort is the distinctive character of the second life. It is *love* that is required to raise man to the third. "True love consists," says M. de Biran, "in the entire sacrifice of ourselves to the Being that is loved. When we are disposed to sacrifice to Him invariably our own will, so that we wish henceforth nothing save in Him and for Him, then our soul is in repose and love is the good of life."

We have already shown, how M. de Biran was led to acknowledge the existence of God, as the source of those rational notions and laws which constitute and illumine the human reason. But before his intellect thus haply found God, his heart had anticipated, and probably induced its conclusion. In the agony of the '*Cent-jours*,' when Napoleon's meteor-rush from Elba to Waterloo shot conflagration and terror over Europe, M. de Biran thus writes: 'To keep myself from despair I will think of God, I will take refuge in His bosom.'

During the political struggles that ensued upon the settlement of Louis XVIII. on the throne of France, this sentiment recurs with growing intensity, in the journal of M. de Biran. He chafed with *ennui* amid the excitement of public controversy, and the frivolity of gay society. In the retreat of his country home, he felt still more the need of some fixed purpose to

concentrate and elevate his soul; some immovable centre on which his will might rest, and around which his spirit might tranquilly revolve; some source of reviving spiritual life from which his weary soul might drink and be satisfied. The distractions of the capital were awaiting here. He felt that he might wander in his library as in the streets of a city, and dissipate himself with books as well as with friends. It was the want of a firm foundation, of a single aim, of the succour of Divine grace, which he bitterly bemoans. 'I have no root,' he writes, 'no support, no constant motive. I suffer.' This suffering, then, of the orphan soul, thirsting after God—the keen anguish of want, as with the prodigal, led him to think of his Father, and to seek His love. Very strikingly has he portrayed to us, in language which breathes the inspiration of a profound personal experience, the insufficiency and the dangers of that conception of the absolute Being which is gained by the intellect alone. 'When,' he says, 'our feeble intelligence undertakes alone to raise itself even to God, and seeks to comprehend Him in His proper nature, it falls back upon itself discouraged, overwhelmed, and dizzied as at the view of the most profound abyss. God can manifest himself to the mind only by the intervention of the heart. It is feeling which is the mediator between the thought of man and the infinite, the absolute, which is its object.'

We may readily infer from these confessions of M. de Biran that such religious sentiments could not long endure the frigid selfishness of stoicism. Yet it was a long and wavering conflict which vanquished M. de Biran, and brought him from the school of Marcus Antoninus to that of Jesus Christ. There are, in fact, but two moral doctrines which compete for the adhesion and government of men—Stoicism and Christianity. Epicurianism, the doctrine of the sty, however purified and lavendered by the modern disinfectants of utilitarianism, has never yet enthralled a noble soul. Never since the first three centuries of our era have the two moral systems which claim to represent and to fashion the sovereign nature of man,* confronted each other in more open

* In the review of a work written by the most eminent of the younger French philosophers, M. Paul Janet, on the Philosophy of Happiness, which appeared in the 'Revue des deux Mondes,' 15th December, 1864, M. Emile Montegert describes Stoicism and Christianity as 'the two grand doctrines which have founded, once for all, morality in the world.' The happiness they describe and offer is distinguished from that of all other systems by its universality. It is not the happiness of a caste, of a condition. It is equally that of the rich and of the poor. It is, indeed, a happiness which may be the possession of the whole human race, and whoever desires it, emperor or slave, can attain it, and repose there in

rivalry than to-day. They are represented as akin to each other, as the two phases of our moral nature, as suiting severally different natures, and as having an equal claim upon the homage and faith of those that please to accept them. In harmony, too, with this view, Christianity is described as only a more humanised and gentle stoicism. A disintegration and softening of the rigid autocracy of the Porch, produced by the amelioration of manners, the fusion of peoples and ideas, the practical and juridical temper of the Roman nation, the decadence of national virtue in the Augustan age, just as the laxer and more diffusive *κωη διαλεκτος*, took the place of the severer typical dialects of Athens and Ionia.*

the peace of the unchangeable and absolute. The work of P. Janet itself deserves especial notice, as illustrating and almost describing the history and end of M. de Biran's experiences. It shows, by the strictest philosophical analysis, that the testimony of religion is true, that there is no happiness for man save in God. See the range of his argument. Describing the soul as dilating in all finite pleasure, he says, 'if by an exceptional favour it is given to it to possess to the utmost all the blessings to which men attach the idea of happiness, yet the soul will not be happy, for there will come an hour when it will reach the extremity of itself or encounter its own limits. It will then suffer more than before its first expansion, for then it will suffer, not as formerly, at such and such a point of its being, but over its whole extent, and it will have exhausted in itself all its capacity of happiness, without having extinguished the desire for it. If the end of the individual is in himself, this misery is irremediable, for during that long pursuit of happiness he has found that none of the blessings which he successively possessed sufficed him; and now, at the end of the pursuit, he feels that his soul does not suffice for itself. He has accomplished that marvellous journey of which St. Augustine speaks, in which man, hunting after the true object of his being, after having traversed by thought all the worlds of space, arrives at last at his own soul, and finds himself then *tête-à-tête* with himself at the moment when he believed himself to be the farthest removed from himself. Nevertheless, even in this state of extreme destitution his invincible hope does not abandon him. He says justly to himself that since he does not find his "end" in himself, he must have another destination than himself, that the desire for happiness remaining in its entirety after it has been so often deceived by the objects which promised to give it, the true "good" remains yet to be found, and then he adds new worlds to the world he inhabits, and new existences to his own existence to continue the search of that supreme object in which he must discover that happiness he vainly pursues here below.'

* See especially 'Histoire des Theories et des Idées Morales, dans l'Antiquité,' par J. Denis. Paris, Aug. Durand, 1856. A work which Mr. Merivale has freely used in his Boyle Lectures on the Conversion of the Roman Empire. Also, 'Essai Historique sur la Société Civile dans le Monde Romaine,' par C. Schmidt. Strasbourg, C. F. Schmidt, 1853; and 'Histoire de la Philosophie Morale et Politique dans l'Antiquité et les temps Modernes,' par P. Janet. Libraire Ladrangé; and especially 'The Critical History of Ethical Philosophy,' by J. S. Fichte.

We are glad that this comparison of the two great moral doctrines which are confessedly destined to rule humanity should be thus rashly ventured. The hypothesis which derives Christianity from the old doctrine recoils by the contrast of the two doctrines upon those who publish it, and reveals the benign character and incontestable originality, the Divine glory of the Gospel morality. No history could bring this contrast more clearly to light than M. de Biran's, as he wandered and wavered long between the two systems. His own philosophical speculations attached him to stoicism. But though resisting the necessity which the sentiment of his own insufficiency laid upon him, to seek the aim of life and the grace for life, in the God whom Christianity reveals, he was vanquished at length.

It was not belief in the existence of God which decided this debate. For though Stoicism consorts best with the Pantheism in which it found its origin, the ground of its doctrine is not altered if there be a God who promises and vouchsafes no merciful help to His creatures. With such a God the sufficiency of the human will must be of itself. It is here, then—but not only here—that Christianity opposes Stoicism. The one proclaims the force, the aim, the foundation of man's soul to be in himself; the other proclaims they are not in himself, but are to be only and wholly found in God. The one asserts that pain and pleasure are to be ignored as unreal, and are neither to be endured nor enjoyed; the other teaches that pain is real, and is to be embraced and joyously borne, from loving confidence in the purpose of Him who sends it; and that pleasure is to be welcomed as a precious gift, made infinitely costlier as the token of the Giver's love. The one, finally, severs man from all human relationships, resents their claims, and closes the soul in a disdainful isolation from our fellow-men. The other opens the flood-gates of the heart, and sends us into the world, as Jesus Christ was sent into the world, with love and blessing for all men. Taken point by point, the Christian doctrine rises in absolute antagonism to the stoical. The spring and aim of life, the value and truth of life, the work and results of life in each are not different, but contradictory. Which is the doctrine for humanity, which doctrine comes from God? Let each man prove and judge for himself.

M. de Biran did thus judge, and decide. To know the good, he seems to argue, is not to accomplish it. The question, then, is not to aver what man could or ought to be, but to furnish man, being such as he is, with the succour which is needful for him. But stoicism does not offer this help. It gives no support, for it denies our feebleness. 'It is good,' De Biran says, 'for the

‘strong, but not for the feeble; for the holy, but not for sinners. ‘It is made for an imaginary man, and abandons the real man ‘to all the weaknesses of his nature.’ The promise of grace allured M. de Biran to Jesus Christ. It was the winning voice of the meek and lowly One sounding so clearly through all time, ‘Come unto me, all ye who labour and are heavy laden, and ‘I will give you rest,’ which thrilled and drew his heart. Another attraction, however, held his soul in allegiance to Jesus Christ. In Him the ideal of human perfection was fulfilled, and shone in grace and glory. The will reigned supremely, without the tremulousness of a moment’s faltering, over the weakness or violence of passions. And in Him the will, thus crowned, abode in the unbroken peace and almighty strength of communion with the Father. His ideal was accomplished, and grace was offered him, likewise, to accomplish it. These are the two magnets which drew him to his Lord. The external evidences of Christianity exercised little influence upon him, but the internal evidence which grew brighter the more fully he imbibed its spirit and practised its lessons, became the stay of his belief. He realised the effects of faith in a manner which his trained powers of internal observation made him peculiarly acute and attentive to discern. He finds, indeed, that this habit of reflection is injurious. Man has to live, not to watch how he lives; and his warning is impressive, ‘The habit of occupying oneself speculatively with ‘that which passes in oneself—the evil as well as the good—can ‘it be immoral? I fear it, judging from my own experience. ‘It is necessary to give oneself an aim, a *point d’appui* out of ‘oneself, and higher than oneself, in order to react with success upon one’s own modifications.’ In this way, his religious faith, grounded upon the deep sentiments of the heart, and not sufficiently corrected and enlightened by the truths of revelation, was prone to speculative excess. The third life of man, he says, is the resignation and sacrifice of the will from love to God. As the will rises from the blind necessity of the lowest life of sense, so it passes at length into the blessed necessity of the highest life of love. His language, though strikingly suggestive, wears the mystical hues of his favourite authors, à Kempis and Fenelon. The will he had exalted so highly, he now seems to humiliate. But the cause of these expressions, which border on a mystical quietism, we believe to be that the roused depths of his spiritual life had not time to gather themselves into repose, and to find out an adequate and lucid utterance. The water-courses foam with a hurrying tumult when the early and the latter rains descend. Let us

hope that the same cause prevented M. de Biran's recognition and expression of the great doctrines of atonement and pardon. His philosophical system found no place for *duty*, so his religious system has no place, apparently, for guilt and forgiveness. His cry is for grace to help, not for grace to atone. So far he resembles many in our time who rob Christianity of its righteousness and peace, and who have not his excuse. They are denying truth they have known. To him the fulness of the grace in Christ was gradually unfolding itself. It was the deep thirst of his soul he came to slake at the fountain of redeeming love:—rest for the weary, strength for the weak. And this thirst was quenched. Mayhap in the sick months which preceded death, when the vision of a disenchanted life lay behind him, and the vision of a judgment lay before him, the sinner confessed his guilt as well as his weakness; and we know the Lord of Infinite Pity would then bear his sins as He had already borne his sorrows. The last phrase written in his journal points to this hope. It sums up his Christian faith, it typifies his Christian life here and in glory. 'The stoic is alone, or with a consciousness of force which deceives him. The Christian only walks in the presence of God and with God, by the *Mediator* whom he has taken for the guide and companion of his present and his future life.'

ART. II.—(1.) *History and Practice of Photogenic Drawing.* By L. J. M. DAGUERRE. 1839.

(2.) *On the Application of the Chemical Rays of Light to the Purposes of Pictorial Reproduction.* By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, K.H., F.R.S.

On the Action of the Rays of the Solar Spectrum on Vegetable Colours, and on some New Photographic Processes. By the Same.

On Certain Improvements on Photographic Processes, and on the Parathermic Rays of the Solar Spectrum. By the Same.

Philosophical Transactions, 1839—43.

(3.) *Researches on Light in its Chemical Relations.* By ROBERT HUNT, F.R.S. Second Edition. 1854.

(4.) *The Journal of the Photographic Society.* Edited by H. W. DIAMOND, M.D., F.S.A. Vols. I.—X. 1853—66.

(5.) *The Photographic News.* Edited by G. WHARTON SIMPSON, M.A. Vols. I.—IX. 1858—65.

(6.) *The Year-Book of Photography.* 1861—66.

(7.) *The Total Eclipse of the Sun, July 18th, 1860.* By WARREN DE LA RUE, F.R.S. (Proceedings of the Roy. Soc., April, 1862.)

- (8.) *Traité de l'Impression Photographique aux Sels d'Argent.* Par ALPHONSE POITEVIN. 1862.
- (9.) *Traité Général de Photographie.* Par D. V. MONKHOVEN. Cinquième Edition. 1865.
- (10.) *L'Art de la Photographie.* Par DISDERI. 1862.
- (11.) *Principles and Practice of Photography.* By JABEZ HUGHES. Sixth Edition. 1865.
- (12.) *Photography : Its History, Position, and Prospects.* A Lecture. By the Hon. J. WILLIAM STRUTT. 1865.
- (13.) *Researches on Solar Physics.* By WARREN DE LA RUE, Ph.D., F.R.S.; BALFOUR STEWART, M.A., F.R.S.; and BENJAMIN LOEWY. 1865.

WITH photography as a prominent fact of the day, essentially belonging to the nineteenth century, everybody is familiar. Its origin, growth, and variety of application have had no parallel in the history of the graphic and pictorial arts. But notwithstanding that its results are to be found in every part of the civilized globe, amongst the most cherished treasures of every home, that it is the recognised, unerring recorder of science, the auxiliary of the law, the willing assistant of the painter and the sculptor, for whom it does yeoman's service, the art itself is without a history. The records of its first days, although scarcely reaching beyond the present generation, are meagre and fragmentary. To the {initial facts upon which it is based we find occasional allusions as early as the sixteenth century, some of the alchemists regarding solar action as one source of the transmutation of metals, a conclusion doubtless derived from their observation that chloride of silver, known to them as *luna cornua*, was changed in colour by the rays of the sun. A century later, in 1777, the illustrious chemist, Scheele, records some interesting experiments on the same properties in this salt; but his discoveries remained dead facts, without application; and it was not until the commencement of the present century that the possibility of drawing by sunlight assumed a definite shape in men's minds.

In 1802, Thomas Wedgwood, the son of the celebrated potter, published in the Journal of the Royal Institution 'An account of 'a Method of Copying Paintings upon Glass, and of making 'Profiles by the Agency of Light upon Nitrate of Silver,' 'Observations,' by Sir Humphry Davy, who had assisted in the experiments, accompanying the paper. In the brief but interesting record of their experiments, after learning that 'muriate of silver' was found to be more sensitive than nitrate of silver, that white leather when prepared was more sensitive than paper,

and that although the images of the camera obscura could not be secured in any moderate time, yet those of the solar microscope could be copied on prepared paper without difficulty. We also learn the fatal fact, that 'no attempts that have been made 'to prevent the uncoloured parts of the copy or profile from being 'acted upon by light, have as yet been successful.' They had discovered but half the spell; the pictures could not be fixed. The agency they had invoked continued its work until the images first produced by its aid were destroyed by its continued action, and a blackened sheet of paper was all that remained. Although these efforts were unsuccessful, and the idea seemed for some time abandoned, yet from this time we find the science of the sunbeam gaining increased attention, and the Transactions of the Royal Society and other learned bodies began to furnish trustworthy records of the researches into the chemical action of the solar rays, which initiated photography as a science, and immediately preceded its advent as an art.

It is somewhat curious to note that, whilst the actual history of photography is a thing of yesterday, we find premonitions of such a mode of delineation at a period long anterior to its existence, either as a fact or a subject of research. In Fenelon's *Fables*, under the title of 'Voyage Supposé, 1690,' a visit to the Island of Wonders is described, a country in which no painter dwelt, but when a portrait or picture was desired, the reflection of the object was obtained in a liquid placed in gold or silver vessels; the water shortly congealed and retained permanently the image which had been mirrored on its surface.* In 1760, Tiphaigne de la Roche, in a singular book, with a title anagrammatized from his own name into *Giphantie à Babylone*, supposed himself transported into the palace of the genii of the elements, and there learns that these genii can arrest and retain the reflected images of objects made in the 'twinkling of an eye.' Cloth was prepared with a subtle adhesive material, which shone like a mirror, and possessed the power to retain on its viscous surface the momentary images reflected there, and being dried in the dark the picture became ineffaceable. The problems involved in such a method of securing the fleeting images of objects, the dreamer proposed for the solution of the philosophers of his day.†

* "Il n'y avait aucun peintre dans tout le pays, mais quand on voulait avoir le portrait d'un ami, un beau paysage, ou un tableau, qui représentât quelque autre objet, on mettait à l'eau dans de grands bassins d'or et d'argent; puis on opposait cette eau à l'objet qu'on voulait peindre. Bientôt l'eau, se congelant, devenait comme une glace de miroir, ou l'image demeurait ineffaçable. On l'emportait ou l'on voulait, et c'était un tableau aussi fidèle que les plus polis glacés de miroir."—*Les Fables de Fénelon*.

† "It is curious to observe, in passing, the frequency of these coinci-

It is not a little noteworthy, however, that whilst photography as a fact dates back little more than a quarter of a century, photography as a possibility, at least in the phases in which it is now known and practised, is confined to a period scarcely less recent, as almost all the elements employed in the first step taken in obtaining a photograph—the production of the negative—are of recent discovery. The sensitive salts, without the aid of which a negative is impossible, consist of iodides and bromides, and the now indispensable vehicle is collodion; chlorides being now used only in the secondary operation of printing. Iodine, the primary element, was unknown until 1812, when it was discovered by M. Courtois, of Paris. Bromine, an imperatively necessary aid to successful work, was not discovered until 1826, whilst collodion is a still younger child of chemical science. Other of the agents commonly used in photography are of recent origin; but these we have mentioned are the very bases on which the art rests, not simply in its existing modes, but in any form we know in which it could be used as the accurate registrar of transient effects, or to secure pictures of objects in life and motion. Thus photography, as a practical fact, came into existence almost as soon as the agents upon which its practice depends were known to science.

Before noticing its most recent developments, a brief glance at the first definite stages in the history of this new art-science may be desirable. The experiments of Wedgwood and Sir Humphry Davy closed without leaving any more tangible result than the indication of a wondrous possibility. To a recluse philosopher residing at Chalons-sur-Saone, however, the first realization of this possibility was given. Joseph Nicéphore de Niepce commenced his labours in 1814, with a view to give a permanent embodiment to the fleeting images of the camera obscura. Led by what suggestions or inducements we know not, his researches were directed to a channel totally different from that to which his predecessors had given attention. They had experimented with certain salts of silver: he turned his attention

dences, or poetic previsions of scientific discovery. The anticipatory allusions of Darwin to the advent of steam have been often quoted. In a number of the *Guardian*, issued a century and a half ago (Tuesday, July 28th, 1713), there is an account cited of a 'Chimerical Correspondence between two friends by the help of a certain loadstone which had such a virtue in it, that if it touched two several needles, the other, though at ever so great a distance, moved at the same time and in the same manner as a dial-plate provided with letters, to which the needles might point, which enabled the friends to communicate with each other instantly, and hold conversation when separated by continents. The similarity between this conception and the actual working of the electric telegraph is almost startling.

to the behaviour of certain resins when submitted to the action of light. Dr. Wollaston had, in 1803, discovered that gum guaiacum was singularly sensitive to the action of the solar ray; but no practical result had flowed from his discovery. The amateur chemist at work in his quiet laboratory at Chalons, steadily laboured at the problem he sought to solve, until success crowned his effort, and he finally produced the first sun pictures which were not of a fleeting character, and in which the productive cause, light, did not in its turn become the destructive agency. His process has since been superseded, but the principle he discovered, and the materials he employed, are the bases of one of the most recent developments of the art. Ten years appear to have elapsed before Niepce succeeded, his first permanent pictures being produced in 1824. The method he employed in his process, which he named heliography, consisted in forming a picture of asphaltum upon a surface of polished metal. The asphaltum, or bitumen of Judaea, according to the first published instructions, was dissolved in the essential oil of lavender, and spread upon a tablet of metal,—polished silver, although pewter appears to have been also used, as we have ascertained from a personal examination of some of the few examples of his work still in existence. This prepared tablet was placed in the camera, the luminous image being projected on its surface. After an exposure of some hours, during which little or no apparent change had taken place, the prepared surface was again submitted to the action of a solvent, consisting of a mixture of the essential oil of lavender and of the oil of white petroleum. The action of this mixture was very curious: where no light had acted, the bitumen was dissolved readily and removed from the metal, but wherever it had been submitted to a strong light its properties were changed; it was no longer soluble in the menstruum which had before acted on it readily, and an image answering in depth to the various intensities of the light to which it had been submitted was produced. The sun had undertaken the office of draughtsman, as he was before known to be a colourist. Newton had indicated that all the gorgeous hues of nature were due to the decomposition of white light: that all the beauty, all the gladness, all the 'holiness,' as Ruskin has phrased it, of colour in the universe, was due to the varied reflection by various surfaces of an infinity of mixtures of the three primary rays, red, blue, and yellow, which, when combined, form a beam of white light. But now the sun had become draughtsman, and had given a permanent form to the images he had hitherto only transiently created in the camera.

In 1827, having attained a high degree of success, Niepce visited England, and resided for some time at Kew. His great aim was to bring his discovery under the attention of the Royal Society, to whom he forwarded some account of his researches, together with various specimens, some of which had been submitted to the action of an etching fluid to indicate the possibility of photographic engraving. A rule of the Royal Society, and, it must be admitted, a wholesome one for general practice, here interposed a barrier to the consummation of the hopes of the scientific enthusiast. He wished to preserve his secret; and the Society could not receive or pass any opinion upon a secret process. Saddened at such a termination to a long-cherished project, M. Niepce returned in 1828 to Chalons, there to find consolation in a fresh devotion to his experiments. His process was never, however, to come into general practice. Ten years afterwards, when he had been some time dead, his nephew and successor, who zealously prosecuted these yet unfinished experiments, when writing to Daguerre, who had been working to the same end by different means, and had by this time made his great discovery, said, 'What a difference between the method which you employ and the one by which I toil on! While I require almost a whole day to make one design, you—you ask only four minutes.' Nevertheless Niepce had discovered some of the great principles which underlie photography, and upon which subsequent practice has been based. Some of the heliographs of Niepce are in the British Museum; but the examples of his process are not numerous in this country.

In the meantime M. Daguerre, a French artist who had acquired considerable celebrity in the painting and management of dioramic effects, had in the year 1824 devoted his life to the realisation of a dream which had taken possession of him—the perpetuation of those images the camera presented to him whilst studying nature for his dioramic paintings. He, as well as Niepce, worked in secrecy: each feared that a whisper of his great project should reach the world, and that he should be forestalled in the great discovery. In the year 1826, however, from the indiscretion of an optician employed by Daguerre, this aim of the visionary painter was made known to the enthusiastic chemist who had so long pursued a similar object. In the correspondence which ensued we have some singular glimpses of the caution and reticence with which they compared notes of their labours. In 1829 they entered into some kind of alliance or partnership in their great pursuit, a certain caution still characterising their interchanges of experience. In 1832, some years after the establishment of this partnership, we find

Niepce writing to Daguerre referring to the use of iodine, which he had employed, but with a different aim, some years before :—
‘ May I entreat of you to tell me, at your earliest convenience, how you employ it? Whether it is in a solid form, or in a state of solution in a liquid?’ Daguerre’s pictures were produced on iodised silver plates : by what steps he arrived at this discovery, and at what period success crowned his efforts, we have no certain record. That he pursued his labours with a zeal inexplicable to the matter-of-fact people by whom he was surrounded, and that he was more fortunate in his domestic relations than was Bernard Pallisy, the potter, we have reason to believe. Nevertheless, we hear of Daguerre’s wife consulting a medical friend on the symptoms of insanity in her husband which such a devotion to a chimera implied. That he pursued his labours somewhat empirically we have also reason to believe, groping with more sagacity than knowledge, supported in his efforts by that high faith in an unseen possibility which is often born of strong desire. A history of the processes of thought, and the experimental efforts of a comparatively unscientific man in conducting such an investigation, and the grounds of the faith which sustained him through years of fruitless search for an unknown thing in an unknown region, would have been most interesting and instructive. His greatest discovery appears to have been the result of happy chance. Working with plates of silver which had been submitted to the fumes of iodine, he strove to obtain an image on the camera which should be visible and permanent. Heart-sick with disappointment, he put away in a cupboard which contained a heterogeneous assemblage of chemicals—his broken spells and fruitless charms—the tablets which bore no record of the image to which they had been submitted on the camera. Taking up one of these tablets one day in order to clean it and recommence experiments upon it, to his surprise he found a perfectly delineated picture thereon. The circumstance was incomprehensible : no picture had been there when the plate was put away ; but here in its minutest detail was the image to which the plate had been submitted. The operation was repeated with like success. A few hours in the magic cupboard produced a picture on the iodised tablet which showed no trace of anything of the kind before. After long and puzzling search, a vessel containing mercury, a substance which slowly vaporises at the ordinary temperature of the atmosphere, was found to be the cause. The action of light on the iodide of silver, although not made apparent by any visible change, had actually impressed a latent image on the surface, sufficient to determine the deposition of

the vapours of mercury on certain parts where light had acted, and thus bring out or develop a picture. We can understand at this stage of his researches the earnestness with which he wrote to Niepce urging him to experiment with iodine, although afraid to say how much he had himself already discovered. At length complete success was attained : a certain means of arresting and retaining the beautiful but hitherto evanescent transcripts of nature presented by the camera obscura was discovered, and it only remained to the happy discoverer to bring it before the public and receive his reward.

In January, 1839, the discovery of M. Daguerre was first announced to the world, and specimens of the results were exhibited, the *modus operandi* being still preserved secret. The French Government at once entertained the project of rewarding the discoverer, and in the following June a bill received the Royal assent which gave to M. Daguerre a pension of 6,000 francs annually, and to M. Niepce, jun., a pension of 4,000 francs annually, that the new art might be presented a gift to the world. The savans of France were elate alike at the novelty and brilliancy of the discovery. Two of the most distinguished men of the time appeared as sponsors for the youngest and most beautiful child of science. M. Arago, in the Chamber of Deputies, and M. Gay Lussac, in the Chamber of Peers, introduced the subject with glowing eloquence. M. Arago was pre-eminently enthusiastic on the aid which such a power would lend to science. 'To copy,' he said, 'the millions and millions of hieroglyphics which entirely cover, to the very exterior, the great monuments at Thebes, Memphis, Carnac, &c., would require scores of years, and legions of artists. With the Daguerreotype a single man would suffice to bring to a happy conclusion this vast labour.' M. Paul Delaroche declared that the pictures carried to 'such perfection certain of the essential principles of art, that they must become subjects of study and observation, even to most accomplished artists.'

Thus in the month of August, 1839, the new discovery was published to the world. It was received with enthusiasm, and rapidly adopted as a means of delineation, portraiture being its most early and extensive application. England alone failed to partake freely of this 'gift to the world,' M. Daguerre having entered into negotiations which secured a patent in this country whilst the question of his claims was under the attention of the French Government.

Daguerreotypes have now passed out of public attention, and the process is no longer practised. Possessed of exquisite beauty, and a delicacy of gradation unequalled by the results of any

other process, these pictures had one essential drawback: the image being depicted on a polished reflecting surface, produced an unpleasant shimmer which rendered its examination difficult except when held in certain positions.

Notwithstanding that many improvements were made with which the names of Claudet—to whose scientific researches photography is much indebted—Goddard, Fizeau, and others were associated, and by which the Daguerreotype process acquired a high degree of perfection, from causes yet to be glanced at, this method of delineation has fallen entirely into disuse; and it is doubtful whether, at the present day, it is practised in any part of the world.

With the strange coincidence which has often characterised the history of invention, whilst an experiment for the production of sun pictures was in progress in France, a series of experiments with the same end, but by essentially different means, was progressing independently and without knowledge or concert in this country, the results of which have chiefly formed the basis of the present practice of photography. In 1834, Mr. Fox Talbot commenced a series of experiments in the reproduction of images of natural objects, chiefly botanical specimens, by the action of light on the salts of silver; and on the 31st of January, 1839, six months earlier than the publication of the Daguerreotype process, he read a paper before the Royal Society on what he termed 'Photogenic Drawing.' The method he adopted was to treat writing paper with a solution of common salt, and subsequently with a solution of nitrate of silver, the reaction between the two substances forming chloride of silver, the salt known to be sensitive to light. Lace, leaves, ferns, &c., laid upon such paper and exposed to light, produced a light image on a dark ground, all their markings being produced with such accuracy, that a *fac simile* which, to quote the paper which appears in the 'Transactions of the Society,' 'Would take the most skilful artist days or weeks of labour to trace or to copy is effected by the boundless powers of natural chemistry in the space of a few seconds.'

It was in the course of these experiments that Mr. Fox Talbot made the important discovery upon which the very existence of photography in a large proportion of its applications depends—the possibility of indefinite multiplication of any number of copies from one cliché or negative. A brief statement of the origin of the discovery will best explain the meaning of the word *negative*. It will readily be seen that if a piece of paper be prepared so that its surface becomes blackened when exposed to light, and any object, such as the frond of a fern be placed

upon it, that portion covered by the fern will be protected from the light except where the object is partially transparent, the light acting through such parts just in the proportion to the transparency of the object. The ground of the paper will become black, and the image of the object will be lighter in tint. If the object to be copied were dark in colour, this result was manifestly imperfect, and it became necessary to adopt some remedy. This soon presented itself: it was only needed to place another piece of sensitive paper under the picture first obtained, and again expose it to the light; and the sun's rays penetrating quickly through the light image but with difficulty through the dark ground, a picture was obtained with the reverse conditions, it was a dark image on a light ground. The first was styled, scarcely happily, a *negative*, because its lights and shades were reversed, and the second in which there was no inversion of light and dark was styled a *positive*. If the image were obtained in the camera or solar microscope, of course the same effect was produced. Where the strongest light acted the silvered paper was most darkened; and so in less degree in proportion to gradation of light, the light and shade being inverted in the image first produced by light; and the result was a negative. The negative at first procured became thus the source from which to print any number of positives. The negative thus stands in the position of an engraved plate, from which a large number of prints can be produced. Its printing qualities depend on the varying degrees of opacity or transparency it possesses. Where the brightest light is in the original object, there the negative is blackest and most opaque, where in the object there are the darkest shadows or deepest blacks, the negative is most transparent, the half-tones being represented by semi-transparency. In printing, the prepared paper is found to be impressed with a picture possessing a variety of gradations from pure white to deep black, corresponding to the gradations in opacity found in the negatives. This capacity of multiplication is the cornerstone of modern photography. Beautiful as was the Daguerreo-type process, it possessed no such power. Each picture produced by its aid was the result of a distinct operation, requiring the presence of the original object. The pictures so produced might have been more prized for their rarity, but the art could never have acquired so much importance as a branch of industry as it now possesses, arising out of this capacity of almost unlimited multiplication from one negative.

Mr. Fox Talbot was not alone in his photographic researches in this country. After the lapse of thirty years another generation of experimentalists had taken up the quest which had

been abandoned by Wedgwood and Davy as hopeless. Amongst these the Rev. J. B. Reade was one of the most successful. He had succeeded, sometime before Mr. Talbot made public his experiments, in securing the images of the solar microscope, as well as images by superposition of the original on a prepared surface. To him, it appears, is due the first use of gallic acid, an important agent in the Calotype process. Remembering that Davy had found white leather treated with the silver salt more sensitive than paper, Mr. Reade had recourse to this material for his experiments. Restrained at length in his frequent incursions on the stock of white kid gloves of a lady of his family, the palms of the gloves having materially aided his researches, it occurred to him to treat paper with the material with which he supposed the leather to be dressed, and a solution of nut-galls, which was found an important accelerator, was forthwith employed in all his operations. This agent, which was subsequently of the utmost importance as a *developer*, or means of giving visible form to a latent image, was only employed at first as an accelerator, to facilitate the more rapid production of a vigorous picture. Incidents occurred in Mr. Reade's experiments similar to that we have mentioned in Daguerre's researches. One day engaged in producing on sensitive paper an image of the *Trientalis Europæa*, by superposition, he was compelled to abandon the attempt before the exposure had produced any impression. The paper which was thrown aside in the dark without any trace of a picture, was found next day to possess a fully developed image, the continued action of the gallic acid and silver salt, with which the paper was impregnated, completing the reduction commenced by light.

We may pause here to give something more than an incidental notice to one of the most wonderful and beautiful facts in the history of science, we refer to the production and development of a latent image: an image produced by the action of light, truly and definitely existing in every detail, but invisible to the most searching examination with the highest microscopic power; yet capable of springing into visible being on the slightest contact with a reducing agent. We have seen that Daguerre had by accident discovered that a latent or invisible image existed, after exposure in the camera, on the iodised silver plate, which the fumes of mercury were able to develop. Reade had also discovered the fact that an image had been produced by the continued operation in the dark of the agents with which his paper was impregnated. But the discovery of a fact and its recognition as demonstrating the existence of a principle, are widely different things. The existence of a latent image was

revealed by accident: the knowledge or conjecture of such a fact could not possibly have been attained by any process of *a priori* argument. It was not only unknown, but was without an analogy in the whole range of science. But the existence of things unseen once demonstrated in one process, it was an easy leap to a logical mind to arrive at a conviction that the same fact would obtain in other processes. Mr. Fox Talbot, whose researches at first had been chiefly confined to what he termed *photogenic drawing*, or the production of images of objects by superposing them on paper prepared with chloride of silver and exposing the paper to light, now gathered together the fragmentary facts which had been ascertained, and by these compacted a beautiful system well worthy of its name—the Calotype process. Sir John Herschel had in the meantime employed iodide of silver as more sensitive than chloride of silver. Mr. Reade had used gallic acid; and M. Daguerre had discovered that a latent image was produced by a short exposure to the action of light, which could be subsequently developed by a suitable agent. Out of these facts, by an inductive process of reasoning, Mr. Fox Talbot created his Calotype process, which was patented in 1841, the first photographic process which was perfect in all its parts, and which, notwithstanding the progress of the art since then, is the analogue in every point of the process used to-day. A principle once established, modifications and improvements followed rapidly, and a variety of important processes were introduced, into the details of which it is not necessary to enter here.

Before quitting this part of the history of photography, there is another interesting point to notice. We have seen that the first experimentalists were compelled to abandon their quest because they were unable to *fix* the pictures they had produced: they had no means of checking the action of light when it had produced the desired image. The surface which was sufficiently sensitive to the action of light to darken where it was required to produce a picture, continued to darken all over when the picture was examined in daylight. The first thing to be ascertained by the new race of explorers in this domain of science was a means of removing the sensitive salts from the paper as soon as the picture was formed, so that light should no longer act upon the surface. Solvents for the salts of silver were at the time comparatively unknown. Scheele had dissolved chloride of silver in ammonia, but it does not seem to have occurred to the first experimentalists to use ammonia as a fixing agent. Had they done so, however, the practical difficulties attending its use must have prevented its extended application to the

purpose. Daguerre, Reade, and Talbot appear to have used a saturated solution of common salt for the purpose of fixing the picture, an office which it only very imperfectly performed. In his patent of 1841, Mr. Fox Talbot refers to the use of bromide of potassium for the same purpose. It is to Sir John Herschel the art is indebted for its first perfect fixing process. In 1819 this philosopher contributed to the *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal* a paper describing the action of the hyposulphites, especially noting their power to dissolve the 'muriate of silver.' In January, 1839, stimulated by reports of the discovery of Daguerre, whose process was still a secret, Sir John Herschel devoted some time to photographic experiment, with considerable success, and produced the first print fixed with hyposulphite of soda, the material in use up to the present day.

For some years after the perfecting of the Calotype method, this process and that of Daguerre divided the realm of photographic art equitably between them. A new era was, however, shortly to arrive, when both methods were eclipsed by a process which combined the beauties of each without the defects of either.

In the year 1851 the details of the Collodion process were published in a periodical named *The Chemist*, which has long since ceased to exist. Perfect in principle as the Calotype process was regarded, the materials employed were felt to have many defects. The fibrous texture of paper was a trouble. As the light in passing through the negative in the operation of printing registered with accuracy every irregularity in the texture of the paper upon which the negative had been taken, the print often suffered in delicacy. Sir John Herschel had early in the history of the art, suggested the use of glass for the negative in the place of paper. But it was not until 1848 that an available method of employing it was devised, when M. Niepce St. Victor employed a film of albumen on a plate of glass as the vehicle for the sensitive salts of silver. The results were beautiful, but the process was troublesome, and the exposure protracted. Collodion, a newly discovered viscous fluid, was suggested as a suitable vehicle for the sensitive salts by M. Le Gray. About the same time (1850) Mr. Bingham employed this substance, and recorded its suitability. But it was not until the publication of a practical process with working details by Mr. W. Scott Archer, that general attention was called to the subject. This gentleman was fortunately associated in his early experiments with Dr. Hugh Diamond, to whose executive skill the excellence of the first results and the introduction to

the world of the Collodion process in a tolerably practical form were largely due.

It was evident that such a process must effect a revolution in the art. In simplicity there was no comparison between this and former methods. In delicacy of delineation and freedom from texture or the structural markings of paper, it left nothing to desire. In rapidity of receiving impressions it was marvellous, the operation being, under favourable conditions, literally concluded in the twinkling of an eye. In the improvements effected since the first introduction of photography, the exposure had been reduced from hours to minutes: it was now reduced from minutes to seconds, whilst the results far surpassed anything which had preceded them. It was evident a new era had dawned on the art, of which its present extended applications are but the natural development.

Before noticing some of the more important recent applications of photography, it may be well to glance for a moment at the present practice of the art, and at the principles upon which it is based. We should premise that practice in this art has always been in advance of theory; which, in reference to some points, is still matter of controversy amongst chemists and physicists. All the methods of producing photographic negatives, and the most usually practised methods of producing prints from the negatives, are based upon the action of light on haloid salts of silver, which tends to split the salt into its elements, liberating the halogen, and reducing the silver to its metallic state. Other salts of silver, organic and inorganic, exhibit the same characteristics, but in less marked degree. The silver, which is reduced by the action of light forms the photographic image, whether negative or positive. Much controversy has existed from the beginning as to the nature of this photographic image, and the precise action of light on the haloid salts of silver, to which we shall again advert. It is necessary to remark in passing, that whilst light is usually spoken of as the chief agent in photography—as indeed the very name of the art implies—it is, nevertheless, not to light properly so called, but to actinism that the photographer is indebted for his power to produce pictures. It was noticed by Scheele, that chloride of silver was blackened more readily in the violet ray than in other portions of the solar spectrum. This question which has been the subject of most exhaustive research by Sir John Herschel, is of vital importance in photography. Not only is the violet ray more active than the other rays, but a portion of the more refrangible rays, extending beyond the violet, which

are invisible to the eye, are found to be highly actinic. This actinic power decreases as the other end of the spectrum is approached, and the orange and yellow rays are found to possess no actinic power whatever. Upon this fact much of the practice of photography is based. If all light were equally active in impressing the salts of silver, all manipulations with a sensitive surface must be conducted in absolute darkness, a condition which would render useful work impossible. As, however, yellow light has no chemical action on the photographic tablet, the operations of the photographer can be carried on in a room illuminated with yellow light without risk to the sensitive surface.

Collodion, which is used simply as a vehicle for holding the sensitive salts, and is itself chemically inert, consists of a solution of pyroxyline, in a mixture of ether and alcohol. The pyroxyline, suitable for the preparation of collodion differs from that used for explosive purposes in containing a less proportion of peroxide of nitrogen: it is less explosive and more soluble than gun cotton proper. When dissolved in the proportion of about one per cent. in a mixture of equal parts of sulphuric ether and rectified spirit, a clear, transparent, slightly viscous varnish is produced, which, when poured on a plate of glass and dried, leaves a thin, transparent, tough, waterproof film. To render the collodion available in photography, it is charged with about one per cent. of a mixture of iodides and bromides. A plate of glass being coated with this preparation is plunged into a solution of nitrate of silver containing about seven per cent. of that salt. This operation is, of course, performed in what is technically called the dark room, although it is freely illuminated with yellow, or non-actinic light. The film of collodion, which was allowed to set, but not to dry, before immersing in this solution, is readily permeated by it, and a double decomposition ensues in the film, in which the iodide and bromide part with the bases with which they are united, and combine with their equivalent proportions of silver. The latter having left the nitric acid with which it was combined, the acid unites with the bases which have left the bromine and iodine, and forms nitrates which remain in the solution harmless, but playing no part in the operation. The layer of bromo-iodide of silver thus formed is now very sensitive to the chemical action of light, and an exposure for a few seconds to the luminous image of the camera obscura produces a latent image which the application of a 'developing solution,' consisting of a deoxydizing agent, renders visible, by reducing the silver to a metallic state wherever light has acted.

The nature of the change produced by the impact of light on

the sensitive surface perplexes profound chemists, and has, as we have before remarked, been the subject of much discussion from the earliest days of the art-science, and remains still undecided. The sensitive plate presents a semi-opaque yellowish white layer of iodide and bromide of silver, in contact with a certain amount of the nitrate of silver solution in which the plate has just been submerged. After exposure to the light no change is visible; the most minute microscopic examination discovers no alteration in the appearance of the film: such analysis as is possible has hitherto failed to discover a chemical change. Nevertheless, the light, wherever it has acted, has been sufficient to determine the formation of a vigorous image, on the application of the developer. Two theories of the mode of operation have been advanced. One asserts that the action of light is purely chemical, and that a real although incipient, decomposition is set up, a portion of the iodine and bromine being liberated. The chemical decomposition thus set up, it is asserted, is completed by the developer, and wherever light has acted the halogen is finally driven off, and the silver reduced to a metallic state. The other theory is, that the action of light is physical,—that it produces such a disturbance in the molecules of iodide and bromide of silver as determines the reduction, on application of the developer, not of the iodide and bromide of silver, but of the free nitrate of silver in contact with it, and it is from the free nitrate, it is alleged, that the image of reduced silver is formed. That the action of light, when prolonged, effects a complete chemical decomposition in the case of bromide and chloride of silver, there cannot be a doubt: whether the same result follows in the case of iodide of silver is less certain. The inquiry is full of matter of curious scientific interest, and the experiments by which each view has been supported have revealed some singular phenomena, to which we may on a future occasion make reference.

Leaving the theoretical considerations for the present, let us glance once more at the practical details of modern photography, which bring us into contact with one of those mysterious processes of nature which, in its sudden revelation of things unseen, seems almost creative in its operations. The glass tablet, which we have already described as coated with a sensitive film of salts of silver, is submitted for a few seconds to the image of an object—say of a beautiful face—formed in the camera obscura. No light has reached the tablet but the light reflected from that face. This light is, however, the photographer's familiar spirit, by whose aid he is potent in creating a world of shadows. Let us adjourn to the dark room, and see if his Ariel has been 'corres-

'poudent to command.' Over the apparently virgin surface of the tablet the photographer pours an acid solution of proto-sulphate of iron. He watches in silence; he mutters no 'abracadabra;' he puts forth no 'charm of woven peaces and of waving hands;' but he exercises a mightier magic than ever necromancer dreamed of. He gives embodiment to the *cera effigies* of that beautiful face, not as imperfectly imitated by the limner, but as projected on the tablet by the light reflected from it, literally fixing the image of the mirror. Oliver Wendell Holmes, in one of his delightful essays, affects to discover in photography an explanation of the classic fable in which Marsyas is flayed by Apollo, after the young shepherd had been beaten in a musical contest with the god of music. Mr. Holmes suggests that the god of song is also the god of light, and that he fastened Marsyas to a tree—the head-rest of the photographer—and took a sun-picture of him, the thin film or skin of light and shade projected directly from his body to the sensitive tablet having been by uninstructed persons interpreted as the *cutis* of the young shepherd. Certain it is, that the identical ray of light which, proceeding from the sun to the face to be portrayed, and actually touching it, is projected on the surface of the sensitive tablet, produces the image. As soon as the revealing solution is applied that image springs into visible being: first the strongest lights on the polished forehead or the lace which surrounds the neck, appear; then the lights on the shining tresses, and gradually the less illuminated portions, until every detail is developed, no freckle missed, no scar unrecorded. The image is there, in the silver liberated from its compounds, not in a bright metallic form, but in an amorphous mass of dark particles. It is now only necessary to remove the layers of unchanged iodide or bromide of silver which have not been necessary to form the image, by immersion in a solution of hyposulphite of soda, and the negative is completed, and is ready for the production of thousands of positive prints.

The process we have described is that by which the best results can be produced, and is therefore in common use. For the purposes of the landscape photographer, who wishes to avoid the inconvenience of a portable laboratory or dark tent, it has been the aim to employ what are termed dry processes, in which the plate, prepared at home, and packed in its dark receptacle ready for exposure, might be easily carried, without adding much to the travelling impedimenta of the tourist. Numerous difficulties, however, attend the operation, the history of the attempts to overcome which would fill a large volume. The free nitrate of silver in solution removed from the plate, neces-

sary in preparing the dry plate, must be replaced by some organic body having the power to combine with the iodine liberated by the action of light, and a variety of substances have been tried with varying success. The dry processes appear to have been, with few exceptions, chiefly the domain of the empiric, and comparatively little real progress has been made. The first dry method proposed, in which albumen was employed as an auxiliary to collodion, is still, in various modifications, the most successful and most commonly used system in dry plate photography.

The usual operation of printing is a simple one. It is, in fact, but a modification of that first practised by Talbot in his photogenic drawing. For the purpose of giving delicacy of detail and brilliancy to the image, it is customary to print upon paper which has received a varnish of albumen containing the soluble chloride, which by double decomposition with nitrate of silver forms the sensitive chloride of silver on the surface of the paper, an organic compound of silver being at the same time formed by the contact of the nitrate solution and the albumen. Paper so prepared, and exposed under a negative to the action of light, is darkened in the degree which light penetrates through the various parts of the negative, and produces an image. The colour of the reduced silver is generally at this stage pleasing; but after the print has been submitted to the action of hyposulphite of soda it assumes an unpleasant foxy tint. In the early days of photography, this image was often improved in colour by converting it into a black sulphide of silver; but what it gained in beauty it lost in stability. Various improvements were effected in this respect, and the present practice is to submit the picture to the action of a solution of chloride of gold, when a decomposition ensues in which a portion of gold displaces a portion of the silver, and produces the purple tint of gold in a fine state of subdivision. This adds to the beauty and permanency of the photograph, gold being less liable to change under various atmospheric influences than silver. After this an immersion in hyposulphite of soda, and thorough washing, to remove all traces of the fixing salt, finish the operation.

It is, however, from this operation of fixing that the chief danger to photographs arises. The stigma of mutability has been the one drawback upon photography. However beautiful, however useful its products, the knowledge that they may and probably will fade, robs them of much of their worth; and this probability is caused by the action set up by the fixing bath of hyposulphite of soda.

This bath of hyposulphite of soda is beset with dangers in every stage, and is perpetually liable to changes which set up decompositions causing the formation of sulphur compounds of silver, which effectually injure, and finally destroy the photograph. When the fixation is properly effected, it is necessary to remove, by washing, the fixing salts; but these cling with such persistency that many hours constant change of water, applied by a variety of ingenious machines, scarcely suffice for their entire removal, and any traces remaining are an additional element of instability. It has been recently proposed to submit the washed print to the action of an oxydizing agent, such as a solution of peroxide of hydrogen or hypochlorite of soda, by which any trace of hyposulphite of silver or hyposulphite of soda would be converted into sulphate, which would be more easily removed by washing, or less liable to injurious decomposition if left in the picture. The action of these agents in producing a higher state of oxidation on the hyposulphite is interesting, and may possibly be, within certain limits, valuable. But when the utmost possible elimination of hyposulphites is effected, there is another source of instability, for the entire removal of which no plan has yet been devised. It was discovered a few years ago by Mr. Spiller, of the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich—a veteran photographer, for veterans in this art are often still young men—that a compound was formed between the albumen on the surface of the paper, and the nitrate of silver, which was insoluble in the fixing bath, and remained in the white parts of the finished print, where no trace of silver should be present. This compound of silver is found inevitably to injure the purity of the whites when the picture is long exposed to the light; and to secure absolute permanency in silver prints it appears necessary to find, on the one hand, some other material than albumen to give a satisfactory surface, or on the other, some solvent which shall remove the traces of silver which combine with it. Notwithstanding, however, all the sources of danger to which an ordinary photograph is subject, it is found, when it receives due care throughout the stages of its production and future preservation from injury, that it possesses a very fair tenure of permanency, and although it may, from inevitable causes, lose some of its purity and brilliancy, it will never become entirely faded or destroyed from internal causes of decay. Some other fixing agents have, from time to time, been proposed, the sulphocyanides especially, but their advantages have not been sufficient on trial to bring them into general use.

Notwithstanding the comparative youth of photography, sun drawing having been once discovered as a possibility, numerous

methods of effecting the same end have been proposed : processes have multiplied *ad infinitum*. Many of these are modifications of the original idea, others are distinctly new in principle. Of these a large number are interesting as scientific curiosities, but have never come into practical use. To Sir John Herschel the art is indebted for many valuable contributions, which contain the germs of practical processes. Amongst interesting researches into the photographic properties of the juices of many flowers, and the salts of many metals, the printing processes with the salts of iron are most important. If paper be prepared with a solution of a persalt of iron and exposed to light, it loses oxygen, and a protosalt of iron is produced, which possesses the power of reducing the salts of other metals, which was not possessed by the persalt. Wherever light has acted, a power to reduce, solution of gold for instance, and so produce a picture, is the result. Of the variety of printing processes which arose out of this property of persalts of iron to pass into protosalts in the light, those in which an image in Prussian blue is produced by the action of some of the compounds of cyanogen, are perhaps the most valuable, although as yet they have been but little utilized.

Amongst the proposed printing processes which have been utilized commercially, is one based on reactions somewhat similar to that to which we have referred ; a salt of uranium being employed instead of a salt of iron. The use of uranium was proposed some years ago by Mr. Burnett, and, after a time, passed out of notice. Its use has recently been revived in a process introduced to the public as the "Wothlytype," a method for which especial merits of various kinds have been claimed. The results were, in many instances, very fine ; but, on the score of permanency, little advantage appeared to have been gained.

One of the most promising methods of meeting the cause of fading to which we have referred, arising from the insoluble compound of silver and albumen in the ordinary prints, appears to be found in a process in which a compound, called collodio-chloride of silver, is employed. This method is the discovery of Mr. Wharton Simpson. The formation of the new sensitive compound is dependent on a curious, and before unsuspected, chemical fact, namely, that chloride of silver, formed by double decomposition in collodion, is held in suspension, instead of being precipitated, as is its wont, when formed in other solutions. The chief purpose to which this compound has been applied hitherto, is the production of very delicate and beautiful pictures on opal glass, ivory, and similar substances.

The reproach of instability does not appear destined to cling to photography much longer. A new mode of printing, in which the agents employed are the pigments familiar to the painter or the ordinary printer, has recently attained a high state of perfection. In 1839, M. Monge Ponton made the curious discovery that a solution of bichromate of potash applied to writing-paper became insoluble whenever it was exposed to light. Subsequent experimentalists discovered that this salt, when mixed with a large number of soluble organic bodies, such as gum, gelatine, starch, albumen, &c., had the property of rendering them insoluble after exposure to the action of light.* In 1855, M. Poitevin conceived the idea of utilizing this property in the production of unfading pictures, by what was termed a carbon process, finely powdered carbon being the material of which the shades of the pictures had to be formed. Numerous practical difficulties delayed the consummation desired, and a host of experimentalists gave attention to the subject, with more or less success. To Mr. J. W. Swan, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, the honour belongs of completely meeting all difficulties of principle and detail, and of producing a method which is practically successful, and yields perfect results. In this process the image may be produced in any pigment, the tint and permanency of which may render its use desirable. This pigment, in the finest state of subdivision, is mixed with gelatine, and applied to paper, which can be kept ready for use. To render it sensitive it is immersed in a saturated solution of bichromate of potash, and when dry is exposed under a negative. Unlike silver printing, the progress of colouration cannot be watched, as no indication of the action of light is visible; but the time necessary is measured by a simple actinometer. When the exposure is completed, it is found that wherever light has acted the gelatine is insoluble, whilst the parts protected from the action of light are still soluble in warm water, and can readily, together with the colouring matter, be washed away, the insoluble portions remaining, and imprisoning the colouring matter so as to form a picture. Gradation in depth from dark to light, is obtained by gradation in thickness of the semi-transparent layer of gelatine and pigment. To secure this gradation in thickness, the observance of a curious principle is necessary. The action of light is suffered to take place on one

* Some little uncertainty prevails as to the precise reaction which takes place. It appears probable, however, that the action of light on the bichromate produces a decomposition in which a chromate of chromic oxide is formed, which, being insoluble, prevents the solubility of the organic matter which is entangled therewith.

side of the film, and the washing away of unaltered and still soluble gelatine is effected at the other side. Through the most transparent parts of the negative light passing most readily, penetrates most deeply into the layer of coloured gelatine; where its passage is retarded by the varying degrees of opacity in the negative, it penetrates the gelatine in a less degree. The film of gelatine and pigment of varying thickness on a white ground gives the effect of washes of water colour of various depths, and produces the picture in gradations of pigment, resembling a drawing in sepia or Indian ink. These photographs, besides possessing all the stability which can arise from the use of permanent pigments, possess a remarkable degree of beauty, not often attained in ordinary photographic prints.

The principle upon which this process is based, namely, the action of light in rendering insoluble a mixture of a salt of chromic acid with organic matter, has been applied in a variety of modes for producing photographic impressions besides that to which we have just referred, and there are photo-engraving, photo-lithography, photo-enamelling, and photo-relievo printing processes, all depending on the action of chromic salts. Very early in the history of the art we find that attempts were made to combine the operations of photography and the printing press. Niepce attempted to etch the image he obtained on metal plates. Fizeau succeeded to some extent in a similar operation with Daguerreotype plates. Various other attempts, with a similar aim, were made with greater or less success; but it was not until the year 1852 that any great success was obtained, when a process was patented by Mr. Fox Talbot, which possessed much promise, and which, in various modifications, has been used with advantage since. A plate of steel or copper was coated with a solution of gelatine or similar substance, to which was added bichromate of potash. This was exposed under a suitable photographic cliché to light, which rendered insoluble all the portions of gelatine upon which it acted, and these insoluble portions protected the metal in the subsequent operations in which an etching liquid was employed to bite the plate, and produced a printing surface. This method was only suitable, however, for the rendering of subjects in which there was none of the gradation technically known as half-tone, although for designs in which gradation was produced by the proximity or thickness of lines or points employed by engravers it answered well. In the attempts to reproduce on an engraved plate the effects of a photograph from nature, it has been found desirable to call in the aid of the principle involved in mezzotint or aquatint engraving, and secure a general grain on the plate,

for the double purpose of rendering half-tone and giving the plate ink-holding capacity. Hitherto these attempts have not been attended with perfect success. About ten years ago, high hopes were excited by a method consisting of a modification of Talbot's plan, which was introduced by Herr Pretsch, and gave some very fine results. An influential association, styled the Photogalvanographic Company, was commenced with a view to work the process commercially, but after spending a good deal of capital the concern was closed, chiefly, we believe, from the difficulty of uniformly obtaining presentable results without considerable and costly aid from the hands of the engraver. Mr. Talbot has since made progress in a method announced as photoglyphic engraving; Mr. Duncan Dallas has issued very fine examples of what he terms photo-electric engraving; M. De la Blanchere has issued very good results engraved by a 'heliographic machine;' amongst others, M. Placet and Mr. J. W. Swan have worked successfully in the same direction; but although there is no reason to doubt that ultimate success will be achieved in the application of sun drawing to engraving purposes, the method of perfectly rendering a photograph from nature by the ordinary operations of the printing press has yet to be introduced to the public.

The application of photography to the production of a printing surface on a lithographic stone has undergone a similar history, and with very similar success. After the trial of various inefficient methods, a perfectly successful process was introduced by Mr. J. W. Osborne, of the Government Survey Office, Victoria, and shortly afterwards, apparently independently, by Colonel James, of the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton; the especial purpose of both gentlemen being the reproduction of official maps. The perfect accuracy and rapid facility with which facsimiles, or reductions on any scale can be multiplied by this method, give it immense economic importance, and it is now regularly employed in the Ordnance Survey Office, an annual saving of more than £30,000 being effected to the country by its use. Facsimile reproductions of portions of Domesday book, of the first folio edition of Shakespeare's works, of other rare works have been also issued by its aid. The mode of working now employed appears very simple. A sheet of paper is coated with a mixture of gelatine and bichromate of potash, and when dry exposed under a negative, by which an image in insoluble gelatine is obtained. The coated surface of the paper is now covered all over with transfer ink, and then floated on hot water, which rapidly softens and removes all the soluble gelatine and the ink attached to it, leaving the insoluble gelatine, forming the

image, coated with ink on the paper. This image is next transferred to the lithographic stone, or zinc plate, which is then etched and worked in the usual way. For subjects in line or stipple this answers admirably, but all the difficulties which pertain to photo-engraving as to the rendering of half-tone belong also to photo-lithography. The same modes of meeting those difficulties by the use of a grain have been attempted, but hitherto without perfect success. The most promising effort has been made in a process by Messrs. Bullocks, of Leamington, who have issued some good examples, in which an aquatint grain is employed to break up the continuous tints of the photograph, and render it possible to print them by means of lithography.

In all the modes of multiplying a photographic image by mechanical printing, it will be seen that the aim has been to make photography conform to the recognised modes of using the printing press. But within the last twelve months a method has come prominently before the public, which involves a distinctly new principle. This method was discovered independently by two gentlemen, Mr. J. W. Swan and Mr. W. B. Woodbury, its development being chiefly due to the latter gentleman. In the ordinary photograph, variations in tint are obtained by different depths of reduced silver, having varying depths of colouring power. In ordinary engravings gradation is obtained by large or small spaces covered with opaque ink. But in the new method, the varying depths of tint are produced by varying thickness of a translucent ink.

By the use of gelatine and bichromate of potash, an image in relief is obtained by the action of light. From this an intaglio in copper by electro deposition, or in soft metal by hydraulic pressure, is produced, and this intaglio forms the printing plate. A transparent ink is formed by adding a permanent colouring matter to a warm solution of gelatine, and a small quantity of this ink being poured on the middle of the plate, and a sheet of paper placed upon it, the whole is subjected to pressure, by which the ink is forced into all the interstices of the intaglio, and pressed away from the portions in relief. In a few seconds this gelatinous ink has set, and the paper, when lifted away, brings with it all the transparent ink from the intaglio, which forms a perfect transcript of the original photographic negative. The picture is really a cast in coloured gelatine, showing, however, but little relief. These pictures, resembling very fine photographs in permanent colours, can be produced, we understand, at the rate of a hundred and twenty in an hour, and will probably form a valuable aid to book illustration. After they are com-

pleted, they are submitted to the action of a solution of sulphate of alumina, which protects the gelatine from the action of moisture. How far the simple photographic presentment of any subject can compete with methods of engraving in which the intelligence and artistic skill of the human brain and hand are embodied, we do not here discuss; but the ingenuity of the method and excellence of the results challenge high approbation.

A mode of photographic printing, novel in some features, and which embodies something of the principle common in the application of dyes to textile fabrics, was last year introduced to the public by Mr. Willis, and may possibly find economic application. It consists in exposing paper prepared with gelatine and bichromate of potash, and exposing it under a cliché, which will protect the portions intended to form the shadows, and permit the action of light on the parts which will form the lights. On submitting this print to the fumes of aniline, the reaction between the chromic acid in the paper, where light has not acted, and the aniline, produces a black tint, whilst the portions upon which light has acted, having no effect on the aniline, remain white. In this method, an ordinary drawing or engraving of any kind serves as the cliché, and reproduces a facsimile of itself, without the necessity of obtaining a negative. In the reproduction of maps, plans, &c., its chief use will be found.

Another phase of photographic delineation in which the chromic salts play a part, has been brought to a high degree of perfection. It has been found possible to form the image, obtained from a negative, in ceramic colours, and by the action of heat to produce perfect enamel pictures. Experiments in this direction requiring especial skill and appliances for the management of ceramic operations, have been confined to a few individuals. M. Lafon de Camarsac has carried out the production of photographic enamel miniatures to the highest perfection, rivaling the finest ceramic paintings. His mode of working is made the matter of much secrecy, but there is little doubt that it is analogous to that of M. Joubert, whose chief attention has been devoted to the production of enamels on glass intended for decorative purposes, in which it may, for many purposes, with propriety replace painted glass. The mode of producing the ceramic image consists in coating a plate of glass with a mixture of a bichromate, albumen, and honey: this is then exposed under a suitable cliché, in which the parts intended to be white will be brought under the action of light. The result is, that these parts become hardened, whilst the protected parts retain

the moist, sticky character belonging to such a mixture. Vitreous colours applied in a fine powder adhere to the moist portions, but not to those parts where light has acted. The picture thus produced in vitreous colours is ready for firing after the usual method employed in enameling. It is possible to colour the enamel photograph so produced in enamel colours, and so produce a finished enamel miniature, combining the faithfulness of photography with the skill of the miniature painter.

In the majority of these modes of multiplying the images drawn by sunlight, it is probable that portraiture will ever be the most popular application. The possession of a similitude of that which it loves, admires, or honours, seems to be a passion almost amounting to a necessity of the human mind. The portrait seems to recreate the past, to restore the absent, and to give enduring being to things which pass away. Cowper's burst of fervid affection in addressing his mother's portrait aptly embodies the feeling of every one in gazing on the likeness of a departed friend. Goethe, when he speaks of the strange sweet way in which we seem to talk to an absent friend when we look upon his picture, tells a tale echoed in the lowliest cottage as well as in the palace. Photography could not fail then to be a popular art in supplying a want which the human heart has always felt. But the recent developments of this phase of the art have almost amounted to the creation of a new passion, or a new want. Photography in its ordinary phases had stimulated the demand for portraiture, and brought into existence a new class of portraitists, who were rapidly superseding the old-fashioned race of miniature painters of the Miss La Creevy school, whose pink and white faces with blue shadows, large eyes, and small mouths, had no chance against the realistic but less pretty likeness produced by the camera. But although for many years photographic portraiture was in demand, it was not a rage. Little more than half a dozen years ago, a Parisian photographer conceived the idea of issuing a new style of picture, which he designated *cartes de visite*. The idea took, although the pictures were never employed for the purpose indicated by the name which distinguished them. But whilst no one was guilty of the vulgarity of leaving a portrait as a visiting card, everybody sat for a picture in the new style, and a system of portrait exchange and portrait collection was initiated, which has no precedent in pictorial art, and the statistics of which seem almost fabulous.

A variety of causes contributed to the popularity of this new phase of portraiture, besides its appeal to the latent love of pictures and persons. There was a completeness in the portrayal

which had not before been usual: the man and his dress, or more important still, the woman and her dress, were depicted. The small proportions in which these were rendered, with a precision which secured complete identity, relieved them of much of the harshness which the uncompromising fidelity of the camera appeared to give to larger pictures, in which every freckle, scar, and wrinkle was rendered in black and white without the redeeming aid of colour. Albums for the reception of these pictures were provided, and these once obtained must be filled, first with family and friends, and then with popular favourites, and the photographic album containing the domestic portrait gallery, soon became a necessary adjunct of every drawing-room table. Royalty did not disdain to countenance and contribute to the popular fashion, and familiar portraits, not only of the reigning sovereign, but of every member of the royal family, down to the latest baby, became common in the home of every subject. At first these picture galleries indicated the predilections, tastes, and prejudices of the collector, and the especial bent of his hero-worship was apparent in the selection of the portraits. But soon the rage assumed a more catholic form, and universal iconolatry seemed to prevail. Cobden and Palmerston, Disraeli and Bright, Gladstone and Derby, Louis Napoleon and Garibaldi, Colenso and the Bishop of Oxford, Father Newman and Dr. Cumming, Archbishop Manning and Mr. Binney, may be found in the same album, without impeaching the orthodoxy in divinity, or indicating the bias in politics, of the collector. Neither can any disrespect to the divine be argued if he is associated as near neighbour to a dramatist or popular singer, or the implied greatness of the statesman be called in question, if his *vis-à-vis* be the Chinese giant Chang, or General Tom Thumb. The publishers of this class of portraits could furnish some singular statistics of popularity, curious enough in their way. A popular singer or actor or a successful prize-fighter will sometimes have a run entering into tens of thousands of copies; but the demand will suddenly collapse, and their names will be heard no more. Public men, whose names are distinguished in connection with the pulpit, with literature, science, or art, or in the legislature, are in constant demand, notwithstanding that the especial rage of this collection of portraits has within the last twelve months considerably subsided. Royal portraiture is always popular, and perhaps nothing can more strikingly illustrate the loyalty of Englishmen than the constant demand for portraits of members of the reigning family. Just about the period of the marriage of the Prince of Wales, a photographer in Brussels had the good fortune to obtain sittings from the

Queen and several members of the Royal Family, including the Prince of Wales and the Princess Alexandra, and the sale of these portraits exceeded two millions of copies. One photographer alone in this country has, during the last few years, issued upwards of half a million yearly of members of the Royal Family. After the Royal Family, popular statesmen are the greatest favourites: Lord Palmerston during his life and for some little time after his death being in greatest demand. If the sale of men's portraits afford any indication of the popularity of their principles, it is tolerably manifest that liberalism obtains very strongly in this country, the circulation of the portraits being in the ratio of ten of Gladstone to one of Derby, who is, however, judged by this standard, the most popular of the conservatives. On the other hand, the portraits of Louis Napoleon and Garibaldi have about an equal popularity, the rage for the portraits of the latter being more spasmodic, and of the former more steady. After statesmen, popular literary men and clergymen are most in demand; and after these, men of science and artists; and lastly, popular actors and singers. Bishops seem to circulate in virtue of their rank, the Archbishop of Canterbury having the most extended circulation, whilst clergymen and ministers are prized only in virtue of their popularity. Mr. Spurgeon was for a time in very large circulation; Mr. Binney less extensively, but more constantly.

Of public portraits alone, it is certain that within the last few years the issue has amounted to several millions, the issue by one publishing firm having exceeded half a million a year, whilst the private portraits circulated in family and friendly circles only, have been distributed in still greater numbers. During some years whilst the card mania was at its height, it was not an uncommon thing for photographers who devoted themselves solely to private practice, without any view to publication, to issue ten thousand copies annually, making an aggregate of many millions of portraits issued in family circles only.

Other forms of photographic portraiture have recently shared with the *carte de visite* a portion of the popular favour. 'Diamond Cameos,' in which four small medallions, representing four different views of the face, punched into convexity to give a semblance of relief, have claimed attention. Cabinet portraits, which resemble the *carte* in form and details, but in larger dimensions, are rapidly gaining popularity. Amplified portraits, some of the size of life, produced from small negatives by the solar camera, an apparatus by which all the details of the small portrait are magnified without the optical inconveniences which would result from the attempt to take pictures of such large

size direct, have of late years begun to attract public attention. On the phenomena of binocular vision, and its illustration by the stereoscope and photography ; on the attempts to produce sculpture by the aid of a series of portraits taken all round the sitter, the outlines of which were subsequently traced by a pentagraph, one arm of which, by successive incisions, cut out the figure from a mass of modelling clay ; and many other familiar and unfamiliar pictorial applications, we must refrain from extended comment.

The claim of photography to rank as a fine art has been, especially in relation to portraiture, hotly contested of late years. On the first discovery of such a method of delineation, its beauty received high recognition from the first authorities, and we find Paul Delaroche affirming its high art excellence ; we further find, that the first President of the Photographic Society was also President of the Royal Academy. Later, it has become customary amongst many artists to decry photography as a soulless, mechanical method of delineation, and its results as vulgar and despicable. The fact that photography displaces and supersedes a large number of those who have hitherto claimed the sole immunities attaching to the name of artist, renders it not unnatural that its claims should be regarded with jealous distrust ; and the fact that its facile arms have been opened to many whose vile productions have tainted its reputation, has furnished a ready argument to those who would dispute its capability and position. In regard to portraiture, however, the case is tolerably clear. The painter is not a mere imitative machine : he endows his work with a certain character. The fact that Titian or Vandyke always made gentlemen of his sitters—that Kneller and Lely invested the most common-place damsel with a meretricious charm—that Reynolds and Gainsborough each lent his own specific grace to the portraits he painted, need not be disputed. It is said they painted a soul as well as a face ; but it may be fairly doubted whether that soul was that of the sitter or the painter. If the artist simply reproduce the expression he sees, he does exactly what photography does. If he paint the expression which he conceives to be characteristic of his sitter, he paints a conception of his own, which, whatever it may add of force, beauty, or pictorial value, does not add to the literal truth of the resemblance. When Boswell asked of Johnson whether he preferred ‘fine portraits or those of which the merit is resemblance,’ he received the unhesitating response, ‘That their chief excellence is in being like.’ A doctrine has been long held, however, which, as commonly stated, cannot be fairly gainsaid, that a portrait should represent the sitter at his best.

Jean Paul Richter has remarked that it should be such a perpetuation of the best self that it might induce the original, whenever he looked upon it, to avoid being more grovelling or base than his pictured resemblance. Mankind readily accept the doctrine, and by common consent it is regarded as a painter's duty to give dignity and grace to his portraits. A matter-of-fact portrait is almost an affront. When Humboldt, the diplomatist, who refused to sit to Isabey, afterwards saw his portrait in the picture of the Congress of Vienna, he exclaimed, 'I determined to pay nothing for my portrait, and the rogue of a painter has taken his revenge by making it like.' This notion of painting a man at his best and representing the inner life and character, and not merely a map of his face, is really more specious than strictly true; or, at least, such truth as it contains is often used to give currency to much that is fallacious. The inner life and character may be suggested: the 'mind, the music breathing o'er the face,' may be embodied in a painting. But when this is attempted by altering in the slightest degree the features, a false and conventional—however pleasing—portrait must be the result. Many painters have certain tricks of their own whereby they conceive they add to the beauty of the countenance. Sir Thomas Lawrence, for instance, gives a special curve of the eyebrow to all his sitters; and society admires these prettinesses. But it is easy to bring the matter to a stern test: Is it not tolerably certain that we should prefer to see a good photograph of Shakspeare or Milton, of Luther, or John Knox, or Oliver Cromwell, than all the paintings in which the artist gave us *his* notion of the best self of his sitter? Of Cromwell we have, probably, one of the best of existing historical portraits: his stern injunction, 'Paint me as I am, warts and wrinkles as well,' checked, doubtless, the softening touches of the artist; and Samuel Cooper's head of Cromwell is a portrait to study.

The fact is that a good photograph has a truth of its own, rarely belonging to the highest efforts of the limner: and the term has become idiomatic in our language, that a truthful transcript of a thing is 'photographic' in its resemblance. A good photograph often possesses a subtlety of resemblance which brings out characteristics of race or mental capacity scarcely seen in the original, but which undoubtedly exist. Unexpected family likeness is at times suddenly revealed in the photograph in a startling degree. Nathaniel Hawthorne has illustrated this very skilfully in his romance of the 'House with the Seven Gables,' and expressed his conviction that 'there is a wonderful insight in heaven's broad and simple sunshine. While we give it credit for only depicting the merest surface, it actually brings

'out the secret character with a truth no painter would ever venture upon, even could he detect it.' The painter, it is true, possesses facilities not always within the reach of the photographer: his work extends over many hours or days, during which he may perchance get glimpses of a higher or better expression than that presented to the camera in the few seconds in which its work is accomplished, an accident in nowise to be debited against photography, as it would have rendered that expression if it had been presented to it. That photography is responsible for some sad travesties of the human face divine is an argument of little weight. We do not estimate the character of the apostles by that of Judas Iscariot.

Out of the domain of portraiture, the art claims of photography have been less disputed. Bedford's photographs of the ruins of Baalbec, of the Mount of Olives, the Garden of Gethsemane, or the Lake of Genesareth, and a hundred other scenes in the East, are subjects in which we require the most literal imitative art, and of which we should resent the production of fancy pictures, or even renderings in which the subjectivity of the painter obtruded itself. In the Swiss views of Mr. W. England, and the English lakes of Mr. Mudd, we prize the admirable rendering of charming scenes in nature the more because they are also truthful. The wondrously beautiful instantaneous pictures of Mr. Valentine Blanchard or Mr. Breese, in which the varying phases of flying cloud and breaking wave, of sunrise and sunset, transient glories which the jaws of darkness swallow before a man can say, 'Behold!' are prized because they snatch a grace beyond the reach of art. In all cases where pure imitative art without imagination is required, it is scarcely questioned that the sun is the best limner, 'nature's sternest painter, yet the best.'

The photographer's materials are doubtless less plastic than those of the painter, and less capable of expressing the artist's conception. Yet even in this respect photography is not so mechanical as might seem at first glance necessary to such a mode of delineation. The photographer can stamp the impress of his mind upon his work, and in proportion to his artistic culture will be the beauty of his work. Even in portraiture the 'manner' of the photographer is as distinctly seen as in the work of the painter, and the connoisseur in this branch of art, in looking over a series of portraits, will distinguish with perfect certainty a Claudet, a Williams, a Mayall, a Robinson, or a Silvy. It is not merely in the distinctive arrangement and accessory, in the management of pose and lighting, or in the attention to expression which is apparent; but in the

pictorial feeling of the whole that this manner is manifest. The control over the light and shade, and the force on the one hand or the delicacy on the other, depending much on the judgment exercised in the exposure and in the chemical process of development, all exercise an important influence on the art-value of the result, and effectually preclude the notion that in photography pictures are produced by a mechanical process similar to that in which a tune is ground out of a barrel-organ. Without falsifying, photography can ameliorate if it be in the hands of an artist, whilst it may easily caricature when it is in the hands of one ignorant of art. The latter like Procrustes fits every sitter to his limited appliances regardless of the result.

It cannot be denied that photography has many pictorial offences to answer for, and if its art-claims were to be judged by the productions of eight-tenths of the self-styled 'photographic artists' who multiply travesties of humanity, they would assuredly be found wanting. Every form of awkwardness in position, every style of incongruity in accessory and entourage has been exhausted, every canon of art studiously outraged. Even the special claim of photography to accuracy has been ingeniously destroyed by mismanagement of light and shadow upon which form depends, by the use of bad lens, and worse manipulation, and by the exaggeration of the tendency in photography to mistranslate colour. These and other enormities are set down against photography; but in spite of these, we apprehend that an art with such capabilities will maintain a high distinctive position of its own, however grudgingly its position in the sisterhood of the arts may be ceded to it.

The inexorable conditions which bound the photographer's powers to the production of that which his lens can see and nothing more, closes to him in the strictest sense the domain of imaginative or ideal art. But difficult as the task may seem to give embodiment to a conception of the artist's brain by the aid of photography, it has been attempted with an amount of success which may be fairly said to establish the legitimacy of the effort. Some years ago Mr. Lake Price, a painter of good position, produced some of the earliest photographs of this kind, which excited considerable attention. More recently, Mr. Rejlander, a Swedish painter, who had devoted himself to photography, took a still more ambitious step, and with wonderful skill made some attempts to produce ideal subjects. By a method technically styled double printing, the various components of the picture, produced on separate negatives, were printed in succession on the paper, and by skilful arrangement and combination made to form one harmonious whole. He has more

recently devoted himself to the production of *genre* pictures by the aid of photography, many of which tell a story, or express a sentiment, with more force, truth, and beauty than half of the similar attempts made with pencil and canvas. Boldest and most successful, however, of those who have made photography subservient to their conceptions of pictorial art is Mr. H. P. Robinson, a gentleman who has attained a high position as a portraitist. His success in what may be termed the purely pictorial applications of photography has been most unequivocal, and has been due not less to his judicious choice of subjects suited to the powers of the art he employed, than to the culture and skill he has brought to bear on its application. Eschewing imaginative art as the legitimate ground of the painter, he has devoted himself to a field in which photography may be applied without challenge, the rendering of characteristic scenes of English domestic and rural life, in which he has achieved very high success, and has illustrated very nobly the capacity of this method of delineation for realising, within certain limits, the conceptions of the artist, and the photographer's power to select, arrange, and compose from various materials a perfect pictorial whole. If Zeuxis of Heraclea were permitted to employ five models from which to select the beautiful parts in each to complete the picture of one beautiful woman, surely the photographer may have the privilege of the painter and produce his picture piecemeal, if he can justify his claim by presenting a successful result.

The absence of colour will always necessarily limit the scope of photography in art, for although photography in natural colours has already been proved possible, there is not much probability of the discovery becoming of practical use. Nevertheless photography will always have a position of its own, which will be little influenced by the status awarded to it in art. One of its most serious early disabilities as a handmaiden of art, the false rendering of colour into light and shade, is fast being overcome. That blue is a highly actinic colour, and yellow and red non-actinic, remain facts. That blue eyes are apt to be rendered too pale, that golden tresses are apt to appear in the photograph black, still remains in tendency; but the improvements in appliances, and the increase of skill in meeting difficulty by expedient, have contributed much to neutralise these disadvantages, and enabled the skilful photographer to approximate to a correct scale in his mono-chromatic rendering of objects in colour. This capability has been found of essential value in the reproduction of paintings, an application of photography of essential value to art and artists, as the photograph presents not a translation in which the special manner of the

author is lost, but a transcript of the original, in which every characteristic of handling and treatment is retained. This is a branch of photography which has received rapid development of late, and by its rapidity and cheapness as well as its fidelity, is materially tending to supersede engraving.

The credit which has been denied to photography on the score of art capacity must, however, be conceded to its literal fidelity in rendering facts. That it is not imaginative, that it cannot modify or omit details from its presentments, becomes, in many cases, its cardinal virtue. If it nothing extenuate, it sets down naught in malice, and when it enters the witness-box its evidence leaves little room for doubt. Hence it has taken an important place as an auxiliary to the administration of justice, both in civil and criminal cases. In multiplying indisputable facsimiles of important documents, in indicating pictorially the relative positions of disputed territory, its use is obvious. But it is in its aid to the discovery of identity in persons charged with crime that its legal use is most important. Nearly twelve years ago Mr. J. A. Gardiner, governor of Bristol gaol, addressed a letter to the governors of Her Majesty's gaols generally, pointing out the importance of preserving a photographic record of the prisoners under their charge—a veritable rogue's gallery! which might be a rare study to the disciples of Lavater. It was not with a view to the study and classification of physiognomical types that Mr. Gardiner proposed to secure sun drawings of his enforced guests, but solely with a view to their identification when they visited gaol a second time. 'It is well known to all,' he said, 'who have been concerned in criminal administration, that the most cunning, the most skilled, and the most daring offenders, are migratory in their habits; that they do not locate themselves in any particular town or district, but extend their ravages to wherever there is the most open field for crime;' the best planned robberies, he adds, being rarely conducted by the resident thieves in any district. This migratory, or Bohemian tendency, diminished the risk of identification in the exact ratio in which it brought the criminals within fresh judicial districts and under fresh official inspection, and often permitted expert professional thieves, hardened criminals, to pass off lightly as first offenders, only just stepping out of the path of rectitude. Written descriptions were rarely found sufficiently precise for identification, and hence Mr. Gardiner was induced to try photography, which he found most efficient for the purpose, and strongly recommended for systematic adoption to his brother governors. The success which attended the partial adoption of this plan induced a Select Committee of the House of Lords, on whose Report the Prison

Act of 1865 was framed, to recommend its universal adoption in Her Majesty's prisons.* For some unexplained reason the Secretary of State did not see fit to adopt the recommendation, and photography is only employed where the governors of gaols themselves see its importance.

Where the system is adopted, the portrait of every criminal is taken as soon as he arrives at the gaol, and prints from this negative are circulated, attached to a printed form, in which a description is given, including details of age, height, complexion, hair, eyes, nose, whiskers, and specific marks, and also the account which the prisoner gives of his place of birth, last residence, education, trade, religion, &c. The circular, contain-

* 'Although the proof of former convictions is not one which is directly involved in the question of prison discipline, the attention of the committee has so frequently, during the course of examination, been drawn to the great public inconvenience which is felt from the difficulty in identifying a previously convicted prisoner, that they cannot close their report without indicating both the extent of the evil and the suggestion of a remedy. The committee are satisfied that it is of the greatest importance that those offenders who are commencing a course of crime should be made aware that each repetition of it, duly recorded and proved will involve a material increase of punishment, pain, and inconvenience to them.

'Sir W. Crofton states with great clearness, the prejudicial effect which the difficulty of identifying previously convicted prisoners has had in Ireland, and he has indicated photography as a simple means by which it has been in a great measure obviated.

'The governors of Bristol, Wakefield, and Leeds gaols, corroborate the advantage of the use of photography. Mr. Gardiner says, "I introduced some years ago, indeed I was the first who introduced them, the Daguerreotype portraits of the prisoners, and, from having succeeded in one or two cases, we introduced it more freely; we now take a large number of portraits, and I think it would be very difficult for a man to escape detection in our gaol. I take a stereoscopic picture instead of a plain portrait, and I request the parties to whom I send it to put it into the stereoscope. They have a better opportunity of seeing the man before them standing out in relief. We merely take portraits of those whom we do not know. Railway thieves, and strangers to the city, who are taken up for picking pockets at the railway stations and in railway carriages. We have found out a great many by that means. On one occasion I recollect an officer of mine being offered a large sum of money by the wife of a prisoner to release him. He was offered £100. This was reported to me; and I thought, as the man had only three months more to serve, he certainly must be wanting somewhere else. I took his portrait directly, and sent it round to perhaps 40 or 50 different gaols, and he was recognised at last at Dover. I had an order from the Secretary of State to remove him instead of discharging him. I removed him on a Friday, and on the following Friday he was sentenced to fifteen years transportation for highway robbery," and the committee strongly recommend the further extension of this system, which is inexpensive, effective, and wholly free from objection.'—*Report of Select Committee on Prison Discipline.*

ing the portrait and these particulars, is forwarded by the governor to the governor of a neighbouring gaol, stating that 'the prisoner above described is in custody for trial;' and a request is added that, if he is recognised as having been in custody before, particulars may be forwarded, and also that the circular may be forwarded to the next gaol marked in the route annexed. Thus the document passes through a prescribed route, receiving as it travels the testimony of various governors, intimating that the prisoner is 'not known,' or that he was convicted at any former period, generally under some other name than that now assumed, and is finally returned to the gaol from whence it was issued, furnishing at times curious facts in the statistics of crime, and in the biography of gaol-birds.

As may readily be conceived the prison limner is not often favoured with willing sitters, and strange are the devices by which the cunning of the criminal is manifested in evading this unerring mode of personal identification, which he regards as taking a mean advantage of him. Some treat the attempt with open defiance, resolutely refusing to sit still during the operation; others, with a mock air of submission, sit perfectly quiet during the preliminary arrangements and focussing operation, but move sufficiently at the vital moment of exposure; others, who pretend to have no objection to be portrayed, contrive to produce such an amount of facial contortion, by squinting, twisting the mouth, &c., as will effectually destroy identity in the portrait. In some cases this cunning is met with resolute perseverance, and in others with stratagem, so that in all cases a sufficiently characteristic likeness is obtained. One governor informs us that he generally contrives that the operation shall take place just before dinner, and refractory sitters are informed that no dinner will be dispensed until the portrait has been obtained, a practical argument, the force of which is generally recognised. In another gaol, after the sitter has, by movement or contortion, baffled the portraitist, he, or still more commonly she, is handed to a seat in a well-lighted place to rest awhile and watch the operation repeated with the next criminal. The sitter just rejoicing in the cunning which has defeated the attempt of the photographer, generally sits perfectly still, watching with eager interest the operation for which another is sitting. In the meantime, a concealed camera, within range of which the first victim had been placed, is doing its work, and a natural and characteristic likeness is obtained of the unconscious criminal, who had apparently retired, master of the situation. A strange and sad gallery of portraits, not quite denuded of individuality by close cropped hair and prison grey garb; the portraits

being often secured in the guise in which the culprit comes into the hands of justice. A series forwarded to the writer, by the excellent governor of Carlisle gaol, himself an accomplished photographer, might furnish a mournful theme for the moralist. Not all brutalized, or besotted, or sinister; not all with the forehead villainous low, the square jaw, the coarse mouth, or the eye of wild beast; but in more cases a weak and weary, or a craven and humbled look. Some of the faces remind us painfully of another series of portraits, taken by Dr. Hugh Diamond, of insane persons, and suggest to us the connection between diseased morals and diseased minds, between crime and insanity. Physiognomy, to the careful observer, may often, doubtless, indicate tendencies of character, and suggest phases of mental history. None of the portraits before us look intellectual, or suggest culture: they are mostly of a low type; but there is nothing to suggest the dogged, resisting, vindictive beings, with overhanging felon-brow and sunken cruel eyes, which sensation writers at times attribute to the criminal classes. They are rather examples of God's image degraded and enfeebled by neglect; plants which resemble weeds, because left without culture. The only portrait marked as that of a murderer is that of a weak but not imbecile-looking old man, the mildest in expression amongst a score of criminals.

Photography, as the auxiliary of the detective in tracking the criminal flying from justice, renders most important service.* The photograph of Müller, the murderer of Mr. Briggs, became practically his death warrant. It supplied the jeweller, who bought the plundered chain, with a means of identifying the foreign-looking person who sold it, and rendered the officer of justice, who had never seen him, familiar with his features, so that he detected him amongst the crowd of passengers on the deck of the Victoria when, on a fine summer day, it entered the bay of New York, to give, in a few hours, the murderer liberty in a new world. The 'card' of the absconding fraudulent debtor or embezzling clerk is placed in the hands of Inspector Bucket, and he starts off without hesitation to Australia or America to apprehend a man he has never seen. The universality of photographic portraiture has been singularly useful in this respect. There are few men, open in any degree to the sympathies of their kind, who have not at some time sat for a photograph.

* We understand that the London Stereoscopic and Photographic Company, one of the largest productive houses in every branch of Photography, frequently receive from Scotland Yard instructions to produce as many as 2,000 copies of the portrait of an important criminal at large and wanted by the police.

little dreaming of the weapon it placed in the hands of their pursuers should they at any time step into the paths of crime. The powers of this silent witness have, however, led to singular exaggeration, and the lovers of the marvellous have been treated from time to time with records of the detection of murderers by the image remaining on the dead eye of the victim, which, duly magnified and photographed, has borne swift witness against the criminal. It is needless to say that this is an absurd impossibility. The retina of the eye retains the impression of an object so long as that object is before it, as does a mirror, and no longer. It has never been alleged, indeed, that the dead eye retained impressions, except in the case of murdered persons; the common belief in the Nemesis which attends the man-slayer, having apparently generated this superstition in the domain of science.

Amongst the scientific applications of this art we find its noblest and most important uses. As an unerring means of making permanent register of transient effects, and recording facts in exact science, it has taken a high position, and as presenting a means of preserving the absolute autograph of nature it has already been the agent of valuable discovery. Sun, moon, and stars have impressed their own portraits on photographic tablets; magnetism by its aid records its own daily history; and the barometer records its own variations by photographic impressions. When announcing Daguerre's discovery, Arago, with prescient view, said it gave hopes of executing, in a few minutes, charts of the moon, then one of the most tedious and most delicate operations in astronomy. Since then his predictions have been more than verified. From the first a host of experimentalists have devoted themselves to the photography of the celestial bodies. Dr. Draper, Mr. Bond, and Mr. Rutherford in America, Father Secchi in Italy; Bertch, Arnauld, and Foucault in France; Crookes, Huggins, Fry, Brothers, with a host of others, and above all, De la Rue in this country, are all associated with its rapid progress. Photography has not only enabled the astronomer to obtain ready and accurate record of all the eye could see, but it has recorded facts in connection with the physical history of the sun which the eye could not see, the photographic tablet being sensible to rays which made no effect on the organs of vision. In the year 1854 Sir John Herschel recommended that daily records should be made by photography of the sun's surface, at different stations, for comparison, and in accordance with this suggestion a photo-heliograph was established at Kew under the direction of Warren De la Rue, and others have since been established in different parts of the

D D 2

world. The importance of this constant and exact observation of the sun-spots becomes striking when it is remembered that a singular coincidence has been noted between the periodicity of their maximum recurrence and the maximum magnetic disturbance of our own globe. More than half a century ago Sir William Herschel, in a remarkable paper on the subject, pointed out a connection between the number of spots on the sun's disc and the abundance of the harvest. Without speculating on the fact that stars of the first magnitude, suns of other systems, have disappeared from record, and the possible darkening of our sun, the ascertained connection between magnetic storms and the increase in these spots, is matter enough for grave consideration and careful observation. For this observation photography presents the only accurate and available facilities, and the results have been carefully tabulated by Mr. Warren De la Rue. Other most important photographic researches into the physical aspects of the sun have been made by the same gentleman. On the occasion of the complete solar eclipse in 1860, an expedition of astronomers under his direction visited Rivabellosa in Spain to obtain the most favourable point of observation. During the eclipse upwards of forty photographs were taken, in which the corona and the luminous prominences, or red flames, were finely rendered. In regard to the latter—observed on two former occasions, but the nature of which and whether they belonged to the sun or moon was unknown—it was ascertained that they really belonged to the sun and were not optical illusions, and one prominence was moreover shown in the photographs not visible in the optical examinations of the phenomena. Astronomers in Italy, France, and America, also obtained photographs of this eclipse, which confirmed the observations made in Spain. Since then Mr. Warren De la Rue has obtained photographs of the sun, showing traces of Mr. Nasmyth's 'willow leaves,' and has further ascertained, by the aid of stereoscopic pictures, that the faculæ are elevations in the sun's photosphere. The photographs of the surface of the moon have suggested facts in its physical history of much interest. Taking advantage of the phenomena of libration, the moon having a libratory motion through an arc of 21° , it has been possible to secure stereoscopic images of the moon, indicating its conformation with an accuracy before unattainable. Portions before regarded as seas, it is now suggested, may be covered with vegetation, and it is deemed probable that it possesses a dense atmosphere. Photographs of the stars and planets, of Jupiter with his belts and satellites, have also been obtained. Minute as are many of these photographs, they admit of a sufficient degree of amplification to prove of the highest interest. In the case of the most recent

and perfect lunar photograph by Mr. Rutherford, of New York, from an original negative under two inches in diameter, enlarged prints of twenty-one inches diameter are obtained, possessed of a sharpness and perfection of definition in every way satisfactory.

Another application of photography cognate to this, is its employment at Greenwich for recording the magnetic and meteorological variations, under the superintendence of Mr. Glaisher. When the importance of preserving a strict record of the magnetic perturbations occurred to the Astronomer Royal, and thirty years ago a magnetic observatory was attached to the establishment at Greenwich, it was placed in the charge of qualified attendants, who made their observations every two hours, night and day; and even this frequency was often found insufficient for a satisfactory record during magnetic storms. Photography has now superseded this wearisome and monotonous duty, and performs the office better, since it preserves a continuous, in place of an intermittent, register. Powerful as the magnetic force would seem, it is utterly impossible to secure self-registration of its vibrations by any mechanical means, the interposition of a cobweb being sufficient to derange the natural movements of the suspended magnetic bar. In effecting the photographic registration, a small concave mirror is attached to the apparatus suspending the magnet, the mirror of course moving with every movement of the magnet. This concave mirror reflects the flame of a jet of naphthalised gas, converging to a point at a distance of about 12 feet, where it falls upon a plano-convex cylindrical lens, which brings it to a sharp focus. Immediately in the focus of this lens is a cylinder of sensitive photographic paper, which steadily revolves, completing its revolution in twenty-four hours. With every movement of the magnet, the mirror effects a movement in the reflected light, and every movement of the light is duly registered in a latent image on the photographic paper, which only requires to be developed to give an autograph of the magnet and the record of its every perturbation. The barometrical variations are recorded by an analogous contrivance.

In microscopic science photography has not been more niggard of its aid, and perfect pictures, amplified several thousand diameters, of the most difficult test objects, such as the *Pleurosigma Angulatum*, with every marking most sharply rendered, have been obtained. In surveying, topography, and physical geography, photography furnishes the most accurate data. In geology its records of the anatomy of the earth surpass in accuracy and interest the finest hand-drawing. In

medical and surgical science its records of malformations or morbid conditions are necessarily of more value than records which might be characterised by the imperfect observation of the recorder. The same is true, indeed, of a score of other applications, such as the presentation of ethnological types, the transcript of ancient manuscripts, or of hieroglyphics from Thebes or Philæ, or the contents of a Saxon barrow. Everything, in short, where a minute record untinctured by the prepossession or the incapacity of the recorder is of importance to the advancement of science, may receive the aid of this unerring and willing adjutor.

Amongst the many singular uses as a recorder to which photography has been put, its employment by Professor Piazzi Smyth in delineating an interior into which for thousands of years the light of day had never penetrated, is one of the most interesting. Professor Smyth had a theory, which had been before promulgated, that we had an inheritance in the Great Pyramid. The wisdom of the Egyptians was supposed to have intended something more than a large tomb by these eternal monuments. Professor Smyth believed that the granite coffer was a primeval measure of capacity enshrined beyond the destructive action of cold, or heat, or moisture, or time; and by means of photography he resolved to bring the hidden and forgotten secret to light. A recently discovered form of portable sunlight, magnesium wire, which burns like a taper with a flame unrivalled in actinic rays, furnished him with the means. With a firman from the Pasha, a photographic equipment, magnesium wire, and a well-seasoned measuring rod to place in contact with the objects to be photographed, the Professor proceeded to his task, and vindicated the position he had upheld. The photograph of the granite coffer, with the system of measuring rods attached, furnished data for the calculation which proves that the vessel was a measure of capacity, from which the English quarter had been originally derived, and that the Egyptian coffer just measured with mathematical accuracy, four times the amount of our hereditary standard wheat measure.

Photography, besides aiding and developing science generally, is perpetually revealing new wonders pertaining to itself, and especially in advancing the twin sciences to which it owes its existence—chemistry and optics. The latter has received very essential development from the new art. The earliest lenses employed in photography were of the least efficient description, slow in action, and without coincidence in the chemical and visual foci. Steadily, but slowly, improvement has been achieved. Opticians for a long time seemed to be under the conviction

that the most perfect lens was that which accurately united the rays of different refrangibility reflected from one plane, persistently regarding the lens as an instrument in which their sole duty was to triumph over optical difficulties in securing perfect freedom from chromatic and spherical aberrations. To Mr. J. H. Dallmeyer photographers are indebted for the most complete recognition of the fact that the requirement of the photographer is an instrument to produce pictures of objects distributed over various planes, and unite the rays proceeding from these planes with sufficiently good definition on a flat surface. Instead of the old form of lens which curved the marginal lines, he also supplied them with instruments having perfect immunity from distortion, and in place of lenses subtending an angle of little more than 30 degrees, he has placed within their power the means of defining as much as 100 degrees on a flat surface. Other opticians have followed in his footsteps, and the optical facilities of the photographer are apparently steadily on the increase.

The reproduction of the colours of nature by means of photography at one time seemed a dream beyond the range of possibility; nevertheless it has been actually accomplished, although perhaps with little hope of practical application. In the early labours of Sir John Herschel, promise was attained of this result as a possibility. Later, M. Becquerel and M. Niepce de St. Victor, the latter gentleman especially, have been successful in reproducing with much vividity the colours of nature; but no means have been found of fixing them. Both these gentlemen have worked on metal plates prepared with a sub-chloride of silver. Still later, M. Poitevin, in France, has produced natural colours on violet sub-chloride of silver applied to paper, and Mr. Wharton Simpson in this country has also secured natural colours on sub-chloride of silver in collodion applied to opal glass. The most singular feature in these operations is, that, whilst the action of light on salts of silver generally is to darken them, in the use of violet sub-chloride the light passing through clear white glass, produces a bleaching effect, at the same time that, passing through coloured glass, it reproduces the colours in their true relations. Apart from the impossibility of fixing these pictures there are many other difficulties in the way which prevent the hope of a practical application of any of the methods hitherto discovered, and leave them simply as illustrations of a wonderful possibility.

The advent of a new art or the discovery of a new science has rarely induced any immediate and specific change in the habits of society. The introduction of printing was gradual, and

beyond the slow but increased spread of education, it for some time induced little change amongst mankind. The discovery of the electric telegraph astonished the public, and introduced a new facility of communication; but with the exception of those engaged in the actual working, the people at large did not concern themselves much about its details. With the introduction of photography the case has been far different. Men of all tastes, habits, and stations seemed smitten as with a mania, but which, unlike older manias, such as the Dutch tulip rage, did not die out in a short time, but has rather gone on increasing. Never was a taste so catholic as that which has united in the bonds of brotherhood the disciples of this new iconolatry. Several priests of the Church of Rome have been amongst the most active contributors to the progress of the new art-science. An archbishop of the English Church is one of its zealous devotees. Clergymen of the English Church, and ministers of dissenting congregations are numerous amongst its adherents. The army, from the general to the private, furnishes recruits. Doctors, lawyers, and scientific and literary men are prominent in its pursuit. The senior wrangler of last year is an accomplished photographer. Every trade, no matter how lowly, every profession, no matter how engrossing, is compelled to afford some leisure to the earnest amateur in photography. Even royalty has not disdained to yield to the fascinations which surround the camera, and dark rooms are found attached to more than one royal palace. Societies have started into existence to discuss the processes, and aid each other in the practice of the new art. The Photographic Society of London, with the sovereign of the realm for its patron, the ex-Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer for its president, and noblemen, artists, and men of science for its council, has a roll of nearly four hundred members, including every grade in society. A dozen other local societies with similar aim are scattered throughout the country. Similar associations are spread over continental Europe and America, and in all these the professional photographer and the amateur, the artist whose aim is to produce pictures, and the devotee of science, whose only object is to penetrate the arcana of nature, vie with each other in the ardour with which they pursue the several branches which photography opens to them. The wealthy amateur, to whom an hour's exertion was scarcely before known, will toil in the burning sun up mountain steep, in close tents, or improvised dark rooms, with an energy and an ardour unknown to him who lives by the sweat of his brow. Failure and disaster, capricious silver baths, tormenting collodion, irritating chemicals of every kind only stimulate him to renewed

exertion; and his devotion to his art-mistress often seems increased in proportion as she tantalises him, now with the hope of success, and then with the despair of blank failure. The whole social history of ~~the art is an enigma~~ without a parallel.

Besides its influence on the literature, as well as the social life of the day, photography has a literature of its own, which is perhaps *sui generis* in its history and character. In this country there are two weekly magazines devoted to the art—one issued in the metropolis, and another representing provincial interests. There are also a monthly and a fortnightly serial, besides certain annuals. America issues three photographic periodicals; France two, solely devoted to the art, and others more or less interested in it. India, Italy, Spain, Prussia, Austria, Holland, Russia, each has its specific photographic serial. Many of these are conducted by men of high rank in science and letters; they are distinguished by a technology of their own, created by the growth of the art-science, to the interests of which, in its theoretical, practical, artistic, and social aspects, they are devoted.

The rapid growth of new and special industries is a fact so characteristic of the present day, that the statistics of photography can scarcely be regarded as wonderful, viewed merely as a question of economics. Nevertheless, some of the facts are sufficiently startling. Twenty years ago one person claimed the sole right to practise photography professionally in this country. According to the census of 1861, the number of persons who entered their names as photographers was 2,534. There is reason, however, to believe that these figures fall short of the real number; since then it is probable the number has been doubled or trebled, and that including those collaterally associated with the art it is even four or five times that number. But these figures fall far short of the number interested in photography as amateurs. We are informed that eight years ago, in establishing a periodical which has since become the leading photographic journal, a large publishing firm sent out 25,000 circulars—not sown broadcast, but specially addressed to persons known to be interested in the new art-science. The number of professional photographers in the United States is said to be over 15,000, and a proportionate number may with propriety be estimated as spread over continental Europe and other parts of the civilized globe. But a more curious estimate of the ramifications of this industry may be formed by a glance at the consumption of some of the materials employed. A single firm in London consumes, on an average, the whites of 2,000 eggs daily in the manufacture of albumenized paper for photographic printing, amounting to 600,000 annually. As it may be fairly assumed

that this is but a tenth of the total amount consumed in this country, we obtain an average of six millions of inchoate fowls sacrificed annually in this new worship of the sun in the United Kingdom alone! When to this is added the far larger consumption of Europe and America, which we do not attempt to put in figures, the imagination is startled by the enormous total inevitably presented for its realization. In the absence of exact data, we hesitate to estimate the consumption of the precious metals, the mountains of silver and monuments of gold, which follow as matters of necessity. A calculation based on facts enables us to state, however, that for every twenty thousand eggs employed, nearly one hundredweight of nitrate of silver is consumed. We arrive thus at an estimate of 300 hundredweight of nitrate of silver annually used in this country alone in the production of photographs. To descend to individual facts more easily grasped, we learn that the consumption of materials in the photographs of the International Exhibition of 1862, produced by Mr. England for the London Stereoscopic Company, amounted to 2,400 ounces of nitrate of silver, nearly 54 ounces of terchloride of gold, 200 gallons of albumen, amounting to the whites of 32,000 eggs, and 70 reams of paper; the issue of pictures approaching to nearly a million, the number of stereoscopic prints amounting to nearly 800,000 copies. We have already glanced at the statistics of the card portraiture of public men. Some estimate may easily be formed of the industries stimulated or created by the circulation of these and other photographs in cases, frames, fittings, and apparatus of various kinds. One house alone, and by no means the largest among manufacturers, has issued little short of a million of albums for the card pictures. Stereoscopic pictures have had a circulation only less than that of the portrait cards, and these as certainly involve stereoscopes as cards involve albums. Accurate figures as the exact extent of the various branches of manufacture, arising solely out of photography, cannot, of course, be obtained; but the facts already named are sufficiently suggestive.

Our review of photography as art, science, and commerce, has already extended beyond the limits we had prescribed for it, notwithstanding that we have only stated the leading facts of its history and applications with the utmost brevity compatible with completeness. Whether its future progress will bear any relation to that which has characterized the first quarter of a century of its existence we do not conjecture; but it is clear that this youngest born of the arts is destined to play an important part in the progress of that civilization which will prevail in the fulness of time.

ART. III. — *Notes on the Battle of Waterloo.* By the late Sir JAMES S. KENNEDY, K.C.B. London: Murray 1865.

THE author of this small but valuable work says truly, that the campaign of Waterloo will be always a matter of interesting enquiry. The settlement of Europe which resulted from it, has indeed gradually yielded to time; Imperial France, Emancipated Italy, Constitutional Belgium, the Crimean war, a United Germany, and a vast shifting of continental alliances, show that its effects have not been permanent; but it closed a long era of revolutions, and set lasting bounds to a colossal despotism. Moreover, in a military point of view, it suggests perhaps more important problems than any contest recorded in history; it confronted, and placed in terrible antagonism the greatest military reputations which modern times, at least, have beheld; and, having opened with fair prospects to the mighty commander who was the assailant, it terminated in the space of four days in his utter ruin and that of his army. A drama, at once so pregnant with interest to the student of the art of war, so grand in its scenes, and so tragic in its issues, will always arrest the attention of our race; and probably to the latest generation, mankind will dwell on the daring spring which Napoleon made upon Blücher and Wellington, on the movements that led to Ligny and Quatre Bras, on the mortal struggle of the 18th of June, on the brilliant march that decided that day, and on the train of mistakes and false purposes that, notwithstanding the heroism of the French, produced the final and complete catastrophe. Our remotest descendants will be attracted to the plains of Belgium in 1915, with the same sympathy which attracts us to the battle-fields of Zama and Pharsalia.

In the descriptions given of this great conflict, the vanquished nation, in our judgment, has certainly gained a victory over its conqueror. General Kennedy indeed, who like a true soldier, has little respect for any accounts of the campaign, except those of military eye-witnesses, says justly that the narrative of Napoleon, though marked with the stamp of his brilliant genius, overflows with falsehood and misstatement, and we much prefer the report of the Duke, though that is necessarily meagre and imperfect. But we cannot exclude from our consideration those historians who, though not spectators, have studied, and elucidated the subject; and, taking the list, the French, we think, have greatly eclipsed their English competitors. Colonel Charras's book, though very one-sided, and composed obviously to decry Napoleon, is a very able and elaborate work; and even the

gorgeous romance of Thiers, though full of Bonapartist flattery and boasting, is, in its way, a remarkable performance. M. Quinet, too, has written some papers of sterling value upon the campaign, and Jomini's tract, if somewhat superficial, deserves certainly a reader's attention. On the other hand, the English accounts, are, almost without exception, deficient in some main requisite of a military narrative. Sir Archibald Alison is tawdry and confused, and does not convey a vivid impression; the description of Siborne, though rich in details, and wonderfully accurate in its particular facts, is without order and general views; and the useful volume of Mr. Hooper, the best English sketch we possess, is wanting in striking effect and animation.

In this state of comparative dearth we turned eagerly to General Kennedy's volume to ascertain if it satisfied our conception of a good English account of Waterloo. We have been much pleased in some respects, and not a little disappointed in others. General Kennedy's description of that part of the battle of the 18th of June, which he witnessed himself, is in a very high degree important, and differs from every other we have read; his observations on the manœuvres of the day deserve study, and are singularly clear, and his criticism on some of the phases of the campaign are often ingenious, acute, and masterly. But his "Notes" unfortunately do not comprehend a great deal of the earlier operations, especially those of the 16th of June, strategically of the very highest interest; and his method and style, though logical and simple, are not those of a real historian who can place before us events like a drama. His tract, therefore, is a mere fragment, an essay, useful, but incomplete; and his narrative is a military anatomy rather than a series of vigorous military pictures. We think, too, that he has not studied the evidence existing on the subject fully; so much so, that we venture to doubt, whether, though he takes the allies to task for their dispositions at the outset of the campaign, he has ever read the celebrated defence of Wellington on this cardinal point, in his formal reply to General Clausewitz. On the whole, this volume, though of much value as a contribution to Waterloo literature, is not all that the reader wants; and, like several other works of the kind, it makes us regret that the stirring theme was not undertaken by Sir William Napier, whose thorough appreciation of the science of war, just estimate both of Napoleon and Wellington, and fine genius for military painting marked him out as the fitting historian of the contest. Sir William, however, as is well known, declined always to enter on the subject, believing, what we very much doubt, that the truth, respecting one crisis of the campaign, the movements of

Grouchy on the 17th and 18th of June, remained undiscovered for this generation.

The volume commences with a brief account of the life and services of General Kennedy. These qualified him for the task of describing and criticising events of military history ; and we may add, what the author omits, that they did not prevent the assiduous care which he gave to letters from an early age, and which is visible in every line of his compositions.

General Kennedy was trained by Sir John Moore in that celebrated school for practical soldiers, which was formed under that accomplished general when our shores were menaced in 1805 by invasion. He was present at the siege of Copenhagen in 1807, and witnessed the long retreat on Corunna, that dark prelude to our Peninsular triumphs. In 1809 he distinguished himself as aide-de-camp to the gallant Craufurd, and in the next year served in the campaign which, beginning on the heights of Busaco, and closing at Fuentes D'Onoro, repelled Massena from Torres Vedras and perceptibly lowered the prestige of Napoleon. His heroism at the siege of Ciudad Rodrigo is commemorated by Napier in immortal language; and he attracted notice during the campaign of 1812, in the operations that led to the battle of Salamanca. After the retreat from Burgos his health broke down, and indeed never completely recovered; and he did not take part in the series of victories which marked the progress of Wellington from Portugal into the heart of France at the close of the contest. In 1815 he returned again to active service, and was engaged on the 17th and 18th of June in most critical and important duties as Deputy-Assistant Quarter-Master-General attached to Alten's, the 3rd division. His senior officer being wounded at Quatre Bras, it devolved on him to reconnoitre the line of the retreat of that division on Waterloo, an operation of the greatest nicety, as it lay exposed to the French at Ligny. On the 18th, General Alten selected him to direct the formation of the division into squares to resist the great attacks of cavalry against the centre of the British line, a duty he performed in a masterly manner, and by a method devised by himself; and when, after the capture of La Haye Sainte, the British army was seriously threatened, he happened to be the officer to report the untoward circumstance to the Duke, and to receive his orders upon the subject. He served with distinction in the Army of Occupation, and conducted the delicate diplomatic operation of providing for the temporary possession of Calais, a point which had been omitted in the treaties. During the long peace he held some commands of a responsible and important kind; and, undoubtedly,

but for his failing health, would have filled posts of the highest eminence. The leisure hours withdrawn from his profession he devoted to the cultivation of letters, and as is well known, he gradually became an accomplished writer on military subjects. His death occurred a short time ago, and these "Notes," we believe, were his last work.

We think it better, in examining this volume, to invert the method of General Kennedy, and to begin with his general views of the campaign, before noticing the particular details he gives us on the battle of Waterloo. There is much truth in his view as a whole that Napoleon's general conception of the campaign, and even his general calculations in his movements, were superior to those of the Duke of Wellington, but that Wellington showed more vigour in execution, and more personal ability and energy. The manner in which the French emperor concentrated his forces for the attack on Belgium, and carried them rapidly across the frontier to the very point where the allied armies were weakest as regards the power of uniting, was undoubtedly one of his grandest manœuvres. The strategy which directed the attack on Ligny, and a flank march of Ney from Quatre Bras was quite in Napoleon's finest style; and had the latter movement succeeded, Ligny would have terminated in a second Jena. Again, the plan of attack at Waterloo, on the supposition of Blucher's absence, was, by the admission of all, a masterpiece; and General Kennedy truly remarks, that its main strength was levelled against the weakest point in the whole British lines, as by a kind of intuitive genius. On the other hand, some of the operations of the French army were very ill conducted, and though, as we shall endeavour to show, Napoleon was not so blameable for this, as General Kennedy thinks he was, and we do not entirely concur with our author in his estimate of the operations themselves, it is certain, we think, that the French Emperor showed less attention to details of importance, and far less activity than his antagonist. It is almost inconceivable, we think, regard being had to Napoleon's antecedents, that he did not, at the crisis of the 16th, interpose peremptorily to bring up D'Erlon, and that, after the battle of Ligny, he retired to his head-quarters at Fleurus, and did not satisfy himself as to the retreat of the Prussians, the main cause of his subsequent disaster. Again, whatever opinion may be formed as to his power of reaching Wellington on the 17th, he certainly was strangely remiss and inattentive in the whole course of his communications with Grouchy; and even his pursuit of Wellington on Waterloo was not marked by his ordi-

nary vigour. As to his tactics in the battle itself, it is well known he admitted their defectiveness, and that he threw the blame on his lieutenants; but, even were this supposition correct, it would prove that he did not take that part in the actual struggle which the Duke did, and did not evince the Duke's great qualities. In short, after making every allowance for errors committed by subordinates in this campaign, Napoleon unquestionably did not display the resoluteness, quickness, and energy of his foe; he was as Soult remarked to Napier, 'unequal to the Napoleon of old, somewhat hesitating and oscillating in his purpose, and sluggish and faltering in actual execution.'

Again, the general movements of Wellington before the campaign, and while it lasted, fell short of Napoleon's masterly genius, though in our judgment they were not so faulty as General Kennedy has described them, and his position and divided command must be taken into account in considering the subject. We think, however, it must be allowed that the Duke continued too long in the belief that Napoleon's attack was upon his right, and was somewhat tardy in perceiving the truth that it was planned to separate the allied armies; and that he should have called in the detachment of Prince Frederick on the 17th, and united it to his forces at Waterloo. There are also grounds for criticising the disposition of Colville and Chassé on the British right on the morning of the 18th of June—the result of the Duke's original belief; and General Kennedy has pointed out what the Duke was magnanimous enough to allow, that the great importance of La Haye Sainte as an advanced part of the allied centre had not been sufficiently estimated.

On the other hand, in carrying out his conceptions, and wherever personal energy was required, the superiority of Wellington over the Emperor is apparent at least in this brief and decisive struggle. His steady and brilliant defence of Quatre Bras was a fine instance of that presence of mind, that intrepidity and strength of character which so often had foiled the French in Spain; and, in our judgment, it not only saved the Prussians from an overwhelming disaster, but, strategically, was the turning-point of the campaign. His retreat on Waterloo on the 17th of June, in the presence of Napoleon and Ney, and a greatly superior French army, and under circumstances of peculiar difficulty, was a model of caution and tactical skill; and its complete success was in great part the immediate result of his own superintendence. His plan of defence on the 18th wants, perhaps, the grandeur of the plan of attack, and may be objected to in some details; but it was able

and skilful in the highest degree, and evinces that perfect knowledge of tactics, and that minute and personal attention to details, which were Wellington's special characteristics.

In the battle itself, his inflexible tenacity, his self-command, and fertility of resource have been admitted by his bitterest enemies; and it cannot be doubted that he handled his army with more ability and prudence than Napoleon, although, in justice, we must allow that, after the apparition of the Prussians on his flank, that great commander had little opportunity to conduct the struggle as he had originally intended. This does not, however, detract in the least from the great merits displayed by the Duke, his exact knowledge of all movements in the field, his promptness in anticipating and repelling all attacks, his admirable management of his reserves, his fine calculation as to his own strength and that of his infuriated foe, and, above all, the confidence he inspired in his own army and its commanders, the result of his genius and iron character.

Passing from this general view of the campaign to its separate parts as a military drama, General Kennedy, agreeing with Napoleon and Charras, condemns strongly the disposition of the allies in reference to the prospect of an attack on Belgium in the summer of 1815. He censures the wide dissemination of their forces from Oudenarde almost to Liege, and especially their proximity to the frontier, their centre being thrown weakly forward, with its points of concentration on Quatre Bras and Sombref. Such an arrangement, he contends with ability, exposed them to what actually happened, a vigorous central attack by Napoleon, in which, notwithstanding an inferiority in numbers, the chances were, for a time, on his side, and in which their armies were liable to be defeated before they had the means of effecting their junction.

Now we think there is this much truth in this criticism, that, we believe, had Wellington had the command of the whole of the allied forces to himself, he would not have separated them as they were, but would have massed them upon a smaller space for the defence of Belgium, and especially of Brussels. Still, it should be remembered that whatever fault may be found in the arrangement of the allies, the event proved that they had the power of concentrating in considerable force even at the outset of the campaign, and that, though Napoleon's attack was confessedly rapid and brilliant in the extreme, and though accidents of an unexpected kind retarded Wellington's and Blucher's movements. Blucher fought at Ligny with 90,000 men; and Wellington had 40,000 men at Quatre Bras, before Ney abandoned the field, the French actually engaged in these

actions being not more than 95,000 altogether; and but for the neglect of Bulow, who was very tardy on the 14th of June, and the remissness of Dornburg and the Prince of Orange, who should undoubtedly have apprised the Duke of the movement on Charleroi upon the 15th, their forces would have been respectively increased to 120,000 and 75,000, sufficient utterly to discomfit Napoleon. It is evident, therefore, that, even at the point where they were, beyond all question, weakest, the allies were very well prepared; and their dispositions, if not faultless, were certainly open to but little objection.

In justice, too, as Wellington has pointed out, some general considerations must be taken into account before condemning the allies' strategy. Their armies were completely distinct and acting on different bases of operation, the English on the sea and its neighbourhood, the Prussians on the Rhine and its provinces; and this circumstance almost inevitably led to a considerable dissemination of forces. Again, there were high political reasons to defend all the approaches to Belgium; and this, in the opinion of the Duke, an opinion he insisted on to the last, could be effected only by extending the allies' cantonments over a wide distance. Napoleon's points of attack, too, were so numerous, and capable of being concealed—six great roads, with fortresses behind, leading into an open and broad position—that Wellington always retained a belief that these points should be all guarded, which made it necessary to divide the allies, and that over a considerable space. On the whole, it may with justice be said that the allies' arrangements were sufficiently good to withstand the Emperor even from the outset; and that they have only appeared questionable because Napoleon's attack was consummate alike in conception and execution.

We regret that General Kennedy has passed over the operations of the 15th and 16th of June with hardly a word of criticism. These operations, if not so successful as the French Emperor had anticipated, attest the excellence of his plan of attack, and the steadiness of the British commander and his army. In the forenoon of the 16th of June, the French army was nearly concentrated to assail Quatre Bras and Sombreff, the points of junction of the allied centre. Napoleon on the centre and right opposed about 75,000 men to Blucher and 90,000 Prussians, and Ney with some 15,000 in hand confronted Wellington on the left with not more than 9,000 or 10,000. In the rear of Ney, and coming to his aid, were 20,000 French under Count d'Erlon, and about 3,000 or 4,000 cavalry; and though Bulow with 30,000 men was hurrying to join his chief at Sombreff, he could not effect his object on that day;

while Wellington's reinforcements, though pressing on Quatre Bras, were not yet up, and far from united. Thus, notwithstanding his numerical inferiority—125,000 against 210,000 men, 350 guns against 500—the French Emperor had certainly a chance of gaining brilliant and sudden success, a result partly owing to the accidents which had retarded the allied commanders, but greatly, too, to his splendid strategy. Napoleon, after some hesitation and delay, which, however he has been censured for it, appears to us to have been inevitable, resolved to attack the Prussians on his front, and ordered Ney to seize Quatre Bras, and, having left a force on that point, to double round on the flank of Blucher, and complete the overthrow of the Prussian army.

Had this masterly plan been attended with success, the allies would have been separated at their centre, Wellington would have been forced back towards his base, if not severely defeated before, while the Prussian Marshal would have been overwhelmed and scattered in ruin beyond the Rhine and the Meuse. But Quatre Bras, the key of the operations, was defended by the consummate tactician who so often had baffled a French enemy; and while Napoleon assailed Sombreff at the points of Ligny and St. Amand, the Duke, making an imposing stand, and hastening up his forces in detail, repelled Ney from the position at Quatre Bras, and thus discomfited the Emperor's manœuvres. It should, however, in justice be observed that Napoleon's scheme might, perhaps, have succeeded, in a way differing from his original orders, had Count d'Erlon, as he was directed, instead of advancing to the aid of Ney, moved obliquely upon the Prussian flank, and so crushed the right wing of Blucher while Ney and Wellington were fully engaged.

We turned eagerly to General Kennedy's 'Notes,' to see if they threw any light on this subject, the most obscure, perhaps, in the campaign, but we regret to have to express our disappointment. Our own opinion, after a study of the evidence, is, that the cross march of d'Erlon upon the Prussian right was finally countermanded by Napoleon himself—in this respect, if we are right, falling short of his wonted resolution and accuracy of calculation—when he felt himself able to succeed at Ligny, but perceived that Ney was being pressed at Quatre Bras; and if our conclusion be correct, the stand made by Wellington at that point twice baffled the schemes of his great antagonist, and twice saved the Prussians from disaster.

General Kennedy criticises with much ability Napoleon's operations on the 17th of June, and condemns them with

unqualified censure. He thinks that the Emperor, early in the morning, should have fallen on Wellington with his whole army, disregarding Blücher and the Prussians completely. 'The allies,' he says, 'were separated for a time, and Blücher for the moment paralysed; the Duke, with his forces not yet concentrated, lay at Quatre Bras in a most perilous situation; why, then, did not the French Emperor, in conformity with his usual strategy, attack the English commander at once, with 100,000 men against 60,000, and crush him between Quatre Bras and Waterloo?' This remissness was a terrible mistake, unaccountable in the General of Ratisbon and Rivoli, and was almost a sign of the 'infatuation' that sometimes proves the forerunner of ruin.

It is a serious thing to charge a strategist, confessedly of the very highest capacity, with conduct savouring of imbecility; and though we agree with General Kennedy that an attack on Wellington on the 17th of June would have been Napoleon's best chance of victory, we see from his own and Soult's despatches why this move was considered impracticable. The French army on the 15th and 16th had been executing two forced marches and fighting two desperate and sanguinary battles; and Soult and the Emperor wrote under their hands that 'the troops were so completely exhausted, that a day was required to recruit their strength, and that they actually did not anticipate an advance beyond Quatre Bras that morning.' General Kennedy, we suspect, has not read this very remarkable and conclusive despatch, which demonstrates that, however desirable it might have been to have assailed the Duke beyond Quatre Bras on the 17th, such an effort was physically impossible to the French in the opinion of Napoleon himself and of his most able and experienced Marshal. This opinion may have been certainly incorrect; and having regard, as the events proved, to the immense importance of striking Wellington while as yet he was divided from Blücher, impartial critics will, perhaps, think that the operation should have been attempted. But it is an opinion entitled to the greatest weight; and, in any case, the fact that it was held, absolves the Emperor from the imputation which General Kennedy, following Charras would, we think unjustly, cast upon him. For ourselves, we shall be slow to believe that Napoleon would have missed an operation, coinciding with his own plan of the campaign, and dictated by the first principles of war, had he felt he had the means of effecting it.

General Kennedy again severely criticises Napoleon's detaching Grouchy on the 17th from the main army to pursue the Prussians. He thinks that, in any point of view, this operation

was a mistake, and that the Emperor, as we have said, should have assailed Wellington with his united forces. In the events that happened there is little doubt that this reasoning is quite correct; but, considering Napoleon's situation on the 17th, and his means of calculation and knowledge, we can understand and justify his strategy. At that moment he could only reason on the facts that Blucher was in retreat in a direction not as yet ascertained; that Wellington was near Quatre Bras, with the British forces not yet collected, and that his own army was extremely fatigued, and not ready for immediate action. Twenty-four hours he calculated, therefore, would be required to fight another battle; and, if so, it was surely necessary to detach a large force to observe the Prussians, and to prevent them falling on the French communications, or even effecting a junction with Wellington. Besides, the Emperor certainly believed that with the 70,000 men he kept with him he could destroy the Duke's army; and though this inference was not correct, it was not without a plausible foundation. Putting ourselves, therefore, in the Emperor's position on the forenoon of the 17th of June, we do not blame him for detaching Grouchy with 30,000 men from his main force, at least as harshly as some of his critics. The operation was certainly unfortunate, but we are far from thinking it a mere piece of folly.

In one essential respect, however, a capital mistake was made in the operations of the French army at this juncture. It was a point of vital importance to Napoleon on the night of the 16th of June to ascertain the retreat of the Prussians when beaten off from the field of Ligny. His great and paramount object in this campaign, and his only possible chance of success being to fight and cut up the allies in detail, he should have satisfied himself beyond a doubt of the direction taken by Blucher and his army, whether he was inclining towards his base on the Meuse, or trying to converge on Wellington's forces. He had a large body of cavalry for this purpose; and, had it been employed as it should, the retreat of the Prussians must have been discovered, and possibly the issue of the campaign been different. But no such movement was made on the night of the 16th. Napoleon retired to his head-quarters at Fleurus; and by the morning of the 17th the Prussians had got completely out of sight and beyond the reach of the French army. It is possible that the Emperor gave the necessary orders to the Duke of Dalmatia, and that Soult unaccountably neglected them; but in a matter of such vital importance a commander-in-chief must be held responsible; and this capital mistake in detail, which led to the ultimate catastrophe is a striking instance of the

interiority in this campaign of Napoleon to Wellington in matters requiring personal attention.

General Kennedy does not dwell at length on the actual operations of the 17th June, so we shall pass them over rapidly, only glancing at them so far as is necessary to appreciate the character of the final contest. Napoleon, joining Ney at Quatre Bras, with an army of 70,000 men, moved slowly against the Duke of Wellington, who, with about 69,000 troops, retreated steadily on the field of Waterloo. The pursuit was feeble, and the retreat most skilful, and Napoleon displayed but little energy, yet we shall hardly blame him for not reaching the Duke at Genappe and the Dyle, in the state of his army. Meanwhile, Blucher united to Bulow with a force still of 90,000 men, was approaching Wellington in a parallel line; and on the night of the 17th of June had concentrated his army at Wavres at a distance of twelve miles only from Waterloo. The Duke and he were in close communication, and it was settled between them that the British army should oppose any attack of the French, and that the Prussians should come up and fall in the flank of the Emperor's forces. Meanwhile, Napoleon, in the afternoon of the 17th, had detached Grouchy with 30,000 men 'to find out where the Prussians were, to watch their retreat, and to keep them engaged so that they should never rejoin the English.' Grouchy having failed to find out the Prussians, advanced to Gembloux on the night of the 17th, uncertain of his subsequent movements, and was separated both from Blucher and Napoleon—from the first by a distance of twelve miles, from the other by a distance of twenty-one, with the Dyle and a most difficult country between. Thus, for the action of the 18th, the Duke and Blucher were almost certain to have 115,000 or 120,000 men to oppose to Napoleon's 70,000, it being evident, on a calculation of space, that Grouchy's co-operation was no longer possible.

Most fatal as this strategy appears, the fault undoubtedly lay with Napoleon, and only in a slight degree with Grouchy: The French Emperor, beyond all doubt—the fact is clear from his own despatches—never guessed that Blucher, on the night of the 17th, had massed together his army at Wavres, and was ready to effect his junction with Wellington. On the contrary, he believed that the Prussians were retreating on a far exterior line, and could not reach the English on the 18th; and with this belief he prepared with confidence to attack Wellington on the 18th, leaving his right flank entirely unprotected, and exposed to the full attack of the Prussians. As for Grouchy, Napoleon seems to have thought that he was not far wrong in

going to Gembloux ; and, at any rate, he directed him to move upon the 18th towards Wavres—that is, entirely away from himself, and on a point at which it was impossible to separate Blucher from Wellington. The French Emperor was thus hastening on his ruin, exposed to be overwhelmed by the allies, and without the hope of aid from his lieutenant.

However false these operations were, and disastrous as they proved in the event, Napoleon was undoubtedly their author, and they flowed from a single strategic mistake, and from a want of attention to details which we see in him often in this contest. The French Emperor, believing that Blucher was unable to rejoin the English on the 18th, and was moving upon a distant line, conceived that he was perfectly secure in attacking Wellington where he stood, and, furthermore, that the wing of Grouchy, at any point between Gembloux and Wavres, extended between his own force and the Prussians. Hence Napoleon's confidence in victory, the disposition of his troops on the 18th, and his indifference in communicating with Grouchy, when it had become of vital and paramount importance. This error, ruinous as it now appears, was not, however, at all extraordinary, considering Napoleon's prior experience ; it rested upon the supposition that Blucher, like so many of his German antagonists, would either try to fall back on his communications, or at any rate would not rejoin Wellington with extreme haste in advance of Brussels ; and, we may say, that a movement of the kind was consistent with timid and prudent strategy. We do not, therefore, condemn the Emperor for 'folly' in making such a mistake ; but where he cannot escape censure is in neglecting to ascertain the line which the Prussians had taken in their retreat, and in not corresponding repeatedly with Grouchy and discovering beyond the possibility of doubt, both where Blucher actually was, and whether his lieutenant had the power of really arresting the Prussian army. Here we see a want of energy and attention, surprising in such a commander as Napoleon—so much so indeed that his admirers have actually invented despatches for him, which they say were written on the night of the 17th, and which regulated Grouchy's ulterior movements. We may, however, affirm positively that such despatches were never written ; and the result was that Blucher and Wellington, approaching each other, and agreed in their movements, were prepared to overwhelm the French at Waterloo, while Napoleon with Grouchy 'idly in the air,' and separated both from the Prussians and himself, was about to strike a blow for a victory which was almost certain to end in a catastrophe.

General Kennedy describes, with great minuteness, the

manner in which the different armies were drawn up for battle on the 18th of June. On the supposition on which he fought, that Blücher would not rejoin Wellington, Napoleon's system of arranging his troops, and his plan of attack, considered as a whole, was, by the admission of all, a master-piece. The long lines of infantry, deployed with cavalry and artillery on the flanks, the splendid masses of horsemen behind, and on the rear the deep massy columns in the master-hand to complete the victory, formed a spectacle of imposing military power, of regularity, order, and discipline, which the Emperor himself has declared was magnificent. Napoleon had seized, with his wonted genius, the weakest point in Wellington's lines, on the left centre towards La Haye Sainte; he had accumulated his artillery on that spot; and his scheme of attack—a vigorous feint on the right wing of the British general, to be followed by a series of efforts against his left, and his left centre, so as to cut his army in two broken parts, to force it from its line of retreat, and to separate it from the Prussians altogether, was worthy of the victor of Austerlitz.

On the other hand, the arrangements for the defence were in the highest degree excellent, though open, perhaps, to some criticism. General Kennedy points out that the Duke had, perhaps, given too much strength to his right wing, and too little to his left and centre; and he censures him for not calling in Chassé and Colville, who were far on the right—opinions held by most military writers, though Wellington himself maintained to the last that he was bound to look to his right especially, in case of any delay in Blücher, and that, as the event proved, his left and centre resisted successfully. General Kennedy, too, points out correctly that the British commander overlooked the immense importance of La Haye Sainte—as an advanced post on the allied centre, a blot hit at once by Napoleon; and he thinks that Wellington's left wing was not posted to the best advantage. In all other respects, however, the plan of defence may be pronounced faultless. The troops were most judiciously posted to support each other, and take advantage of every dip and eminence of ground; the reserves were well in hand and prepared; and, with the exception of La Haye Sainte, all points of vantage, and especially Hougoumont, were well occupied to meet the enemy. A front of battle, admirably designed, well concentrated, and, as far as possible, masked, was arrayed against its magnificent foe; and at its head was the great commander—energetic, cool, sagacious, resolute—who had so often baffled the proud legions of France, and who, confident

in himself and his combinations, awaited calmly his imperial antagonist.

General Kennedy's description of the 'battle of giants' is well worthy of careful study. It is a failure, indeed, as a piece of painting; and does not convey a clear notion of the movements and changes of the actual struggle, but it is a very careful and remarkable analysis. The battle, General Kennedy points out, was a drama of five distinct acts, each almost isolated from the other, and forming a different mode of attack. The first embraced the assault on Hougoumont, a feint to disturb the attention of Wellington from the real advance on his left and centre, and to open a way to that great effort. General Kennedy indicates, with a soldier's skill, the admirable character of the defence, and coincides with all military writers that Napoleon wasted much strength on this point—perhaps on account of that want of attention to details on which we have already commented. The second act was the gigantic attack of D'Erlon's corps on our left and centre, supported by artillery and cavalry—the real serious commencement of the action—which failed, according to French accounts, from the malformation of the advancing columns, and, as we believe, from the steadiness of our lines and the splendid charge of Ponsonby's brigade. General Kennedy remarks, with much truth, that this attack was entirely unsuccessful in attaining Napoleon's real object, and was very destructive of the French force; but it certainly inflicted heavy loss on our infantry, and Ponsonby's brigade was cut to pieces.

By this time the columns of the Prussians—according to the plan of the allies—were beginning to menace Napoleon's right, and he was compelled to detach the corps of Lobau to make head against his new enemy. He was now severely weakened in infantry, and so he resolved, with his magnificent cavalry, to renew the attack on our left centre, and, if possible, to carry the position and hurl the British into the wood of Soignies. General Kennedy describes, with great minuteness, these splendid but fruitless cavalry charges, which, according to him, took up two hours, from half-past three till half-past five, and which proved a complete failure against the squares of the British infantry. It is most remarkable that General Kennedy, in this differing from all other historians, asserts distinctly that those attacks were made *before* the capture of La Haye Sainte, and before one point in our line had been forced; and if this be true, a greater mistake in tactics can hardly be conceived, the movement being entirely premature:—

'The formation and advance of that magnificent and highly dis-

ciplined cavalry had, as a spectacle, a very grand effect. These splendid horsemen were enthusiastic in the cause of Napoleon, full of confidence in him and in themselves, thirsting to revenge the reverses which had been suffered by the French armies, led by most experienced and able cavalry commanders, and they submitted to a rigid discipline. Their advance to the attack was splendid and interesting in the extreme. Our surprise at being so soon attacked by this great and magnificent force of cavalry was accompanied with the opinion that the attack was premature, and that we were perfectly prepared and secure against its effects so far as any military operation can be calculated upon. Nearly the whole of the ground between La Haye Sainte and Hougoumont was covered with this splendid army of horsemen; their advance to the attack, made in a manner that showed the highest discipline, was majestic and imposing. The attacks on the oblongs were made with much enthusiasm and obstinacy; but in no instance was one of them penetrated or overthrown, although several of them were formed by only young and totally inexperienced troops. These seventy-seven magnificent squadrons, after using their best endeavours to overthrow the infantry, suffered such severe loss by the fire of artillery and infantry, as to be thrown into hopeless confusion, and were driven by the allied cavalry down the exterior slope of the position. They soon rallied, and resumed the attack with the same daring spirit as before, but with the same results, for they were again thrown into a state of hopeless confusion by the enormous loss they suffered under the fire of the squares and oblongs, and in this state were again driven down the exterior slopes by the cavalry at about half-past five o'clock.'

At six, Bulow, with 30,000 Prussians, was striking fiercely Napoleon's right, but still the French Emperor thought he could win; and in a fourth and tremendous attack of cavalry, infantry, and artillery combined, he succeeded in capturing La Haye Sainte, and effecting a lodgment in our centre, by which it was placed in considerable danger. The Duke's position was now critical, but strengthening his centre with the reserves, he still continued the stubborn defence, awaiting steadily 'night and Blucher.' On this Napoleon collected his force for an overwhelming and fifth attack; and though Blucher was near at hand, and Bulow was gathering in his flank and rear, he launched his forces on our centre and right, determined to snatch, if possible, victory.

General Kennedy's account of this advance is very comprehensive and full; and he points out clearly that the movement of the Guard was, for some reason or other, misdirected; it should have been by La Haye Sainte, and not on our centre towards Hougoumont. The result is, of course, well known to our readers; the Guard was splendidly repulsed and routed;

the whole of the British army advanced, while Blücher and Bulow poured in on all sides; and in half-an-hour the magnificent force which Napoleon had arrayed in the morning was a mass of scattered and perishing fugitives. The night closed on a scene of carnage and despair struggling against exulting victory—the triumph of Europe, the fall of the Empire.

General Kennedy's reflections on the character of the battle, and on the tactics of the opposing commanders, are very able and full of interest, even if we do not fully assent to them. He is right, we think, in calculating the strength of Napoleon, before the apparition of the Prussians, at more than a third superior to Wellington's, and in dwelling upon the great advantage the Emperor possessed in an army composed of one nation, and enthusiastic in his cause. In justice, however, to a gallant foe, he might, in our judgment, have laid more stress on the difficulties which the nature of the ground—soaked through and through, and softened by rain—opposed to the attacks of the French; and there is little doubt that the French army had a want of confidence in some of its officers, a sentiment which somewhat enfeebled its efforts. He has given sufficient prominence, perhaps, to the importance of the attack of the Prussians, which quite disorganised Napoleon's schemes, though it was not much felt till about five; but, in criticising Napoleon as a tactician, he hardly takes into sufficient account how this diversion must have distracted him and paralysed or baffled his intended operations. He is correct, certainly, in pointing out that the cavalry charges were a mistake, and that the Guard was not well directed; but though we agree with him that Napoleon must be held responsible for these movements, he should have added that the French Emperor was engaged with the Prussians at the time, or near it, when these measures were planned or executed. We wish that he had considered more fully the evidence as to his allegation that the capture of La Haye Sainte was after and not before the cavalry charges; in this respect, his statements differ from every account of the battle extant; and if it be true, it gives a new tone and character to the whole of the operations.

Taken altogether, however, his analysis of Waterloo is very clear and masterly, and we fully agree with him that the Duke showed more resource and vigour than his antagonist. Making every allowance that should be made, Napoleon was somewhat remiss and inattentive in the attack on Hougomont and that of D'Erlon; he at least allowed the false cavalry charges; and he should have advanced with his Guards in person when the hour had come to die or to conquer. On the other hand, the

promptness of the Duke, his coolness, sagacity, and self-possession were worthy of the highest admiration; and the manner in which he handled his troops, divided their strength at the proper points, employed his reserves, and weighed out the measure of the forces of battle with calm calculation, has perhaps never been surpassed by a General.

We quote General Kennedy's view of the battle, considered with reference to the rival commanders, in which, subject to the few criticisms we have already endeavoured to illustrate, we concur in most essential particulars:—

“The most important mistake which the Duke of Wellington committed as to the actual fighting of the battle of Waterloo was, his overlooking the vast importance of retaining possession, at any cost, of the farm and enclosures of La Haye Sainte.

“This farm was at the very centre of his position, and was on the great chaussée by which the French army so easily approached the position; these circumstances, and Napoleon's known modes of attack, indicated that the possession of this farm would be of the utmost value. Napoleon had, from the first, seen the vast importance of his possessing himself of this part of Wellington's field of battle, as is proved by his massing so very large a force immediately opposite to it, and by his establishing a battery of seventy-four guns to bear upon it. Lord Ellesmere says that the Duke, with that noble singleness of mind by which, among his other great qualities, he was so eminently distinguished, acknowledged his having been in error as to La Haye Sainte; and he admitted what was certainly true, for its importance was such, that in place of being neglected, and all the implements removed from it, by which preparations might have been made for its defence (and which also had the effect of lulling all supposition that it was to be defended), it ought, on the contrary, to have been occupied, in addition to Baring's weak battalion, by one of the weak British battalions; and all the usual means of defence should have been in progress during the whole night of the 17th and morning of the 18th. The proposals for strengthening the place on the morning of the 18th were repudiated by the head-quarter staff. When it was seen in the morning that a general action was inevitable, it was suggested to them to place a British battalion in the buildings in addition to Baring's, but the proposal was negatived.

“That Napoleon, from the first, attached much more importance than Wellington did to the possession of that part of the Anglo-Allied position at which La Haye Sainte stood, is fully proved by his having prepared such immense means for its attack; while Wellington occupied the ground weakly and paralysed the defence of the buildings by withdrawing from them the workmen and tools that would have been required to put them into a state of defence. In this instance, as in that of the dispositions of the armies when the operations of the campaign were commencing, Napoleon's general views

seem to have been superior to those of Wellington ; but in both cases Wellington showed great superiority in execution. The blunders and looseness of Napoleon's movements on the 16th, 17th, and 18th, were surpassingly great and numerous ; while Wellington acted with unerring energy, firmness, and precision. His ready boldness in making the stand which he did at Waterloo, and in arranging that Blucher should support him there, has seldom been surpassed. Again, on the field of battle, Wellington's execution greatly surpassed that of Napoleon. Wherever there was a turning-point in the battle, there Wellington directed in person, judged for himself, and met the storm. Napoleon, on the contrary, sluggishly kept almost to one spot, and acted on the information of others ; for example, he says that he disapproved of the great cavalry attack as a premature movement. Why, then, when he saw Milhaud's whole corps of cavalry begin to move across the Charleroi-road, immediately in front of where he stood, and directly under his view, did he not gallop forward with his staff and stop the movement, since he had at that moment nothing else calling for his immediate attention. Again, after the taking of La Haye Sainte, which uncovered the Anglo-Allied centre, in place of seeing himself what progress his troops had made there, and the state of the Anglo-Allied line at that critical point, he never took any close view of that, nor indeed of any other part of the action, and from this probably arose his giving an erroneous direction to the Guard when he finally struck for victory by ordering it to attack. Upon the whole, there seems fair reason to infer, that, like Cæsar, Wellington was ready, at all periods of his career, to throw for victory, at all hazards, with a coolness and self-possession that nothing could shake ; while Napoleon, in his latter campaigns, fell more into a habit of trusting to his general directions : hence the general inference is probably not far from being correct, that, while Napoleon perhaps exceeded all men in general views in war he did not display on all occasions the imperturbable moral firmness, combined with the utmost personal energy, that seem never for a moment to have been wanting in Cæsar and Wellington."

The result of Waterloo, viewed strategically, and with reference to the general arrangements of the commanders arrayed against each other, was caused by the junction of the Prussians with the British army, according to a plan preconceived between the Duke and Blucher. On the feasibility and certainty of the success of this combination depends the question as to the strategy of the allies ; for otherwise Wellington and Blucher would have committed an error of the most serious kind in not retreating behind the wood of Soignies, and in accepting battle at Waterloo. In reply to this, it is no use saying that the Duke, even if unaided by Blucher, might have repelled the French emperor's attack ; had he not been assured of the

Prussian co-operation he should not have given his antagonist such a chance; for it was in his power to delay the action, and in a few days to be united to Blucher, with a force capable of crushing Napoleon. Again, the strategy of Napoleon at Waterloo, apart from his tactics in the field, depends on the problem—had he so laid his scheme that he had a good prospect of defeating Wellington and preventing the junction of Blucher with the English, by his disposition of his own and Grouchy's forces.

Our own opinion on this subject coincides entirely with General Kennedy's; and we believe that on the 18th of June it was impossible for the French Emperor to stop Blucher on his way to Waterloo; that the junction of the allies was certain; and, consequently, that their fighting the battle was in conformity with sound strategy. From this it follows, that we equally think that Napoleon, placed as his army was, was almost beforehand doomed to ruin; and that, placed as Grouchy and he were, he was certain to be overwhelmed by the allies, without the support of his lieutenant.

The whole question resolves itself into a calculation of distance and force, in spite of all that has been written upon it. Could Grouchy, with 30,000 men, divided from the main French army by twenty-one miles of an impassable country, and with positive orders to move on Wavres, either reach Napoleon at Waterloo, or intercept 90,000 Prussians on their way, they being only twelve miles from Wellington, and he being thirteen from them? There is the whole question, and no impartial person can fail to answer it in the negative. We have indicated the enormous mistake which in this respect Napoleon made in fact; a mistake, however, by no means so foolish as some writers have said, and founded on a general calculation that Blucher, like Alvinzi or Wurmser, would fall back on his line of communications after the bloody defeat he had suffered at Ligny. This mistake was ruinous in the result, yet it was not a mere display of ignorance; it was committed beyond all doubt, and committed by the most brilliant of strategists. It could not, however, have taken place had Napoleon, on the 16th and 17th, acted with more vigour and personal attention to the management of the operations in detail; an error often noticeable in this campaign, and which, possibly, may justify the idea entertained by writers of much ability, that in his final struggle for empire his faculties were somewhat impaired and his energy in war considerably diminished.

ART. IV.—(1.) *The Vicarious Sacrifice*. By HORACE BUSHNELL, D.D.
London : Alexander Strahan. 1866.

(2.) *The Life and the Light of Men*. By JOHN YOUNG, LL.D.
London and New York : Alexander Strahan. 1866.

THE ancient limits between the great schools of theological thought seem temporarily effaced, and the dogmatic map of Christendom must be drawn anew. Before the commencement of the present century, nearly all who acknowledged the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, maintained that the direct intention of His sufferings and death was to re-adjust the relations of the Divine government to the human race. Only those who affirmed the simple humanity of our Lord rejected altogether the catholic idea of the Atonement. Arianism itself constructed a theory in which the humiliation and dying agonies of the Son of God were represented as, in some sense, satisfying the exigencies of Divine justice and providing a reason for the remission of human sin.

But, during the last fifty or sixty years, there have risen up in Germany and France, in England and America, distinguished theologians who have dissolved what appeared to be the natural and necessary alliance between the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, and the doctrine that by His death He made a true and proper atonement for the sins of mankind. They adore Him as God manifest in the flesh. If they shrink from accepting the intricate definitions of the Athanasian Creed, it is not because they are disposed to withhold from our Lord any of the prerogatives or glories of Divinity. They even insist that the modern church has degenerated from the faith of the fourth century ; and they proclaim the fact of the Incarnation with all the energy and fervour of men who believe it to be their mission to re-assert a forgotten or neglected truth. But they repudiate the interpretation which, from the days of Polycarp to the days of Anselm, and from Anselm's days to our own, the vast majority of Christian theologians have attached to those passages of Holy Scripture which represent the death of Christ as a sacrifice, a ransom, a propitiation, for the sins of men. Their Gospel begins and ends with the song which the angels sang to the shepherds of Bethlehem. They contract their creed within the first fourteen verses of St. John's Gospel.

We propose to discuss in this article the principal objections of this new theological school,—of which Dr. Bushnell and Dr. Young may be taken as among the fairest and ablest representatives,—to the orthodox conception of the Atonement ; and, in

doing this, we shall be able both to illustrate and to sustain our own position. If in the course of this discussion Dr. Young's name occurs less frequently than Dr. Bushnell's, it is not because we are unimpressed by the great power and the admirable spirit of the English divine, but because Dr. Bushnell's treatise presents the 'Moral View' in a form rather more convenient for criticism. The two writers agree in their rejection of the theory of Expiation; and in answering one we answer both.

1. We take objection to the very first sentences of Dr. Bushnell's argument. He thinks it will be conceded that the whole theory of the Atonement is still an open question in the Christian Church, and that after the lapse of more than eighteen centuries of Christian life and controversy, we have just arrived at that point at which some satisfactory solution may be possible. He claims to be 'no mere innovator—but one who is trying in good faith to make up some defect, more or less consciously felt by everybody, and bring on just that stage of progress in the truth which its own past ages of history have been steadily preparing and asking for.* In an historical review of the doctrine which he had prepared, but which he has not published, he believes that he was able to show 'that no doctrine of the Atonement or reconciling work of Christ, has ever yet been developed that can be said to have received the consent of the Christian world.†

In a sense, this is true; but not in a sense that can be of any use to Dr. Bushnell. No doubt 'the doctrine of the Atonement' has assumed in successive ages of the Church very various forms—some of them grotesque, some of them horribly repulsive. Nor has the Church ever accepted any definition of the doctrine with the unanimity with which it has accepted the Athanasian definition of the Trinity. The theory of the relation of the death of Christ to God's moral government has been entangled in the philosophical and ethical speculations of many different schools of thought, and has never assumed a form to which the consent of hostile churches, and of a long line of theologians, could be secured. But had Dr. Bushnell published the chapter he has suppressed, it would have been evident to his readers that in every theory which has found general acceptance, there has been present the very idea which provokes his antagonism.

The Apostolic Fathers attempted no scientific development of the doctrine: but that they connected the sacrifice of Christ directly with the Divine forgiveness, it is difficult to dispute. The vicarious idea is as distinctly present in their representations of our Lord's death as in the representations of any

* Page 1.

† Page 2.

Calvinistic divine. They do not teach that Christ suffered simply to make us better, and so to effect our rescue from sin, but that 'He gave His body for our body, His soul for our soul,' and that 'the remission of sins is by the shedding of [His] blood.' If anything could demonstrate the depth and strength of the convictions of the early Church that the Atonement was not intended merely to exert a sanctifying influence on the human soul, but to accomplish a strictly objective deliverance from the penalties of wrong-doing, it would be the strange fancy that our Lord's death was a price paid to the devil for our release from his power. Had any tendency to the 'Moral View' prevailed in the first five centuries, it is inexplicable how this revolting form of the doctrine could have arisen. It can be accounted for only on the hypothesis that, unable as the theologians of those times were to develop the true philosophy of the Atonement, it was a matter of faith that Christ died to deliver man from great objective evils. The notion that Christ died to satisfy the claims of the devil would never have been suggested, had the Church believed that the only, or even the principal, purpose of His death was to reveal to the soul the infinite mercy of God. The errors of theologians are sometimes among the plainest and most valuable indications of where Christian truth really lies.

We do not care to challenge the accuracy of Dr. Bushnell's account of Anselm's theory in his famous *Cur Deus homo*. Even if it be true that, according to Anselm, 'retributive justice . . . 'or penal suffering has nothing to do with the supposed satisfaction;' and that 'the satisfaction to God's honour turns wholly . . . 'on the matter of Christ's obedience unto death,' the objective element of the Atonement is not eliminated.* The whole argument of Anselm's treatise rests on the principle that 'with God 'there is no freedom, but to do what is expedient or *fitting*;' and that 'if it is not fitting for God to do anything unjustly or 'out of order, it does not belong to His freedom, or His kindness, or His will, to let go unpunished the sinner who does not 'pay that of which he has robbed God.† The same moral necessities which forbid God to lie or to act unjustly, forbid Him, according to Anselm, to pardon sin without satisfaction. Whether that satisfaction consists in what theologians have called the active obedience of Christ, or in His sufferings, or in both, is unimportant in relation to the characteristic principle of Dr. Bushnell's book.

* See the discussion of Neander's account of Anselm's theory in Shedd's 'History of Christian Doctrine,' vol. ii. pp. 281, 282, Note.

† *Cur Deus Homo*, Book i. cap. 12.

'After Anselm,' writes Dr. Bushnell, 'comes a long roll of teachers, reaching down to our own time, who have it as their endeavour more or less distinctly, to unfold some conception of the Cross, that will make it a salvation by its power on life and character. In this line we have Abelard, Hugo of St. Victor, Robert Pulleyn, Peter Lombard, Wycliffe, and Wessel and Tauler; and nearer our own times, John Locke, Dr. J. Taylor, Kant, De Wette, and Schleiermacher.*'

The necessary limits of this article forbid us to develop the theories of the theologians to whose reputation Dr. Bushnell virtually appeals on behalf of his own position; but it may be worth while to consider what is the real weight to be attached to these imposing names. That Abelard found the whole significance of the sufferings and death of Christ in the revelation they gave of the Divine love to man is admitted; but Abelard, throughout his life, was in open antagonism to the prevailing faith of Christendom. Hugo of St. Victor, while asserting strongly the importance of the moral influence of our Lord's death, did not abandon even the earlier notion of a legal transaction with the devil, and explicitly maintained the doctrine of expiation.† Peter Lombard who, like Pulleyn, adhered to the general theory of Abelard, retained the proper idea of vicariousness, and he revived, in a most ludicrous form, one of the most eccentric fancies about the relation of Christ's death to Satan.‡ As for Wycliffe, he taught that 'it is a light word to say that God might of His power forgive this sin [Adam's] without the aseeth [satisfaction] which was made for it, for God might do so if He would; but *His justice would not suffer it*, but requires that each trespass be punished, either on earth or in hell. And God may not accept a person to forgive him his sin without satisfaction.'§ Wessel is not less explicit. He says, 'According to the second or servant form, the Lord Jesus is not only mediator between God and man, but is rather mediator for man between the God of justice and the God of mercy; for *it behoves that the whole law of God's justice should be fulfilled, without failure of one jot or tittle; and as this has been achieved by Jesus, it is easy to find the way in which mercy can flow forth in streams of compassion.* The wisdom

* Page xxxi.

† 'Christus ergo nascendo debitum hominis Patri solvit et *moriendo reatum hominis* expiavit.'—*De Sac.*, cap. 4. (Hagenbach.)

‡ 'Non enim sufficeret illa poena, qua poenitentes ligat ecclesia, nisi poena Christi co-operaretur, qui pro nobis solvit. . . . Quid fecit Redemptor captivatori nostro? *tendit ei muscipulam crucem suam, posuit ibi quasi escam sanguinem suum.*' (Hagenbach.)

§ 'Tracts and Treatises of Wycliffe,' p. 84.

NO. LXXXVIII.

F F

'of the Father, however, made the way by the device (artificio) 'of a mediator.'* Even Locke said, in reply to the charge of Socinianism, 'It is very hard for a Christian who reads the Scriptures with attention and an unprejudiced mind, to deny 'the satisfaction of Christ;† and Dr. John Taylor, unable wholly to escape from the traditional faith that it is 'for Christ's sake' that God saves mankind, taught that 'obedience, or 'doing the will of God, was the sacrifice of a sweet-smelling 'savour which Christ offered unto God for us. It was His 'righteousness, or righteous, kind, benevolent actions, His 'obedient death, or the sacrifice of His blood and obedience, 'which made atonement for the sins of the world; so far, and 'in this sense, that God, *on account* of His goodness or perfect obedience so highly pleasing to Him, thought fit to grant unto 'mankind, whom He might in strict justice have destroyed for 'their sin and wickedness, the forgiveness of sin.‡ There is something more than Dr. Bushnell's theory here.§

To maintain that the 'moral view' of the death of Christ is an adequate account of the awful mystery, is an innovation after all; an innovation which, we acknowledge, has been attempted more than once in past centuries, by men of the most distinguished genius, but which has never been able to secure a firm hold on the faith of the Church. The essential principle of Dr. Bushnell's scheme, is not a new contribution towards the settlement of a doctrine never yet fully matured; it is the revival of a rejected error. Whatever authority belongs to what we know to have been the faith of Christendom from the earliest times to our own, though it cannot be invoked for any developed theory of the Atonement, sustains its objective character.

2. But it was not Dr. Bushnell's intention to claim these illustrious names on behalf of his own position; he only mentions them as belonging to 'a long roll of teachers who 'have it as their endeavour, more or less distinctly, to unfold 'some conception of the Cross, that will make it a salvation by its

* Ullman's 'Reformers before the Reformation,' vol. ii. p. 450.

† 'A Second Vindication of "The Reasonableness of Christianity,"' Works, vol. vi. p. 418.

‡ Taylor's 'Key to Apostolic Writings,' pp. 45, 46.

§ Even the theory developed in the striking and profound treatise on the Atonement by Mr. McLeod Campbell goes farther than Dr. Bushnell's. Mr. Campbell acknowledges what might be called a vicarious repentance and a vicarious confession on our Lord's part, by which our sins were expiated.

'power on life and character.* Indeed he thinks that 'Gospel teachers appear to have been trying everywhere and in all the past ages, if not consciously, yet unconsciously, *to get beyond their own doctrine*, and to bring out some practically moral-power view of the Cross, more fruitful and sanctifying, than 'by their own particular doctrine, it possibly can be.† We challenge Dr. Bushnell to give us a solitary name in support of the statement implied in this sentence. Let him quote a single line, or a single phrase, or the fragment of a phrase, which indicates that the theologians who have insisted on the direct relation of the death of Christ to the Divine government, have had any consciousness of the necessity of *getting beyond their own doctrine*, in order to recognise its relation to the moral and spiritual life of man. He might as well say that those who believe in the Divinity of our Lord have to 'get beyond 'their own doctrine,' in order to illustrate the sympathies of His humanity and the pathetic beauty of His earthly history. There is no need to deny the penal character of our Lord's death in order to maintain that the infinite tenderness of the Divine heart was revealed in the sorrows and humiliation, the patience and compassion of Jesus of Nazareth. Our theory does not exclude—does not merely supplement—the 'Moral View;' by insisting that Christ died to atone for sin, we augment that very power of His life and death over the souls of men, which Dr. Bushnell and Dr. Young, and a number of other men not less able or less devout, charge us with ignoring.

We appeal to Dr. Bushnell himself. After writing four hundred and fifty pages to demonstrate that Expiation, Substitution, Propitiation are the pernicious fancies of theologians, that the ideas they involve are morally revolting, that the theories they represent are hostile to the very genius and spirit of the Christian revelation, that the whole object of Christ's coming was to regenerate human nature by revealing God, he asks how the doctrine he has determined is to be used and preached. The answer, given roughly and briefly, amounts to this: Do not preach it at all; or rather, Preach the other doctrine which has been under the fire of the author's logic, passion, denunciation, wit, from the first page to the four hundred and fiftieth. The 'Moral View' is the only true one, but very little good and some mischief may come of preaching it. The objective view is false, but it is necessary for the health and energy of human souls. The common belief about Christ dying as a sacrifice for sin is offensive to the moral sense, but without it the death of Christ will produce no moral impression. The whole conception

* Page xxxi.

† Page xxx.

of an altar, a victim, an atonement, is a mistake; and yet 'the most cultivated, most intellectual disciples,' cannot do without it. The notions about a propitiation are an insult to God, but we must 'get our dearest approaches to God in their use.' Some care, indeed, is necessary to prevent misconception. The preacher should begin with 'one or two discourses showing 'what the sacrifices were not and what they were,'—showing, that is, that they had no relation to God but only to man—and then 'let him throw himself on all these altar figures freely, 'allowing just such impressions to be taken as there probably 'will be' [wrong impressions in all probability, notwithstanding 'the one or two discourses'] 'still going on without concern.'*

That we have given the true sense of Dr. Bushnell's last chapter, will appear from the following passages:—

'For besides the outward figure of the facts, occurring under conditions of space and time, and significant to human feeling in that manner, *God has contrived a thought-form, to assist us in that kind of use which may conduct us into the desired state of practical reconciliation with Himself.* In the facts outwardly regarded, there is no sacrifice, or oblation, or atonement, or propitiation, but simply a living and dying thus and thus. The facts are impressive, the person is clad in a wonderful dignity and beauty, the agony is eloquent of love, and the Cross a very shocking murder triumphantly met; and *if then the question rises, how we are to use such a history so as to be reconciled by it, we hardly know in what way to begin. How shall we come unto God by help of this martyrdom? How shall we turn it, or turn ourselves under it, so as to be justified and set in peace with God? Plainly there is a want here, and this want is met by giving a thought-form to the facts which is not in the facts themselves.* They are put directly into the moulds of the altar, and *we are called to accept the crucified God-man as our sacrifice, an offering or oblation for us, our propitiation; so to be sprinkled from our evil conscience, washed, purged, purified, cleansed from our sin.* Instead of leaving the matter of the facts just as they occurred, there is a reverting to familiar forms of thought, made familiar partly for this purpose, and we are told, in brief, to use the facts just as we would the sin-offerings of the altar, and make an altar grace of them—only a grace complete and perfect, an offering once for all. According to the Epistle to the Hebrews, this ancient ritual was devised by God, apart from its liturgical uses, to be the vehicle in words of the heavenly things in Christ, moulds of thought for the world's grand altar-service in Christ—the universal offering, regulative conceptions for the fit receiving and effective use of the Gospel. And so much is there in this, that, *without these forms of the altar, we should be utterly at a loss in making any use of the Christian facts, that would set us in a condition of practical reconciliation with God.* Christ is good, beautiful, won-

derful, His disinterested love is a picture by itself, His forgiving patience melts into my feeling, His passion rends open my heart, but what is He for, and how shall He be made unto me the salvation I want? One word—*He is my sacrifice*—opens all to me; and beholding Him, with all my sin upon Him, I count Him my offering, I come unto God by Him, and enter into the holiest by His blood.*

Again:—

‘The principal reason for setting forth the matter of Christ’s life and death as an oblation remains to be stated; viz., the necessity of somehow preventing an over-conscious state in the receiver. It was going to be a great fault in the use, that the disciple, looking for a power on his character, would keep himself too entirely in this attitude of consciousness, or voluntary self-application. He would be hanging round each fact and scene, to get some eloquent moving effect from it. And he would not only study how to get impressions, but, almost ere he is aware of it, to make them. Just here accordingly it was that the Scripture symbols, and especially those of the altar service, were to come to our aid, putting us into *a use of the Gospel so entirely objective*, as to scarcely suffer a recoil on our consciousness at all. When I conceive that Christ is my offering before God, my own choice Lamb and God’s, brought to the slaying, and that for my sin, my thought moves wholly outward and upward, bathing itself in the goodness and grace of the sacrifice. Doubtless, there will be a power in it, *all the greater power that I am not looking after power*, and that nothing puts me thinking of effects upon myself. . . . *We want, in short, to use these altar terms, just as freely as they are used by those who accept the formula of expiation, or judicial satisfaction for sin*; in just their manner too, when they are using them most practically. . . . We cannot afford to lose these sacred forms of the altar. They fill an office which nothing else can fill, and serve a use which cannot be served without them. It may, perhaps, be granted that, considering the advances of culture and reflection now made, we should use them less, and the forms of common language more; still we have not gotten by the want of them, and we never shall. The most cultivated, most intellectual disciple wants them now, and will get his dearest approaches to God in their use. We can do without them, it may be, for a little while; but after a time we seem to be in *a Gospel that has no atmosphere*, and our breathing is a gasping state. Our very repentances are hampered by too great subjectivity, becoming as it were a pulling at our own shoulders. Our subjective applications of Christ get confused and grow inefficacious. Our very prayers and thanksgivings get introverted and muddled. Trying to fight ourselves on in our wars, courage dies, and impulse flags. And so we begin to sigh for some altar, whither we may go and just see the fire burning, and the smoke going up, on its own account, and circle it about with our believing hymns; some element of day, into

* Page 460.

which we may come, and simply see, without superintending the light.*

Dr. Bushnell could hardly have cast this chapter when he wrote that sentence in his Introduction about the theologians, whom aintain the expiatory theory, trying 'to get beyond their own doctrine, and bring out some practically moral-power view of the Cross, more fruitful and sanctifying, than by their own particular doctrine it can possibly be;' for his closing advice to his readers amounts to this: My theory is the only one which can satisfy the speculative intellect, or endure the criticism of conscience, but the theory which I have destroyed is necessary to give depth and freedom to the spiritual life of man; the 'Moral View' is the only tolerable one in the lecture-room, but to 'make the Cross a salvation by its power on life and character,' we must fall back on the very conceptions which I have proved to be offensive to the conscience, and philosophically absurd. Dr. Bushnell begins by telling us, that those who hold the expiatory theory have been always trying 'to get beyond their own doctrine' in order to develop the moral power of the Cross. He ends, by recommending his own disciples to make use of all those conceptions of Christ's death, which the expiatory theory alone can justify, if they wish men to escape from a morbid self-consciousness into 'the free state of faith and love.'

It appears, therefore, that the 'Moral View' is morally powerless; and that the objective view, though utterly untenable, is necessary for the salvation of the world. 'The stone which the builders rejected has become the headstone of the corner.'

3. We cannot allow that the common representation of the Atonement springs either from an ungenerous distrust of the Divine mercy, or from the presumptuous activity of the mere speculative intellect. There may be reason enough for Dr. Young's tone, when he says that, in certain theories of expiation, 'God's procedure is not only vindicated, it is demonstrated to be correct, politically, judicially, even commercially correct in every point, to the very letter;† but it is the conscience of man, which asks even more urgently than his intellect, for the fact which these theories are intended to illustrate. The conviction that it belongs to God to punish sin, is at least as deeply rooted in the soul as the conviction that God is infinitely merciful. It may be granted that the bare word of God should be enough to awaken and to perpetuate faith in God's willingness to pardon; and yet it is not a restless spirit of speculation or an unacknowledged distrust which asks for something more. It is

* Pages 462-3.

† Page 64.

no sign of defective confidence in God's righteousness and benevolence, to desire a solution of any of the perplexing mysteries of the moral universe, but rather a sign of the soul's indestructible conviction, that if God were fully known all perplexity would cease; and a sign, too, of the unexpressed conviction that since man was made in the Divine image, he has a capacity, which if undeveloped in this world will be developed in the next, of understanding the moral reasons of the Divine acts, and perceiving their perfect justice and goodness. The question, *How can the Just and Holy One forgive?* is no more the suggestion of a faltering confidence in the Divine mercy, than the question, *'Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?'* was the suggestion of faltering confidence in the Divine equity. The revelation of the Atonement—not the Atonement itself—is God's response to the homage of man's moral nature to the awful and inviolable majesty of the eternal law of righteousness. It is God's guarantee of man's innate belief that wrong-doing ought not to be simply passed by and forgotten. The moral perfections of God are not revealed alone. From the very first, they have been developed harmoniously. As the early ages of the world's history knew less than we know of His goodness, they knew less of His justice too. In the Christian revelation, in which God has manifested Himself more fully than ever before to the human heart, He has also manifested Himself more fully to the human conscience. The moral sense of man would have been overborne, if when the Holy God revealed so amazingly His infinite love for His sinful creature, there had not been a corresponding revelation of His judgment of that creature's guilt. The prophets and saints of the old world had little more than the general promise of the Divine mercy to rely upon; and such a promise, if nothing more had been given, should be enough for us; but the higher development of the moral life and thought of the human race, which is one of the results of the coming of Christ, has made the cry for an expiation more urgent and passionate.

Some of man's strongest moral instincts—instincts which Christianity itself has helped to intensify—will remain unsatisfied if Christian theology cannot affirm that, in the old meaning of the words, the sin of the world was laid upon Christ.

4. The denial of the expiatory character of the Atonement introduces inextricable confusion into the theory of God's relations to the eternal law of righteousness. It is indeed quite possible to construct a philosophical scheme of the Divine government, which, if its first principles are conceded, will leave no

room, or at least no necessity, for the vicarious element in the death of Christ. Deny the absolute and independent authority of the moral law; maintain that the mere will of God is the ultimate ground of all moral distinctions and of all moral obligation, and you may have a theory of moral government, in which the penalties of sin may be remitted without reference to an objective atonement. But this theory is most energetically repudiated by the theologians represented by Dr. Bushnell and Dr. Young. They believe with Plato,* that actions are good, not because the gods are pleased with them, but that the gods are pleased with them because they are good; and that God's own highest perfections are illustrated in His eternal fidelity to the eternal right.

'The grand, primal fact then is, that God's own nature was in law, or crystallising in eternal obligation, before He became a law-giver, and that He became a law-giver only because He was already in the power of law. Not that He was in obligation to any governing force above Him, or back of Him; for He was Himself the only Being, and the container of all forces to be. The law was ideal, and not governmental; a simple thought, which to think was to be in everlasting, necessary, obligation to it. There was no command upon God, no penalty hovered by to threaten; but, thinking *right*, His whole nature answered in sublime, self-prompted, allegiance. And this allegiance to an idea, viz., *right*, was His righteousness—the sum of all His perfections, and the root and spring, in that manner, of all He governs for, or by instituted government maintains.†

It is this eternal law which is the ultimate ground of the Divine government, and of Creation itself; for 'the end of creation is not happiness, but the virtue of rational souls.‡

The constitution of our own moral nature, the relations between the soul and the material universe were determined by it. It speaks in the human conscience. It was translated into human language by inspired men, and into a human life in the character and history of our Lord Jesus Christ. If its independent authority be denied, and the Divine will be affirmed to be the original fountain of moral distinctions, the moral perfections of God have no splendour, and His commands no moral obligation—'*on peut être forcé d'obéir au plus fort, on n'y est pas obligé.*'§ It is because God is Righteous, not because He is Almighty, that it is our duty to obey Him.

Dr. Young is as firm as Dr. Bushnell|| in maintaining what

* Euthyphro.

† Bushnell, p. 187.

‡ Cobbe's 'Intuitive Morals,' p. vii.

§ Cousin, 'Cours de Phil.,' Serie ii., vol. ii. p. 272.

|| Our space does not permit us to refute Dr. Bushnell's singular chapters

we believe to be the fundamental principle both of theology and ethics ; and his chapter on 'Spiritual Laws,' illustrates very instructively the difficulties and confusion into which a very ingenious thinker ~~must be plunged~~ in attempting to harmonise a great Truth with a very serious error. He begins by asserting the eternal and absolute authority of the laws of the spiritual universe ; they are unchangeably the same ; it lies in the essential nature of things that veracity, fidelity, rectitude, purity, loving-kindness, are good ; they could never have been, they never can be, anything else. The 'Order of Nature,' on the other hand, is contingent ; it might have been different from what it is, we have no certainty that it will not some day be altogether changed. As for the laws of human states, they are mutable ; it is a necessity of their origin that they must be more or less unwise and unjust ; at the best, there is an inevitable uncertainty about them, a doubtfulness and a degree of untrustworthiness which tend to shake confidence, and materially to weaken the foundations of authority ; they need in all that is manifestly right, the utmost possible vindication and support.

'But on no such grounds as these, nor on any other grounds whatever, do spiritual ordinances need or admit of either vindication, or protection, or support from human or Divine hands. Defender or avenger, they have none, and they need none. Without aid from any quarter they avenge themselves, and exact, and continue without fail to exact, so long as the evil remains, the amount of penalty—visible and invisible—to the veriest jot and tittle which the deed of violation deserves. Essentially and perfectly wise and right, they are irresistible, in the case of the obedient and the rebellious alike. There is no formal trial of the criminal, there is no need for investigating the question, and determining the amount of guilt or of innocence. Without inquiry and without effort each case discovers and exposes itself. No judicial verdict is pronounced, and no officer of justice is appointed to carry out the sentence ; but at once, punishment or reward, visible or invisible, or both, dispenses itself, and in the amount in which either is merited. Spiritual laws are self-acting ; with *all their penalties and sanctions they are immediately* self-acting, and without the remotest possibility of failure or mistake.*'

The *πρόρον ψεύδος* of the 'Moral view' of the Atonement, lies in this passage. Unconsciously, Dr. Young has glided away from the ideal law of right, which is the rule of God's eternal life, and of our own humbler activity, to the structural laws of

on 'The Law before Government' and 'Instituted Government.' If the principles for which we contend in replying to Dr. Young are admitted, this part of Dr. Bushnell's theory requires no separate discussion.

* Young, p. 87.

man's moral and spiritual nature. The ideal law is simply imperative; it defines righteousness and commands it; it condemns sin. But the 'spiritual laws' of which Dr. Young is speaking now, which are 'irresistible in the case of the obedient 'and rebellious alike,' which do not 'need or admit of either 'vindication or support from human or divine hand,' are not ideal; they are not simply imperative; they exactly correspond in the soul to the laws of health and sickness in the body; they have their original ground in the eternal law, but are not identical with it.

Dr. Young leaves no place for the moral government of God. By the necessary constitution of man's moral nature, sin is followed with an inevitable and adequate penalty, and holiness crowned with a certain and complete reward. God has simply to look on, and see the great machine work. As a moral ruler, He has nothing to do—He can do nothing. His moral activity is exhausted in sustaining the integrity of the righteous, and, by regenerating and sanctifying the wicked, recovering them from the corruption of sin.

But, is there such a thing as Divine forgiveness? We do not raise any question at present, as to its connection with the change of moral and spiritual character which all admit to be necessary to salvation. It matters not, for our immediate purpose, whether forgiveness is supposed to be antecedent to regeneration or subsequent to it; or whether the two are supposed to be contemporaneous. It matters not on what grounds forgiveness is supposed to rest,—whether God forgives men because Christ has died for the sin of the world, or whether He requires from men themselves penitence, or good works, or both, as an atonement for past wrong-doing, or whether He forgives at the sole impulse of His infinite mercy. Let it be granted that the agonising cry of the heart for God's pardon can be answered, and the narrow limits within which Dr. Young's philosophy would confine the functions of the moral Ruler of the universe break down and disappear. For the Divine pardon is not identical with the moral transformation of the sinner. Forgiveness cancels guilt; absolves the sinner from liability to the penal consequences of past wrong-doing. The interior energy of the Divine grace changes the very life of the soul and creates the dispositions which ensure future righteousness. The one deals with sin already committed, the other inspires the soul with strength to do better in the time to come. To identify these two distinct Divine acts, is to violate the laws of language and of thought, and to introduce confusion into

the philosophy of man's spiritual life as well as into the theory of God's moral government.

The cry for pardon is the expression of a profound conviction of the soul that God may justly punish it for former crime ; the prayer for regeneration expresses a desire for future holiness. If, as Athanasius said, long ago, the question of salvation pertained only to the corruption of sin and not to the guilt or ill-desert of it, salvation would be effected by the moral change to which we give the name of repentance ; but, if forgiveness is necessary, the guilt has to be cancelled as well as the corruption purified.

The question is, therefore, immediately raised, Does God forgive ? or, as soon as we repent, are we released from the penalty of wrong-doing, without His direct interference, and by the natural and necessary relenting of 'spiritual laws' ? If He forgives, on what grounds does He dissolve the connection between sin and its penalties ? The penalties are deserved ; is God free to remit them ? It is God's function to acknowledge the principles of the eternal law in government, as it is ours to acknowledge them in obedience ; does it not belong to Him to recognise the ill-desert of sin as well as to command righteousness, and to give us strength to obey Him ? The penalties, as well as the precepts, of the moral government which God administers rest upon an eternal foundation. How then can He forgive ?

It is not clear to us that either Dr. Bushnell or Dr. Young, believes in what is commonly understood by the Divine forgiveness. Their theory of the constitution of the spiritual universe, leaves no place for it. 'In the very act, in the very 'moment of evil,' according to Dr. Young, 'the real penalty 'descends irresistibly, and *in the very amount* which is deserved. 'The sin insures, because it is, its own punishment.' 'Punishment or reward, visible or invisible, or both, dispenses itself, 'and in the amount in which either is merited.' This is surely 'rectilinear justice.' But he also says, 'It can readily 'be shown that rectilinear justice, in the sense of apportioning 'exact desert, neither less nor more, is not an attribute of God 'at all.' 'He does not need to be, and He is not just, in the 'human, rectilinear sense at all.'

What, then, are we to believe ? Can the penalties of sin be remitted, averted, or not ? Are we in the power of the 'spiritual laws' which 'never slumber and are never defrauded for 'a moment,' whose 'dire sanction' 'there is no evading,' from whose 'retributive awards' there is no escape,* which infallibly

* Pages 96, 97.

and inevitably dispense 'punishment or reward' 'in the amount 'in which either is merited?''* Or are we in the good hands of Him who is 'more and better than merely just, and acts on the ground of pure mercy?'† 'Ever and ever,' says Dr. Young, elsewhere, 'justice inflicts an inevitable penalty, and expects the 'completest satisfaction.'‡ And yet 'the whole course of the 'world, from the creation till now, and the manifest system of 'Divine providence towards the good and towards the bad, are 'right in the face of rectilineal justice.'§

Into such irreconcilable contradictions is an able man betrayed, when he constructs a theory which begins by affirming the independent and immutable authority of the eternal law of righteousness, and then denies the necessity of an Atonement as a condition of Divine pardon. Abelard was more consistent. He rejected the idea of expiation; but he also maintained that the Divine will is the fountain of moral law.

A reconciliation of these apparently conflicting statements is attempted in the following passage, which states very concisely the theory of redemption which is offered to us in place of that which is commonly received in the Church:—

'There is no such attribute in God [as rectilineal justice]. But the inevitable punishment of moral evil always and everywhere, is certain nevertheless. The justice of the universe, in this sense, is a tremendous fact, an eternal and necessary fact, which even God could not set aside. There is an irresistible, a real force, springing out of the essential constitution, whereby sin punishes itself. This is the fixed law of the moral universe, a law in perfect harmony with the eternal will, and which never is, and never can be broken. God's mercy in our Lord Jesus Christ, does not in the least set aside this justice; what it does is to remove and render non-existent, the only ground on which the claim of justice stands. Instead of arbitrarily withdrawing the criminal from punishment, it destroys in his soul that evil which is the only cause and reason of punishment, and which being removed, punishment ceases of itself.'||

Again, we ask, Does God forgive? Or does He simply change the condition of a man so that he does not need forgiveness?

We further deny that Dr. Young is entitled to affirm that his theory does not represent God as 'arbitrarily withdrawing the 'criminal from punishment.' If sin is not merely 'the only 'cause and reason of punishment,' but, as is elsewhere maintained, 'its own 'punishment,'—the moral disorder and tendency to evil which every act of transgression increases being the worst consequence of disobeying the Divine precepts,—is not the

* Young, pp. 96, 97, 115.

§ Page 115.

† Page 119.

|| Pages 115, 116.

‡ Page 115.

punishment, after all, 'arbitrarily withdrawn,' if God by a supernatural interference restores the harmony and purity of the soul?

No natural law was violated when, at the Divine word, Lazarus, after he had been dead four days, left his sepulchre and came back to Bethany; for his resurrection was not an abnormal result of the common forces of the universe whose regular action constitutes the 'order of nature;' it was the immediate effect of a volition which is above all natural law. But is the Divine will superior to the laws of the spiritual universe? Does it move in a region where their obligation does not bind? Is it absolutely free to dissolve the connection between sin and its penalty? This passage of Dr. Young's alleviates no difficulty and creates new confusion.

We believe that the sense of guilt in the human heart is a true witness to impending evils which past sin has provoked, and which future obedience cannot of itself avert; that sin is more than a moral disease which has simply to be cured; that it is a crime which must be either punished or forgiven. We reject, too, that conception of punishment, which represents it as simply an expedient to prevent wrong-doing, an expedient which may be arbitrarily dispensed with by the Moral Ruler of the universe, if wrong-doing can be prevented by other means. There is a story of an English judge who once said to a criminal, 'You are condemned to be transported, not because you have stolen these goods, but that goods may not be stolen.' No principle more false in itself or more ruinous to public morality was ever announced from the English bench. The whole moral effect of punishment lies in its being just. The man who suffers for the benefit of others is a martyr, not a convict.' When a great crime has been committed which awakens the moral nature of a nation into fiery life, the cry is for justice, not for a great and edifying moral lesson; the salutary impression produced by a stern sentence is only an incidental thing. 'The suffering of a criminal benefits the public because it is deserved; it is not deserved because it benefits the public.'

God cannot ignore the ill-desert of the sinner. By giving existence to creatures capable of obeying the eternal law, and therefore capable of transgressing it, He came into relations to the universe and to the law itself which oblige Him to recognise the guilt of wrong-doing. The penalties of sin are not arbitrary in their origin, and cannot, therefore, be arbitrarily annulled; God is free to determine how the principle to which these penalties do homage shall be honoured, but not to violate the principle itself.

5. We have now to examine how the 'Moral View' of the Atonement can be harmonised with the teaching of Holy Scripture; and although Dr. Bushnell is 'clear in the conviction' that his theory 'has the *particular merit*' of giving to 'the strong substitutional or imputational phrases applied to 'Christ' 'their most easy and genuinely natural meaning,'* the language of inspired men writhes in torture under his hand; and, in the discussion of Jewish sacrifices and of memorable facts in Old Testament history, he is habitually compelled, in the exegesis of a solitary quotation from Isaiah in St. Matthew's Gospel, to resort to that 'heavy practice' with which he charges Dr. Magee.

This quotation is Dr. Bushnell's strong point. Matthew tells us (chap. viii. 17), that 'When the even was come, they brought 'unto Him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast 'out the spirits with His word, and healed all that were sick: 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the 'prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our 'sicknesses.' This passage is introduced by Dr. Bushnell in his first chapter as 'being the one Scriptural citation that gives, 'beyond a question, the *usus loquendi* of all the vicarious and 'sacrificial language of the New Testament.' He says:—

'Christ has been pouring out His sympathies all day, in acts of healing, run down, as it were, by the wretched multitudes crowding about Him and imploring His pity. No humblest, most repulsive creature is neglected, or fails to receive His tenderest, most brotherly consideration. His heart accepts each one as a burden upon its feeling, and by that feeling, he is inserted into the lot, the pain, the sickness, the sorrow of each. And so the evangelist, having, as we see, no reference whatever to the substitution for sin, says, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." And the text is the more remarkable that the passage he cites from Isaiah, is from his 53rd chapter, which is, in fact, a kind of stock chapter, whence all the most vicarious language of the New Testament is drawn. Besides, the word *bare* occurs in the citation; a word that is based on the very same figure of carrying as that which is used in the expression, "bare our sins," "bare the sins of many," and is moreover precisely the same word which is used by the Apostle when he says [*βαρύνετε*], "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." If then we desire to know exactly what the substitution of Christ for sin was, and how far it went—what it means for example that He bare our sins—we have only to revert back to what is here said of His relation to sicknesses, and our question is resolved.

* Pages 332, 333.

‘What, then, does it mean that Christ “bare our sicknesses?” Does it mean that He literally had our sicknesses transferred to Him, and so taken off from us? Does it mean that He became blind for the blind, lame for the lame, a leper for the lepers, suffering in Himself all the fevers and pains He took away from others? No one had ever such a thought. How then did He bear our sicknesses, or in what sense? In the sense that He took them on His feeling, had His heart burdened by the sense of them, bore the disgusts of their loathsome decays, felt their pains over again, in the tenderness of His more than human sensibility. Thus manifestly it was that He bare our sicknesses. His very love to us put Him, so far, in a vicarious relation to them, and made Him, so far, a partaker in them.’*

Remembering how the very straitest of orthodox interpreters relax their rigour in discussing quotations from the Old Testament in the New, we are greatly edified as well as a little astonished by the severity with which Dr. Bushnell can, for once, play the precisian. We should no more dream of determining the *usus loquendi* of a common Biblical phrase by its application in a single passage in which it happened to be quoted by an evangelist, than we should think of determining the meaning of a line in Milton or Shakespeare by the use which Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Bright might make of it in a political debate. It is one of the cardinal principles of modern exegesis that the New Testament writers quote the language of psalmists and prophets very freely; that even the formula ‘that it might be fulfilled,’ sometimes means very little more than that the old words, though not perhaps in their exact and grammatical sense, may be used to describe the new fact. This exegetical principle is sometimes carried to a perilous excess, so as to impeach not the inspiration merely, but the common sense of the writers of the Christian Scriptures; but scarcely any thoughtful scholar will deny its essential soundness. We altogether deny that even if St. Matthew quoted the words in the sense which Dr. Bushnell suggests, this would reveal ‘the true law of interpretation’ to be applied to the almost innumerable expressions which affirm ‘the vicarious relation of Christ to our sins.’

But without availing ourselves of the theory that all the human sorrows of Christ entered into His expiatory work, there is no reason for those who maintain the unique significance of His death to dispute the accuracy of the evangelist in the present instance. With all respect for those orthodox interpreters who have thought otherwise, we believe that the

* Pages 8, 9.

original passage in Isaiah means exactly 'what the vast majority of theologians have supposed.* The words themselves, and the line of the prophet's thoughts, require the common interpretation. So far as we remember there is no case in which ^{נָשָׂא} ('Surely he hath borne our griefs,' Is. liii. 4) is used in the sense of 'taking away,' *apart from the idea that he who takes away, himself carries the burden which he removes from another.* The apparent exceptions which occur to us are only apparent. The word ^{נָשָׂא}, translated 'our griefs,' in Is. liii. 4; and 'our infirmities' in Matt. viii. 17, is a general term for 'evils' of all kinds. The verb ^{נָשָׂא} is accurately rendered 'carried.' The whole verse is very properly rendered—'Surely He bore our griefs, and carried our sorrows.' That the prophet did not mean to say that 'He took our griefs on His feeling, had His heart burdened by the sense of them,' is plain from the second clause of the verse, 'And we thought him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.' He endured visible sufferings, which made men suppose that He was under Divine chastisement. Had he simply *felt our pains over again and in the tenderness of His more than human sensibility*, no such impression would have been given to the men who watched His history. The fifth verse, 'But He was wounded for our transgressions,' &c., confirms our interpretation. The natural meaning of the whole passage is, that the Messiah was to suffer, not merely in sympathy with suffering men, but for their sake, and as the direct result of their sins.

Nor does St. Matthew's use of the prophecy impeach this interpretation. The very object for which Christ *bore our griefs* was, that he might *bear them away* from us; He *carried our sorrows* that we might be *relieved from the burden of them*.

* Dr. John Brown ('Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah,' p. 205) denies that the vicarious idea is present in Is. liii. 4, at all. He says: 'the word rendered "bear," signifies to carry away, except when it is connected with sin, iniquity, or some such word, in which case it uniformly signifies to bear the punishment of sin, or to forgive sin.' He quotes 1 Sam. xvii. 37; Hos. v. 14; Judges xvi. 31. The first reference is a mistake, as ^{נָשָׂא} does not occur in the verse. It occurs, however, in v. 34: 'there came a lion and a bear, and took [bore away—not simply removed, but *carried off*] a lamb out of the flock.' The passage in Hosea is of the same kind: 'I will be unto Ephraim as a lion, and as a young lion to the house of Judah; I, even I will tear and go away; I will *take away* [carry off, bear away], and none shall rescue him.' The passage in Judges is the account of Samson's burial: 'Then his brethren and all the house of his father came down and *took him* [carried him, bore him], and brought him and buried him,' &c.

The second half of the verse, 'he carried our sorrows,' Dr. Brown thinks refers to that deep sympathy with the sufferings of the afflicted, which induced him to labour even to fatigue in order to relieve them.

Matthew saw in the benignant and merciful acts of Christ's miraculous power, an anticipation of the result of His predicted sufferings. Every cure that He wrought was a visible sign that His vicarious sorrows were already effecting their object. That the evangelist, or the author of the Greek version of His Gospel, wrote ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν, as a translation of the Hebrew מַצָּרִים, which has a far wider meaning, is explained by the special occasion which suggested the quotation; and it is instructive to notice that instead of translating מצָּרִים by φέρει (LXX), he has translated it by ἔλαβε; φέρει brings out most prominently the idea that Christ himself bore our griefs; but ἔλαβε suited Matthew's purpose better, as giving prominence to the idea that He removed them from us—though, as Dr. Bushnell justly says, λαμβάνω is not a mere taking away, but an appropriation on the part of the person who takes away.

That the Messiah was merely to take our sufferings as a burden upon His feeling, is a conception which the original passage resents; the prophet declares distinctly that in the ordinary sense of the words He was actually to bear them, and men were to think that He was being punished for His own sins when He was really bearing the punishment of ours. The quotation in St. Matthew will as little submit to what Dr. Bushnell thinks to be a 'most natural and certainly great and 'worthy meaning;' the evangelist says nothing of a subjective sympathy with human distresses, but of that objective removal of them which, according to the orthodox theory, is the result of our Lord's atonement. The only difference between the Old Testament writer and the New, is that the one thinks most of the vicarious suffering which constituted the Atonement, and the other of the benefits which flow from it; in neither the one nor the other is there any thought of a mere sympathetic sorrow.

This solitary passage is the great Scriptural argument for Dr. Bushnell's theory of our Lord's vicarious sacrifice. Every reference to the substitutionary character of His sufferings is to be interpreted by the testimony which has been extorted by rack and thumb-screw from this martyred text. An accidental application of a single prophecy is to determine the *usus loquendi* of innumerable expressions, the plain meaning of which can hardly be missed.

We should greatly regret to give our readers a false impression of Dr. Bushnell's treatise. Nothing that he writes, can be commonplace or worthless. In the development of his system, there are many paradoxes, but also many noble thoughts vividly

expressed ; and there is an intense glow of spiritual fervour on almost every page. But, in the way of positive teaching on our Lord's sufferings he has nothing more to tell us, than, that 'Love is a principle essentially vicarious in its own nature, identifying the subject with others, so as to suffer their adversities and pains, and taking on itself the burden of their evil.' In the sacrifice of Christ there is nothing unique. Whatever we may say or hold, or believe, concerning the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, we are to affirm in the same manner of God. The whole Deity is in it from eternity, and will to eternity be. . . . There is a cross in God before the wood is seen upon Calvary ; hid in God's own virtue itself, struggling on heavily in burdened feeling through all the previous ages, and struggling on heavily now, even in the throne of the world.* The Holy Spirit bears the sins of men, precisely as Christ Himself did in His sacrifice.† 'All holy beings created are in exactly the same vicarious spirit and suffering way of love as Christ was, only not doing and suffering exactly the same things.‡ 'Vicarious sacrifice' is not 'a point where Christ is distinguished from His followers, but the very life to which He restores them, in restoring them to God.§ He lays it on His disciples to follow Him, and be, if they may, the ransom purchase of others, saying, "even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give His life a ransom for many."'' The profound spiritual truths which are implicated in this process of thought, it is not our present duty to dwell upon, but that this is nothing like an account of the Scriptural representation of our Lord's death may be made clear in a few paragraphs.

Dr. Bushnell contends, that the phrases which speak of Christ as *bearing our sins* mean nothing more than 'He took them on His feeling, had His heart burdened with them.' That the pure nature of our Lord was distressed by the wickedness which was always about Him—by the insincerity, the sensuality and the godlessness of the priests and of the people, is certain. There is something horrible in the number and variety of the forms of evil which pressed upon Him during the last few hours of His mortal life—the treachery of Judas, Peter's blasphemy and cowardice, the lying of the false witnesses, the malignity and hypocrisy of the priests, who were plotting murder, and would not go into the hall of the heathen governor, 'lest they should be defiled ;' Pilate's betrayal of justice, the brutal cruelty of the soldiers, the reckless bloodthirstiness of the

* Page 36. † Page 37. ‡ Page 54. § Page 66.

people among whom He had gone about doing good, the heartless mockery of those who witnessed His dying agonies, the revilings of the impenitent thief. No doubt, there was torture and unutterable anguish in His soul when He was in the immediate presence of these ghastly crimes—crimes committed by creatures for whom He had more than a brother's love, and whose flesh and blood He had assumed that He might be one of themselves, their very brother, by community of nature, through eternity. But neither evangelists nor apostles give us any hint that they are thinking of His moral sufferings when they speak of Christ's bearing the sin of the world. Any such interpretation of their language is specifically met and destroyed by the well-known passage in 1 Peter, ii. 24. 'Who his own self bare our sins'—not 'on His feeling,' merely, as Dr. Bushnell would have it—but 'in His own *body* on the tree.'

There has been a disposition of late years, even among orthodox theologians, in developing the doctrine of the Atonement, to insist more strongly upon the mysterious sorrows of the soul of Christ than upon His death. This is a natural reaction and protest against the hypothesis that God found satisfaction in our Lord's physical agonies, and against the coarse and intolerable representation of the tortures of the crucifixion which were once common in Protestant pulpits, and which we believe are still frequently heard from Roman Catholic preachers. A place is still left for the significance of His death, but what is essential and most prominent with the writers of the New Testament is thrown back into a subordinate and inferior position. The 'Moral View,' however, as illustrated by Dr. Bushnell, would be complete if the four Gospels closed with the story of Gethsemane, and if our Lord had been miraculously delivered from the death, which was then threatening Him; or if Pilate's proposal had been accepted, and Jesus of Nazareth had been 'released' instead of Barabbas the robber.

'The Agony gives in a sense the key-note of His ministry, because it is pure moral suffering; the suffering, that is, of a burdened love, and of a holy and pure sensibility, on which the hell of the world's curse and retributive madness is just about to burst' . . . 'The moral tragedy of the garden is *supplemented* by the physical tragedy of the Cross; where Jesus, by not shrinking from so great bodily pains which the coarse and sensuous mind of the world will more easily appreciate, shows the moral suffering of God for sinners more affectingly, because He does it in a lower phase of natural sensibility.'

Can anything be more out of harmony with the whole strain of Apostolic thought than to speak of 'the physical tragedy of

* Bushnell, pp. 178, 179.

the Cross *supplementing* the moral tragedy in the garden'? Throughout the New Testament, in the Gospels and in the Epistles alike, it is the *death* of Christ on which the salvation of the world is made to rest. Our Lord Himself speaks the same language as His inspired disciples. St. Paul does not say, 'While we were yet sinners *Christ endured the agony of Gethsemane,*' but 'Christ *died* for us;' nor that 'we have redemption through *the moral sufferings of Christ,*' but 'through His *blood*;' nor that 'we were reconciled to God *by the mental distress of our Lord,*' but 'by the *death* of His Son.' St. Peter says that we were redeemed 'with the precious *blood* of Christ,' that 'He *died* the just for the unjust to bring us to God.' St. John says, 'The *blood* of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.' Our Lord said that His '*blood*' was 'shed for many for the remission of sins.' Waiving for the present all controversy as to whether any or all of these passages can be fairly interpreted as meaning that the direct end of our Lord's sufferings was to exert a moral and spiritual influence over us, not to atone for our sins, we contend that they at least demonstrate this point—that our Lord Himself and the Apostles attach supreme importance to that 'physical tragedy' which, according to Dr. Bushnell's theory, is consistently regarded as merely supplementary to what was far more significant. It is not the moral anguish of Christ which the New Testament connects with the forgiveness of sins, but His death. His death, not His agony, is 'the key-note of His ministry.'

Are we then to be driven back upon the revolting conception that the value of our Lord's Atonement is determined by the degree of the physical torture that He passed through during His Passion? Must we take the crucifix as the visible type of our sermons? Must we speak incessantly of the nails crushing their way through His hands and feet, of the festering fiery torment of the wounds, of His muscles convulsively contracting, of His feverish thirst? If we do, we cannot appeal in our defence to the authority of Apostolic example. It is deeply suggestive that the New Testament writers, in speaking of the death of Christ in relation to the forgiveness of sins, do not dwell upon the horrors which aggravated it. It is not the suffering which preceded the death, but the death itself which is always present to their thoughts when they refer to its atoning power. This is the more striking, because when the humiliation and death of our Lord are appealed to as an example, the Apostolic manner is different. When the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, exhorting the Jewish Christians to constancy and endurance, turns aside from the long and illustrious pro-

cession of saints who had all 'died in faith' to Jesus Himself, he reminds his readers that our Lord not only *died*, but 'for the joy that was set before Him, *endured the Cross, despising the shame*;' and they are exhorted to consider Him that endured 'such contradiction of sinners against Himself,' that they might not be 'wearied and faint in their minds.' When St. Paul charges the Christians at Philippi to show a spirit of self-sacrifice, to 'look every man, not on his own things, but also 'on the things of others,' and recalls the example of our Lord Jesus, he accumulates all the circumstances which illustrate the magnitude of His voluntary self-denial for the sake of mankind. 'Being in the form of God [He] thought it not robbery to be equal to God: but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled Himself,' and not merely died, but 'became obedient unto death, *even the death of the Cross.*' Peter, speaking of Christ as atoning for human sin, says simply 'he died the just for the unjust, to bring us to God;' but in the verses immediately preceding this, having spoken of Christ as 'leaving us an example that we should follow in His steps,' he adds, 'Who, when He *was reviled*, reviled not again; when He suffered threatened not.'

Of course, there are passages in which the duty of self-sacrifice is enforced by an appeal to the death of our Lord without any attempt to emphasise its terrors; but the point of our argument is, that though the Apostles dwell upon the ignominy and sufferings of the crucifixion when it is their intention to exalt a virtue which Christ manifested in dying for mankind, and which it is the duty of His followers to imitate, they limit themselves to a bare reference to His death, or His blood, when they are speaking of the means of our redemption. Not His moral sufferings, not His physical tortures, but the mere laying down of His life is what they connect with the forgiveness of sins.

Those who are interested in discovering the moral ideas of the Christian faith in the typical institutions of Judaism, will remember that no tortures were inflicted upon the animals offered as expiatory sacrifices; the shedding of their blood, not the amount of pain they endured, constituted the atonement.

That the distinction we have asserted between the death of Christ and the distress which He suffered from mere contact with human sin, is not arbitrary and technical, is sufficiently proved by the profound influence it exerted on the whole struc-

ture of Apostolic thought. The distinction is never formally expressed, but it moulds and shapes all the references of the inspired writers to our Lord's work. It is inseparable from their thoughts. ~~It determines their idiom.~~ The principle of the distinction is perfectly intelligible. The grief and anger which our Lord felt at the 'hardness' of human hearts, were not, in any legitimate meaning of the word, penal consequences of sin. They had no more expiatory power than the sorrow of a father for his son's profligacy, or the anguish of a mother for her daughter's shame. That the moral pains of our Lord were in a sense voluntary,—because his assumption of humanity was voluntary, and apart from the incarnation he would not, of course, have known the new experiences which were rendered possible by his human sensibilities,—does not change their essential nature.* We believe, too, that these moral pains were a revelation of Divine facts. He was 'the image of God' when He wept over the crimes and impending calamities of Jerusalem, as well as when He wept at the grave of Lazarus. Men saw the Father, when they saw Christ's sorrow for their sins, as well as when they saw His compassion for their sufferings, and His joy over their repentance and well-doing. Dr. Bushnell cannot justify what he has said about 'the cross in God before 'the wood is seen upon Calvary,'—but whatever difficulties may be involved in assigning to the vivid anthropomorphic

* It will be observed—and we desire to call special attention to this point—that our argument is intended simply to show that *so far as the moral sufferings of Christ were of the same character as the sorrows occasioned to any holy being by witnessing sin, they were not expiatory.* The 'Moral View' recognises in our Lord's distresses nothing that distinguishes them in their essential principle from what St. Paul felt when he thought of the unbelief and guilt of his countrymen—nothing that distinguishes them from the anguish of ordinary men occasioned by the sin and shame of relatives and friends. The elder divines believed that the 'wrath of God' rested on the soul of Christ; this, if the theory could be made out, would produce moral sufferings truly penal. Some modern theologians, too, contend that the voluntary humiliation of the Eternal Word was in itself an expiatory act, and that therefore *all* the sorrows which came of it were expiatory. To criticise these positions would lead us far away from our immediate purpose. With these who insist upon the presence of the penal element in our Lord's moral sufferings—an element discriminating them in their very essence from all the common experiences of pure and upright beings—we do not desire to raise any controversy. But even to these, the characteristic manner of the inspired writers, who always connect forgiveness with the death of Christ, should suggest caution. The indispensable condition of *expiatory* suffering is that it should have a penal character. We hope to have an early opportunity of developing our own theory of the relations of the sufferings of our Lord to God's moral government. The present article is necessarily polemical and negative.

language of the Old Testament its natural meaning, we think it most perilous to impeach the reality of God's displeasure and grief because of the wickedness of our race. There is a sorrow inseparable from love, when the objects of love are guilty of sin or are involved in great calamities. But this sorrow, we repeat, is not penal. It is no disgrace to feel it keenly. It belongs to the noblest natures to suffer its sharpest pang. It is an indirect, not a direct consequence of wrong-doing. No matter how agonising it may be, it does not satisfy the moral principle which imposes a penalty on the sinner. The criminal cannot allege the pain his crime has inflicted on pure and virtuous souls as a reason why he should be forgiven, and escape punishment. That pain has no expiatory value.

But the death of Christ has no analogy to the suffering occasioned to a holy being by witnessing moral evil. It cannot in any way be identified with the sorrow which a parent feels for the crime of a child, or a sister for a brother's ruin. It was not among the indirect sufferings which sin entails on the good; it was the specific punishment which sin was to entail on the sinner. In all the moral distress that our Lord felt for the crimes of our race, He was still standing out of the direct line of the penal consequences of wrong-doing; but when He died for us, He endured what no holy being ever endured before, or will endure again, a penalty with which Divine justice had guarded the eternal law of righteousness.* This was a new fact in the history of the universe. He who had ordained and inflicted the terrible sanctions of the law, is now seen, not in the place of the legislator and ruler, but in the place of the transgressor. He had, no doubt, been 'burdened in feeling' by the sin of mankind before; but now He submits to what He had appointed to be the punishment of sin.

It may, however, be objected that this is only an *explanation* of the death of Christ. It may be alleged that the emphasis with which our Lord Himself and the apostles insist upon His death, may be accounted for in another way. The theory of 'the agony' being 'the key-note of our Lord's ministry' may not be in harmony with the prevailing spirit of the New Testament writers, and yet Christ may have offered no expiatory sacrifice. His death on the cross may have had the supreme place in the thoughts of inspired men for other reasons; it may

* That infants die though they have not personally sinned may be alleged against the fundamental idea of our argument; the allegation may be satisfactorily met, but this article would extend through a whole number, and through many numbers of the *Review*, if we attempted a detailed reply to all objections, or even to important objections.

have been because the surrender of life is the consummation of self-sacrifice, or because, whatever the sorrows through which our Lord passed before, they culminated, not in the mere physical sufferings of the crucifixion, but in the moral anguish of his last hours—anguish of which the evangelists give us no uncertain intimations, and which has always exerted an awful and mysterious power over devout souls. He may have died to 'draw all men to Himself,' not to atone for sin; the 'tragedy of the cross' may have been intended to produce, as it has in fact produced, the profoundest impressions on the hearts of men. The death of Christ may be the last and completest expression of that infinite love which was striving, at once, to shame the world for its sin, and to awaken confidence in the Divine mercy. The death, even more than the agony, may have been 'God's instrument of reconciliation and redemption, God's method of conquering the human heart, and of subduing a revolted world and attaching it to His throne—pure love, self-sacrificing love, crucified dying love!'

That this was one of the ends for which Christ died, as it was one of the ends for which He lived, is not conceded merely, but strenuously maintained by theologians who believe in the theory of expiation. They contend that Christ's endurance of the penalty of sin, is that element in His sufferings which gives greatest intensity to their influence over the human soul. But what we have called 'the idiom' of the inspired writers is inexplicable if the solitary and immediate intention of our Lord's death was to inspire the heart with penitence and trust, and, by a transcendent revelation of the moral character of God, to restore the nature of man to the Divine image. Had this been Isaiah's conception of the Messiah's sufferings, he would surely have said, 'He was wounded' for our *future obedience*, 'bruised' for our *future holiness*. What he did say was, 'He was wounded for our *transgressions*, and bruised for our *iniquities*.' Paul would not have written, 'He was delivered for our *offences*.' 'He gave Himself for our *sins*;' but He was delivered—He gave Himself—to awaken in us a keen love for *righteousness*, and to give us strength to *do the will of God*. Peter should have told us that 'Christ also hath once suffered,' not for our '*sins*,' but—for our *sanctification*. These quotations—and they might be indefinitely multiplied—grew out of a different habit of thought about the death of Christ from that which the 'Moral View' would have necessarily created.

Dr. Bushnell speaks more than once of 'the charlatanism of interpretation,' and tells us that 'it is one of the saddest chap-

* Young, p. 313.

ters of our Christian history.* It is 'a considerable and sad part of his duty . . . to reclaim the lost proof texts which have been carried over to the side of the satisfaction theory, and away from their very obvious natural meaning.'† We have no anxiety to press the right of 'the satisfaction theory' to every 'proof text' which has been appealed to in support of it, either in sermons or in grave theological treatises; let half of them go, and enough will be left to make that theory perfectly secure. But there is a 'charlatanism of interpretation' possible on the other side. The mystery of the art is easily explained. There are texts which teach that Christ died to make men holy; *therefore*, according to Dr. Bushnell, other texts which teach that He died to atone for sin must be explained to mean that He died—not to expiate its guilt, but to cleanse us from its impurity. Because the ultimate object of Christ's death, as far as man is concerned, was to restore the soul to its lost integrity, therefore the immediate object could have had no relation to the remission of penalty for past offences.

Are there not innumerable cases in which our ultimate intention is spoken of as our immediate purpose—cases in which our declared object can be secured only by the intervention of an act to which our words only implicitly refer? Dr. Bushnell, let us suppose, has a son who has always had an unreasonable and uncomfortable distrust of his father's affection for him—we are sure our supposition is not a fact, for there is a glowing kindness in his writings which makes us certain that all who know him must love and trust him. Young Horace is in great trouble about pecuniary obligations which have somehow come upon him, and which the severest economy and incessant industry will not enable him to discharge; the poor lad is wretched, and his health is giving way, but he shrinks from telling his father. The generous doctor finds the secret out, goes to him and exclaims—"I will put everything right, my boy! I can't endure to see your anxiety; you shall be happy again; I want the old light in your face once more, and the old ring in your voice; and Horace, my son, never distrust me in future. I think I am showing you now that I love you." "Thank you, father," replies the lad, "for your cheerful and affectionate moral influence on my mind." "Moral influence!" we think we hear the doctor saying, with a look of blank astonishment, "Why, I am going to set you right at the bank, Horace; I have written a cheque for ten thousand dollars." "But father," young Horace answers, "I thought you said you merely wanted me to be happy again and never

* Page 409.

† Page 119.

'to distrust you any more; it is surely not my past debts that you are thinking of; you don't mean to pay *them*; it is my future peace and my future confidence in your affection that you are anxious about.' We think Dr. Bushnell would be quite clever enough to make the hopeful Horace, who had profited so much by the exegetical principles of his father's treatise on 'Vicarious Sacrifice,' understand that he intended to pay the debts just because he wanted his son to be free from trouble, and to be sure of his father's love. The 'moral effect' might be his ultimate object; but the settlement of the balance on the wrong side at the bank might be the precise thing on which his mind was at that moment set.

In the light of this illustration, let us look at some of 'the lost proof texts' which have 'been stolen away from their rightful use and import,'—texts which, according to Dr. Bushnell, really show that 'Christ is here for what He can do in the restoration of character.' We say that we will look at *some* of these texts, which it was 'a sad part' of our author's 'duty to reclaim;' for we venture to say that several of them, if they were ever used on behalf of the expiatory theory, have been restored long ago by orthodox theologians, who are supposed still to retain them—to retain them not exactly feloniously, for Dr. Bushnell expressly exculpates us from the charge of 'fraud,' but without any sound proprietary right.

"Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world." It is not from God's justice, nor from any future wrath, that Christ will deliver when He gives Himself for our sins—no compensation to God's law is even thought of—but He gave Himself to deliver us from a state of evil now present; from corrupt custom, the law of this world, "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."*

But surely it is at least conceivable that though the ultimate object of our Lord was to 'deliver us from this present evil world,' it was indispensable that He should first suffer for the sins, of which we have already been guilty; and that this is the meaning of the phrase, He 'gave Himself for our sins,' is strongly sustained by a subsequent passage in the same epistle;—Christ came to redeem us 'from the curse of the law;' but He redeemed us by 'being made a curse for us.' The paragraph on this last text is too exquisite to be omitted.

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles though Jesus Christ." 'Probably,' says Dr. Bushnell—*very*

* Bushnell, p. 120.

probably, we should think—"the expression, *being made a curse* for us, does *imply* He somehow comes under the retributive consequences of sin—[imply I—if this is only implied, what is explicitly declared?—in what manner will hereafter be explained,* but that will not justify the conclusion that Christ's *chief errand* was to satisfy God's justice [but was it part of "Christ's errand" at all? Dr. Bushnell says, No], and so to prepare the forgiveness of sin. Is not the object plainly declared, viz., "that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles?" Is it then the blessing of Abraham, that God is satisfied in Him, and forgiveness of sins obtained by Him? or is it rather that the Gentiles might come as near to God as Abraham was, and be so brought in as to be also friends of God with him?

Here again the ultimate effect of our Lord's sacrifice is illegitimately made to exclude the intermediate conditions on which that effect depends.

Again:—

"For Christ also hath suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God." As if this suffering, the just for the unjust, must, of course, mean a suffering of penalty for the unjust, when it is even declared as the object of the suffering ministry and mission that "He might bring us to God."†

The 'heavy practice' necessary to 'reclaim' this 'lost proof text' may well have made Dr. Bushnell's duty 'sad.' No one denies that Christ suffered 'to bring us to God,' but Dr. Bushnell denies what St. Peter plainly asserts, that He effected this by suffering, not merely for our future righteousness, but for our past iniquities. For he is saying to 'the strangers scattered abroad 'throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,' that 'it is better if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-'doing than for evil-doing;' better, that is, they should suffer *punishment* from wicked men for their fidelity to Christ than for offences, for which God Himself would condemn them; and then he reminds them that Christ Himself '*suffered* for sins, the just for the unjust.' They were likely to suffer, not in their moral sympathies, or their burdened feelings, but by the loss of property, by public shame, by expulsion from their homes, perhaps by death itself; and Peter charges them to see to it

* The promised explanation is given on page 442: 'The meaning [of "Christ is made a curse for us"] is exhausted when He is conceived to simply come into the corporate state of evil, and bear it with us—faithful unto death for our recovery.' 'Bear it *with* us!' This is what the 'Moral View' requires Dr. Bushnell to say; but St. Paul says, He bears it '*for* us,' which is a very different thing. How is it that the apostles uniformly avoid the '*with*' when they are speaking of Christ's death in relation to human forgiveness and justification?

† Bushnell, page 120.

that they suffered not for real crimes but for 'well-doing.' They ought to suffer with the same patience and courage which Christ Himself manifested—for He too suffered—'suffered,' as they knew, '~~for sins,~~ ~~not indeed for~~ His own sins, but for the sins of men; 'died the just for the unjust.' Dr. Bushnell's theory would have given this verse a different turn. It would have read, 'Christ also suffered for *well-doing*—and He the Just One died *unjustly*;' or else, 'He the Just One, like you, had to suffer cruel wrongs from unjust and wicked men;' but though Peter had once told the Jews that the Christ, whom God had sent to them, they 'with wicked hands had crucified and slain,' he is thinking here, not of what Christ suffered *from* His enemies, but of what He suffered *for* them.

We have space for only one more illustration of the treatment to which texts of this class are subjected.

"Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world." It is not said that He taketh away the punishments of the world, but "the sins"—just that which was signified by the sacrifices of the altar, and the scape-goat sent away into the wilderness. The lamb was not punished, neither was the goat. The very thing signified was the removal, or deportation of the sin.*

When John delivered this testimony it is practically certain that the great prophecy of Isaiah was prominently before his mind, and would be instantly brought before the minds of those who heard him. If this is granted, then the expiatory sufferings of our Lord were the direct subject of John's testimony. But suppose that John's words had no connection with that memorable passage, the words themselves are in irreconcilable hostility to Dr. Bushnell's interpretation. 'The Lamb,' he says, 'was not punished.' What lamb does he mean? The paschal lamb was slain; the lamb offered as a 'burnt-offering' at the morning and evening sacrifice was slain; and death, in the ordinary opinion of mankind, is the last and supreme penalty of sin. About the 'scape-goat' being sent away into the wilderness, it is not necessary for us to say anything, simply because John says nothing about it.

'The thing signified,' Dr. Bushnell tells us, 'was the removal or deportation of the sin.' Signified by what? By the scape-goat, no doubt, and Dr. Bushnell should have remembered that one goat was slain before 'the deportation of the sin' was symbolised, by the sending of the other into the wilderness; but whether it was Isaiah's prophecy that suggested the form of John's testimony, or any of the lambs offered for sin under the

* Bushnell, p. 119.

Jewish law, the idea of suffering in order that sin might be removed, cannot be separated from the passage. There was no *scape-lamb*, though there was a *scape-goat*. Both the Messiah of Isaiah liii. and the sin-offerings of the Temple are represented as *taking away sin* by making expiation for it.

It is due, however, to Dr. Bushnell, that we should consider the positive arguments by which he attempts to demonstrate that the expiatory theory has no place in Holy Scripture. 'Is there,' he inquires, 'any such theory as expiation contained 'or supposed to be wrought in the Scripture sacrifices?' He replies, 'I am able, after a most thorough and complete examination of the Scriptures, to affirm with confidence, that they 'exhibit no trace of expiation.'*

His first point is, that 'nothing was made of the victim's 'death, or pain of dying, in the ancient sacrifices.' To this it is only necessary to reply, that *death* and the *pain* of dying are two very different things. English law requires that a murderer should be hung; but the whole nation would now cry out against subjecting him to torture; the 'death' is required, but not the 'pain of dying;' the 'pain' is reduced to the lowest possible amount consistent with a shameful execution. As the infliction of death was uniformly and imperatively required as part of the ritual of the sin-offering, it is rather bold to affirm, that 'nothing was made of the victim's death.' It is quite true that it was 'the blood' which was 'all-purifying;† but no purification could be effected by the blood of a living animal: the death of the animal was necessary before its blood could symbolise 'the 'sacred, mystic, new creating of life.'‡

His second point is, that—

'Expiations are always conspicuous in their meaning. No man could ever raise a doubt of the expiatory object of the pagan sacrifices; no such doubt was ever entertained. In this view, if the Scripture sacrifices do not show an expiatory meaning on their face, and declare themselves unmistakably in that character—if it is a matter of rational doubt or debate, such doubt is a clear presumptive evidence that their object is somehow different.'§

It might not be courteous to reply, that the chief reason that men do not perceive 'the expiatory object' of the Mosaic sacrifices is a desire to eliminate the expiatory element from the sacrifice of Christ; but Dr. Bushnell will allow us to say, that

* Page 425.

† Page 401.

‡ Ibid.

§ Page 426.

in the judgment of nearly all Christendom, from the earliest centuries till now, it has not been 'a matter of rational doubt or debate,' that the sin-offerings of the Levitical system had an 'expiatory meaning.' We hope to show that nothing he has said calls for any reversal of this judgment.

Thirdly, he objects that

'The original of the word *atone*, or *make atonement*, in the Hebrew scripture, carries no such idea of expiation. It simply speaks of *covering*, or *making cover* for sin, and is sufficiently answered by anything which removes it, hides it from the sight, brings into a state of reconciliation, where the impeachment of it is gone. . . . Everything turns here, manifestly, on the meaning of the original Hebrew word; and as the root or symbol of this word means simply *to cover*, we can see for ourselves that, while it might be applied as a figure, to denote a covering by expiation, it can certainly as well and as naturally be applied to anything which hides or takes away transgression.'*

But if the word is almost uniformly used in a connection which shows that the 'covering' was effected by 'expiation,' it is to no purpose to urge that it can 'as well and as naturally be applied to anything which hides or takes away transgression.' Can he give us any instance in which atonement can possibly mean the awakening of repentance in the wrong-doer?

The true explanation of the word is, that it means originally to 'cover;' that in relation to sin, it always means so to cover it as to avert the *penalty* due to it; and that this covering is almost always effected by expiation. It is, without exception, an objective effect that is said to be accomplished by atonement.

The fourth point is that

'Atonements are accordingly said to be made, where the very idea of expiation is excluded, and sometimes where there is in fact no sacrifice at all.'†

He instances first the atonements which were made for the sanctifying of the altar; the altar could not sin; and, therefore, no expiation could be made for its sin. But the ceremony of making an atonement for the altar, and indeed for 'the holy place' itself, was repeated every year on the great day of atonement; and the reason of the ceremony is given in Leviticus xvi. 16: 'He shall make an atonement for the holy place because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins.' Kurtz gives a very just inter-

* Page 427.

† Ibid.

pretation of the ritual, when he says that, 'having been erected in the midst of the sinful nation they might be regarded as having been contaminated and defiled by the impurity of the atmosphere that surrounded them.*' The sanctification of the altar 'in men's feeling,' was the result of the atonement for the sins which had defiled it.

The other case, 'where expiation is excluded because there is no sacrifice,' is that of the intercession of Moses, who, when the people had sinned by making and worshipping the golden calf said, 'Now I will go up unto the Lord, peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins.' No more fatal illustration could have been alleged on behalf of the theory it is quoted to support.

For (1.), according to the 'Moral View,' Moses should have preached to the people to bring them to a better mind; instead of this, he went up into the mount to pray to God. Plainly he must have thought that the immediate object of atonement was not to make men better, but to avert God's displeasure. (2.) Did Dr. Bushnell forget the sublime spirit of self-sacrifice which was in the heart of the great legislator, when he went back into the solitudes of Sinai to meet God. 'Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin:—he exclaimed, 'and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of Thy book;' anticipating the passionate exclamation of St. Paul, 'I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.' It is clear that the immediate purpose of Moses was to obtain Divine pardon for the sins which the people had already committed, not to keep them from sin in the time to come; and it is even possible that when he spoke to them of 'atonement,' he was meditating an appeal to God that he might himself be punished in their stead. In any case, he was endeavouring to 'cover' the sin, not by leading the idolaters to repentance, but by interposing something—perhaps his own vicarious intercession merely—between the anger of God and the guilt of the people.

Fifthly,—

'It is a great point that expiations or expiatory sacrifices are certainly not offered where we should expect them to be, if they are offered at all.' He instances again the case of the golden calf, also the mutiny which followed the judgment of Korah, and the reformations of Jonah and of Ezra.† 'In all such cases,' he says, 'and they are many, we look for expiation, and do not find it, and, what is quite as remarkable, there is no case to be found where God's anger

* 'Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament,' p. 386.

† But Ezra did offer 'twelve he-goats for a sin offering.' *Ezra* viii. 35.

in a day of guilt and fear is placated, or ever attempted to be, by a clearly expiatory sacrifice.*

The reference to the popular discontent which followed the destruction of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, is singularly infelicitous. 'Moses said unto Aaron, Take a censer and put fire thereon from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly into the congregation, and make an atonement for them.' Dr. Bushnell says, 'it is never supposed that there is any such thing as expiation by incense.' But (1.) what was the object of the act which Moses suggested? To use Dr. Bushnell's language, 'no one supposes' that it was intended to touch the hearts of the people. 'There is wrath gone out from the Lord; *the plague is begun;*' and Aaron's direct and sole purpose was to appeal to the Divine mercy, and to avert the wrath against the whole nation which threatened to 'consume them as in a moment.' If there was no 'expiation,' there was certainly not 'such a working on the bad mind of sin as . . . reconciles it to God.' 'The effect' was not what Dr. Bushnell declares the effect of atonement to be, 'wholly subjective, being a change wrought in all the principles of life and character, and dispositions of the soul.'† And (2.) the fire is distinctly stated to have been taken 'from the altar.' The burning incense was thus connected with the ritual of expiation.

It is, however, perfectly true that the Jewish law did not provide for the expiation by sacrifice of definite moral offences, strictly so called.‡ This act of Aaron's stands alone, so far as we remember, in Old Testament history. It was the natural impulse of a moment of agony, and the spirit in which the appeal was made to the Divine mercy was a reason for the Divine response to it; no such use either of incense or of sacrifices was contemplated in the Levitical institutions. We shall have occasion to speak of the great annual atonement in reply to another passage in Dr. Bushnell's treatise; but, apart from that ceremonial, prescribed for a particular day once a year, the Jewish sacrifices did not profess to atone for violations of the moral law. Only involuntary ceremonial offences, which were but the symbols of real moral transgressions, could be expiated by sacrifices which were but the symbols of the real Atonement for sin. Had it been otherwise the worst and most fatal consequences would have followed. If when an individual or the whole nation had committed any

* Pages 428—430.

† Page 446.

‡ For a fuller discussion of the whole question, and for the limitations with which this statement is to be taken, see 'The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church,' by R. W. Dale, M.A., pp. 270—296.

moral offence, or intentionally violated any ceremonial law, the Levitical system had provided a ritual of atonement, nothing could have prevented the external act from being regarded as a means, divinely appointed, for cancelling the guilt. No exhortations about the necessity of repentance would have had any practical effect. 'The moral sense of the nation would have been enfeebled and paralysed by the natural influence of its religious institutions.' When, therefore, Dr. Bushnell says that 'expiatory sacrifices are certainly not offered where he should expect them to be,' he shows that he has failed to recognise a most remarkable proof of the profound wisdom of the Mosaic legislation. In such cases as he instances—cases of gross moral offences—expiatory sacrifices were not offered, because they were not prescribed; to have prescribed them would have been to inflict the gravest injury on the moral life of the people.*

Sixthly—

'The requirement of the heart, as a condition necessary to acceptance in the sacrifice, is a very strong presumptive evidence that no idea of expiation belonged to sacrifice. At first, nothing appears to be said of the spirit in which the offering is to be made, though it is not to be supposed that it was ever accepted, in any but a merely ritual and ceremonial sense, unless coupled unconsciously, or implicitly, with a true feeling of repentance.' †

A closer investigation of the Jewish sacrificial system, would have led to the cancelling not only of these two sentences, but of the four or five paragraphs which follow them. For (1.) it is a fact which any one may verify for himself that, though four books of the Pentateuch are almost filled with ritualistic laws, there is not a single line to remind the man who brings a sin-offering to the priest, that its atoning efficacy will depend upon 'the spirit' in which the offering is made. (2.) The offences which could be expiated by sacrifices, were not, generally speaking, such as could be thought of 'unconsciously or implicitly with a true feeling of repentance,' and in the special cases in which acts of injustice were atoned for by 'trespass-offerings,' the wrong had actually been undone by voluntary restitution to the injured person, and the shame of public con-

* The 'sin offerings' of Ezra (Ezra viii. 35) and of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix. 20 *seq.*) do not invalidate the general principles maintained above. They were in strict harmony with the spirit of the Mosaic legislation though not prescribed for such occasions by the letter of the law. They also show how deep was the conviction that the 'sin-offerings' had symbolically an expiatory value.

† Page 430.

fession had been voluntarily endured, before the sacrifice was presented. (3.) The denunciations of the prophets, directed against the hypocrisy and formalism of the Jewish people, were not intended to show that ceremonial atonements could not expiate involuntary ceremonial offences unless there was a right 'spirit' in the offerer. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, and Micah insist upon the great moral duties which the nation had neglected, denounce the moral offences of which the kings, priests, and commonalty were guilty, and, in the very spirit of the ancient legislation, maintain that no ritualistic services can compensate for disobeying the moral law.

A singular use is made of Saul's haste to offer sacrifices at the commencement of his campaign against the Philistines, and his sparing of the spoil taken from Agag.

'We find that Saul, an overgrown child of superstition, offers a sacrifice on two several occasions in his own way, disregarding God's appointed way, and even His special command,—in the first instance, because, in going to battle, he wants to "make supplication to the Lord;" and in the second, because, having gained a victory, he wants to honour God in a grand ovation of sacrifice—whereupon, Samuel meets him in sharp rebuke, saying, "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord! Behold (this appears to be an already accepted proverb) to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."'

Surely this does not prove that 'the spirit' in which the offering was made, was essential to whatever expiatory effect the sin-offerings were supposed to produce. For (1.) it is not said that Saul offered or intended to offer any 'sin-offerings' at all. (2.) Saul committed, in the first instance, a moral offence in not waiting till Samuel came. As Samuel had told the king to wait for his coming, Saul was guilty of impatience and distrust by precipitately offering the sacrifice before the prophet's arrival. It was of the greatest importance that the first human monarch of the elect nation should recognise God as the true invisible king, under whose authority he reigned:—

('Ere Saul they chose,
'God was their king, and God they durst depose')—

but Saul was about to attack the Philistines without the Divine directions which Samuel would have given him. 'He disregarded,' as Dr. Bushnell says, 'God's special command,' and did not merely fail to offer his sacrifices in the right 'spirit.' In the second instance, Saul had already disobeyed 'the voice

* Bushnell, p. 431.

'of the Lord,' in preserving the spoil which he had been told to destroy. Samuel does not condemn him for being about to sacrifice 'the sheep and oxen,' without 'the requirement of the heart,' which was 'a condition necessary to acceptance in the sacrifices,' but for rebellion and 'stubbornness.'

Dr. Bushnell's seventh point, that it was not the death but the blood, which was the significant element in the Jewish sacrifice, and that as 'the blood is the life, so it is life-giving; a 'symbol of God's inward purifying and regenerating baptism 'in the remission of sins,' has already been answered. Even if it be true that this was the meaning of the sprinkling of the blood of the victim, it only shows that after the death had expiated guilt and so averted penalty the removal of the interior pollution was still necessary.

Eighthly, it is maintained that 'the passover sacrifice has certainly nothing of expiation in it,' and that as 'the Christian Supper, which commemorates our Lord's death, is the continuance of this ceremony,' it is unlikely that the death of Christ was expiatory. This argument we can afford to let go; to discuss it would carry us far beyond the space to which the present article must be limited; but that there was an expiatory value in the blood of the paschal lamb is confessed by some who deny that it was properly a sin-offering.*

Ninthly, Dr. Bushnell cannot believe that the sacrifices were associated with 'notions of penal sanction for sin,' because all 'the most joyous and grandest' religious festivals were 'celebrated in rivers of blood.'† But (1.) why should not the Jews rejoice when their sins had been atoned for; and especially when by 'burnt-offerings,' between which and 'offerings for sin,' Dr. Bushnell makes no distinction, 'they had surrendered themselves afresh to God?' Nehemiah and Ezra checked the grief occasioned by the reading of the law, and charged the people at the very time they were distressed by their long neglect, to 'go their way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions to them for whom nothing is provided.' (2.) The day on which the annual atonement was effected was not a day of gladness; there were no 'processions of music and songs of praise;' but the people were to afflict their souls.

Finally, it is alleged that,—

'Where the rite of sacrifice bears a look of expiation, and the instances are taken as facts of expiation, a closer examination shows in every case, that the impression is not supported by the transaction.'‡

* See Kurtz, 'Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament,' p. 367.

† Page 436.

‡ Ibid.

The sacrifice of Job for his sins is the single historical example on which Dr. Bushnell relies, and as we believe that in the 'burnt-offerings' of patriarchal times, the expiatory idea, if present at all, was exceedingly obscure, we do not take any exception to the paragraph in which it is contended that this was at most a supplicatory offering.

We cannot extract, nor indeed is it necessary that we should, Dr. Bushnell's account of the solemnities of the day of atonement. A single paragraph in which, under the influence of the fundamental mistake of his whole argument, he implies that what is intended to produce a moral effect upon man, cannot at the same time be expiatory before God, will adequately represent his account of these remarkable ceremonies.

'We shall be struck, in the review of them, *not with any discovery of an expiatory element*, but with the fact, that everything is ordered with such a manifestly artistic study and skill, to beget, in minds too crude for the reflective modes of exercise, a whole set of impressions answering to those of the Christian doctrine of salvation; the holiness of God, the uncleanness and deep guilt of sin, and the faith of God's forgiving mercy.'*

Expiation, as defined by Dr. Pye Smith, 'denotes anything that may supply an *adequate reason* for exempting the criminal from the penalty due;† and it admits of proof that expiation was the most conspicuous and sometimes the only idea of all the 'sin-offerings' and 'trespass-offerings' of the Mosaic legislation. The subjective effect was secured by the presentation of an objective atonement.

Dr. Bushnell discovers no 'expiatory element' in the service on the great Day of Atonement; but what was a Jew likely to discover in it? If the 'Moral View' had been suggested to a devout worshipper in the Tabernacle or the Temple, we can imagine him giving some such reply as this:—'What atonement is, I know. More than once, ignorantly and unintentionally, I have broken the precepts of the law, and when I discovered my offence, I was troubled by fear of the Divine displeasure. I brought a kid of the goats to the priest, and he offered it as a "sin-offering,"—it was an expiation for the transgression I did not mean to commit; when it was offered my involuntary offence was blotted out. But I have been guilty of sins innumerable for which I could not offer any expiation. For my ungoverned anger, for my selfishness, for my want of pity for the poor, for the ingratitude of my heart to Jehovah for all his goodness to me, the law permits me to bring no sacrifice. If my

* Page 438.

† 'Outlines of Christian Theology,' p. 531.

‘lesser offences can only be forgiven when the priest has atoned for them, these greater sins must surely need atonement too. My case is that of the whole nation. We have all sinned and done wickedly; and though we have expiated involuntary transgressions, for our worst crimes no expiation has been made. But, year by year, we call to mind all our iniquities and we “afflict our souls.” We assemble before the holy place, and sacrifices are slain for us all. They are called “sin-offerings”—the very name which is given to the atonements for our inferior transgressions of the law. We cannot, indeed, believe that if one man must bring a goat to expiate an unintentional breach of God’s lighter precepts, these two goats can expiate all the great offences of which all the people have been guilty; and yet these two goats are also a “sin-offering;” over the head of one of them the high priest confesses “all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins.”* Surely I am to think of the sacrifices offered for the nation as I think of the sacrifices which I have offered for myself; when the annual atonement is made, I may look to God to pardon me. God means me to think of all my sins as expiated by the death of the goat that is slain, and as removed from me, “far as the east is from the west,” by the goat that is driven into the wilderness. No promise, indeed, is given that when the day is over, all our iniquities shall be forgiven;† and in this the law of the Great Day of Atonement is unlike the laws which direct us how to atone individually for our ceremonial offences. The reason of the difference is plain, for in other cases a full expiation is made, in this case, there is only the form of an expiation. But it is just because I see on this great day what exactly corresponds to the common atonements for ceremonial transgressions, that I dare to trust in the Divine mercy, and to hope that God will pardon all my sins. It is only a form; it has no real atoning power; and this prevents me sometimes from finding perfect peace;‡ but God means that I should think of my worst sins as expiated, and though sometimes “heart and flesh fail” when I remember my transgressions, I will believe that He is willing to forgive them all.’

* Lev. xvi. 21.

† No Jew was likely to confound the ‘cleansing’ which was to follow the annual atonement with the Divine forgiveness. The conspicuous absence of the formula, ‘it shall be forgiven him,’ from Leviticus xvi., was very suggestive.

‡ ‘The law can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.’ Heb. x. 1.

Our imaginary Jew's account is, we think, truer to the genius of the Levitical institutions and to the ritual of the Day of Atonement itself than Dr. Bushnell's; nor would the Jew be at all perplexed by the suggestion that the goat 'by which the people are to be personally cleansed themselves, suffers no death or dying pain at all, as their substitute, but having their sins all put upon his head by the priest's confession, is turned loose alive, and driven off into the wilderness; so to signify the deportation or clean removal of their guiltiness.'* It is expressly said that the *two* goats constituted the sin-offering; they cannot be severed. The one is sent off into the wilderness as a visible sign that the sins confessed over him are utterly removed, because the other has first been put to death.

The idea of a real expiation cannot be separated from the sin-offerings for individual and ceremonial offences; the idea of a symbolic expiation cannot be separated from the sacrifices annually offered for the sins of the whole people. The institutions of Judaism, as well as the explicit teaching of Christ and the Apostles, protest against the theory of an Atonement from which the expiatory idea is excluded.

We regard with serious apprehension the silent but rapid advance of the theological tendencies which we have combated in these pages. It will not be supposed that we are inclined to under-estimate the infinite importance of the confession that our Lord Jesus Christ is the 'brightness of the Father's glory' and the express image of His person,' the Eternal Word who 'was with God' and 'was God.' The whole structure of Christian theology rests on this stupendous fact; and the most urgent practical questions affecting man's religious life and destiny are answered when it is determined that he who hath seen Christ hath seen the Father. Nor is it wonderful if, in the present chaotic condition of European thought, many who themselves believe in the old doctrine of Expiation, sometimes speak as though everything important in the Christian Faith is secure while the Divinity of our Lord is firmly maintained. At a moment when among the foremost nations of Christendom the foundations of all religious faith are shaken by the portentous triumphs of a philosophy which treats as obsolete and insoluble all the questions which have agitated past ages in relation to the higher life of our race, and the mysteries of the invisible and spiritual world; a philosophy which paralyses the noblest energies of human nature and robs it of all its glory; which ignores rather than denies—and to deny is less insolent than to ignore

* Page 395.

—the existence of a Personal Deity, and proclaims that whether there be a 'High and Lofty One inhabiting Eternity' or not, is practically unimportant to mankind,—it is natural that the fact of the Incarnation—the supreme witness to the moral freedom of God and to the immortal dignity of man—should be asserted with a passionate and exclusive devotion. We thought that the Materialistic Philosophy of the last century had rotted back to corruption, but 'out of its tomb,' to avail ourselves of the magnificent imagery of Edmund Burke, has arisen 'a vast, tremendous, unformed spectre,' overpowering the imagination, and subduing the fortitude of the most devout and courageous souls. They find that in the presence of the Incarnate God, the evil power of this terrific vision is baffled and broken : and, grateful for a Divine security and peace, they care to know nothing more than that in Jesus Christ our Lord, God was manifest in the flesh.

It must also be remembered that both in Europe and America, the whole system of Christian doctrine is passing into new forms and undergoing complete reconstruction ; and it may be, that as the Incarnation was the first truth which was elaborated and defined by the scientific thought of the early Church, the Person of Christ, which many theologians regard as the solitary problem of modern theology, must, for a time, again absorb the chief thought and strength of Christendom. But the theory of the Christian Faith will be ignominiously impoverished, and the power of the Gospel over the moral and religious life of mankind injuriously diminished, if the expiatory value of the death of Christ is finally rejected. The doctrine of the Atonement cannot be eliminated from the Christian system without imperilling the authority of its inspired teachers ; contradicting some of the strongest and deepest instincts of man's moral nature, and undermining the noblest theory of God's moral government ; repudiating communion with the religious life and faith of the nineteen Christian centuries, and impeaching the wisdom and worth of the characteristic institutions of that earlier revelation, which for fifteen centuries before the coming of Christ, testified to the Unity of God, and sustained the hope of human redemption. The issues of this controversy are infinitely momentous, *Ab actu ad posse valet illatio*. For a time, those who refuse to acknowledge that Christ has redeemed us with His 'precious blood,' may still confess that He is 'the King of glory,' and 'the everlasting Son of the Father,' may cling to Him with enthusiastic love, may adore His bright perfections, and, from the depths of their spiritual nature, may confess that in Christ are treasured up the immortal hopes of our race. While

this Faith lasts, their hearts will be true to Him, and in Him they will find 'eternal life.' But with the new generation this theology must either return to the ancient creed of the Church, or drift away into mortal heresy. For eighteen hundred years, the Divinity of our Lord's person and the Expiation effected by His death for human sin, have stood and fallen together; the rejection of either has been always followed by the rejection of both. The doctrine of expiation, profoundly true in itself and of transcendent value to the religious development of the soul, is the surest defence of the only Christian truth which can claim to be of still higher worth to the spiritual life of our race—the personal manifestation of God in Jesus Christ our Lord.

ART. V.—*Report of the Jamaica Royal Commission.* 1866.

TOWARDS the end of last October the people of England were startled by the arrival of a telegram announcing that the island of Jamaica was in a state of insurrection, and that troops and ships of war had been hurriedly summoned from our North American and other adjacent colonies. In the interval, before the detailed news arrived, the greatest anxiety was felt in this country to know how or why the insurrection had arisen. Ere long the detailed account of the outbreak arrived, in the form of a lengthy despatch from Governor Eyre, accompanied by several numbers of the *Colonial Standard*, to which he referred Mr. Cardwell for additional information. It appears that, on Saturday, October 7th, a Court of Petty Sessions had been held at Morant Bay, and whilst a black man was being brought up for trial before the Justices, a large number of the peasantry, armed with bludgeons, entered the town, openly expressing their determination to rescue the man about to be tried, should he be convicted. One of their party having created a disturbance in the court-house was taken into custody; whereupon the mob rushed in, rescued the prisoner, and maltreated the policeman in attendance. 'But so little,' says Mr. Eyre, 'did the magistrates think of the occurrence that no steps were taken to communicate with the Executive.' Two days afterwards the magistrates issued a warrant for the apprehension of twenty-eight of the persons principally concerned in

the assault and riot. Upon the arrival of the police at the settlement where the parties lived, at Stony Gut, three or four miles from Morant Bay, a shell was blown, and the negroes collected in large numbers with arms in their hands. They caught and handcuffed three of the policemen, and administered to them an oath binding them to take the side of the blacks against the magistrates. And here be it observed that the quarrel between the blacks and the whites appears to have originated in the attempt made to expel the negroes from an abandoned plantation called Middleton, on which the negroes had been settled for years, but of which Mr. Anderson was seeking to deprive them. On receiving intelligence of what had taken place, Governor Eyre requested the General in command of Her Majesty's troops, to get ready a hundred men for embarkation, and the senior naval officer was requested to send a man-of-war to receive the troops and take them to their destination. Having done this, Mr. Eyre returned to his house in the mountains in order to be present at a dinner-party. This, which is mentioned by himself in his despatch, is a sufficient indication that at that time the Governor did not suppose that there was any risk of an alarming rising in the island.

The next day, however, (Thursday, December 12) he received a private letter containing a report that the blacks had risen and murdered Baron Ketelholdt and others, and stating that it was rumoured that the rebels were advancing along the line of the Blue Mountain valley. This report proved to be but too well founded. It appears that on Wednesday, October 11, when the Vestry had met at Morant Bay, about four o'clock drums were heard, and a large body of rioters, reckoned by Mr. Cook at from 400 to 500, appeared, 'armed,' says Mr. Cook in his narrative, 'with sticks, cutlasses, spears, guns, and other deadly weapons.' It appears, however, that the guns were some old muskets taken by the rioters from the police station, near the court-house, and which had neither flints nor cartridges. The magistrates, warned some hours before of the approach of the rioters, had drawn up a volunteer corps, twenty-two in number, in front of the court-house. On the approach of the rioters within a few yards, the Riot Act having been already read, the captain of the volunteers, alarmed by the violence and demeanour displayed by the rioters, and by a volley of stones which had been thrown by them, gave the order to fire. Some twenty of the negroes fell, but the remainder appear to have been infuriated by the loss of their comrades, and attacked the volunteers, who, overpowered, took refuge inside the court-

house, where the Custos, magistrates, and other gentlemen were already assembled. Upon this the negroes surrounded the house, smashed the windows, firing into the court-house with the rifles taken from some of the volunteers, while others of that body returned their fire with good effect, until, most unhappily, the court-house itself took fire.

'The Custos then put out a flag of truce. The rioters asked what it meant, and were answered "peace." They said they did not want peace, they wanted war. A second flag of truce was put out with no better effect, the rebels crying, "War, war." On the roof of the court-house falling in, through the fire that had been set to the premises, the Custos and other gentlemen burst open the doors and ran down the steps, the rebels attacking them in every direction. The Custos was armed with a sword which he took up. Each endeavoured to save himself. The mob cried, "Now we have the Baron; kill him!" and loud shouts announced that the deed had been done.'

Dr. Gerard was called to come out, the mob protesting that they would save him, which, in fact, they did; and a few others were also spared, but nearly all the whites who were in the court-house were murdered or severely wounded. It is, however, worth noting, that thirty-five of the party in the court-house escaped with their lives. But what, perhaps, excited the greatest emotion was the rumour, that in the words of Governor Eyre's despatch,

'The most frightful atrocities were perpetrated. The island curate of Bath, the Rev. F. Herschel, is said to have had his tongue cut out whilst still alive, and an attempt is said to have been made to skin him. One person, Mr. Charles Price, a black gentleman, formerly Member of Assembly, was ripped open and his entrails taken out. One gentleman, Lieut. Hall, of the volunteers, is said to have been pushed into an outbuilding, which was then set on fire, and kept there till he was literally roasted alive. Many are said to have had their eyes scooped out; heads were cleft open and the brains taken out. The Baron's fingers were cut off and carried away as trophies by the murderers. Some bodies were half burnt, others horribly battered. Indeed, the whole outrage could only be paralleled by the atrocities of the Indian mutiny. Women, as usual on such occasions, were even more barbarous and brutal than the men.'

Such was the statement made by Governor Eyre in his despatch written nine days after the terrible affair, and we cannot but regard it as deeply discreditable to the Governor that he should have thus given his official sanction to these rumours, instead of taking the trouble to make some inquiry whether they were founded on fact. It would have been only necessary for him to send for the medical gentleman who

examined the bodies, or for those who buried them, and he would then have ascertained what was subsequently proved before the Commission, that such frightful atrocities never were committed at all. The bodies showed the wounds that had been inflicted upon them during the violent struggle that took place, but there were no indications of any attempt at mutilation, whether of the living or of the dead. Bearing this in mind, it arouses our indignation to find that in a despatch from General O'Connor, dated October 15, he mentions that he has hung one woman—*although she had been recommended to mercy by the court-martial which tried her*—because, he says, 'the atrocities perpetrated by women on the occasion of the massacre of Baron Von Ketelholdt and others, communicated verbally to me by the Custos, Mr. Georges, decided me to confirm the sentence, and to ignore the recommendation to mercy.' That is to say, he hung this woman, not because she individually had been convicted of perpetrating these atrocities, but because 'women' were supposed to have perpetrated them, and therefore, it seems, he thought it desirable to hang her as a warning or punishment—what shall we say?—to those other women; the fact being that these atrocities, which the women were supposed to have perpetrated, had not been perpetrated at all.

After the commission of this horrible massacre, for which no one, so far as we have seen, has ventured to offer any palliation, some of the rioters set off on an expedition through the east end of the island, and are said to have plundered the small town of Bath, and on the evening of the next day they attacked and plundered Duckinfield House. At this place, we are told, no one was hurt: but they next made for Amity Hall, the residence of Mr. Hire, attorney or agent for the estate. This gentleman was killed; and his son and two other persons were severely wounded; but Dr. Crowder, who was ill in bed, was spared. They next made for Hordley House, where many ladies and children had taken refuge; but here they were met by fifty of the black labourers on the Hordley estate, who refused to allow them to approach. While parleying, the rest of the Hordley servants took the ladies and gentlemen to a place of safety, and next day escorted them to the protection of the troops. After their departure the house was sacked and gutted by the mob. It is difficult after this to trace the proceedings of the rioters, but there is no doubt that during two days the east end of the island was at their mercy, and the greatest alarm was felt by the white inhabitants. The measures taken by the authorities were, however, very prompt. All troops that could be procured, and a large body of Maroons were sent in three

columns through the disturbed districts. No resistance, however, was offered in any quarter. Rumours prevailed as to assemblages of rebels, and their military preparations, but, if such existed at all, they invariably vanished on the approach of the troops.

‘Different persons,’ says Governor Eyre, ‘have reported seeing from several hundreds to as many thousands (of rebels) at a time, and Col. Hobbs reports in one of his letters, that there were still thousands of rebels around him. No stand has ever been made against the troops, and though we are not only in complete military occupation of, but have traversed the disturbed districts, not a single casualty has befallen our soldiers or sailors, and they are all in good health.’

He proceeds, ‘A large number of rebels have been shot with arms in their hands; a great many prisoners have been tried and hung, shot or flogged, and a considerable number of prisoners are still awaiting trial by court-martial.’ In fact, the outbreak, insurrection, or riot—whatever name ought to be applied to it—appears to have blazed up for a moment, and then to have disappeared with almost equal rapidity.

Before we continue our narrative we must diverge for a moment to the very important question, what the real intentions were by which the rebels were actuated. The whole white population, including all the authorities and the Governor himself, appear to have yielded, without a moment’s doubt or hesitation, to the conviction that the whole negro population of Jamaica had been plotting to shake off the dominion of England, to form themselves into a Republic, after the fashion of Hayti, and to commence operations by a general massacre of the white inhabitants of the island; except, indeed, that this tale was varied by the assumption that the English women were to be kept as slaves. The language used by Mr. Eyre on this point is of the strongest kind. In his despatch of October 20, he says, ‘It is my duty to state most unequivocally my opinion that Jamaica has been, and to a certain extent still is, in the greatest jeopardy; the whole colony has been upon a mine, which required but a spark to ignite it.’ And the same sentiment was repeated by him in his address to the Assembly, in even more vivid terms. In fact, he announced to his surprised auditors that ‘so widespread a rebellion, so rapidly and effectually put down, is not to be met with in history!’

The Report of the Commission has proved that this assumption on the part of Mr. Eyre and others was not founded upon fact. The Commissioners, indeed, speak of the rising as having been of a dangerous character, and they state that not a few of

the negroes appear to have contemplated the death of the white inhabitants, or their expulsion from the island; but, at the same time, their deliberate conclusion is that there was no conspiracy of the kind supposed. In fact, it seems clear that the negroes, though greatly dissatisfied at their expulsion from the lands, and at the impossibility of obtaining justice from the planter magistrates, had not formed any design of throwing off the authority of the Queen or of massacring the whites. It is, we fear, but too probable that they meant mischief to a few individuals, and that they attacked the court-house with the view of inflicting vengeance upon those persons, and then, maddened by the volley fired at them, and by their success in mastering the whites in the combat that ensued, some of them in the wild excitement of the moment uttered cries and exclamations that seemed to indicate an intention to murder all the Europeans.

But what demonstrates that there was no real conspiracy to massacre the whites generally, is this pregnant and striking fact, that notwithstanding the excitement of the rioters after the deadly struggle at Morant Bay, that town remained during the whole of the ensuing night completely at their mercy, and not one single individual was killed by them at that place after the massacre: and again, that during the two or three days in which the whole of the eastern end of the island was completely at their mercy, only two out of the large numbers of men, women and children who were found there, were killed, while upwards of a hundred are reported as having escaped from the various plantations. No doubt very great terror prevailed, and in some cases threatening language was used by the negroes. The actual result, that, except Mr. Hire and one other person, no one was killed, amounts to a demonstration that the negroes were not actuated like the Sepoys in India, by a deliberate intention to exterminate the Europeans. On this point, too, we have the very important testimony given by the Rev. Alfred Bourne, who had gone out on his father's behalf to look after an estate at Manchioneal, which was in the very heart of the disturbed districts, and who informs us that he remained there quite openly during the whole time of the disturbances, with a party of seven other English in his house. When the rioters approached, two of the party took fright and were concealed for one night by the negroes, but not the slightest injury or insult was offered to any of them; and although the rioters plundered some houses belonging to Europeans who had fled on their approach, and two houses were burned, they did not display the least desire to exterminate the English. Two days after the riot, Mr. Bourne assembled the people in the

church and addressed them, commenting in severe terms on what had been done, and they seemed to be heartily ashamed of themselves, although, indeed, it was only a small portion of the people who had joined in these acts of incendiarism and plunder. The following day, however, Mr. Bourne heard shots fired in the village, and saw columns of smoke arising from it, and on running down he found that some men belonging to Captain Hole's column had arrived, and were shooting the people without any form of trial whatever. Two men were killed near Mr. Bourne, one of whom he knew to be a most respectable negro, who had had nothing whatever to do with the riot. In the course of a few days a court-martial was formed, and it is very remarkable that the president of the court-martial was a young man named Warmington, a clerk, belonging to one of the estates, whose only title to sit on the court-martial was, that a commission as lieutenant of volunteers was sent down to him at the moment. He was one of those who had been severely wounded at the court-house, and some of his property had been plundered. Naturally, therefore, he was full of exasperation against the rioters, and this was sufficiently evinced by the very striking fact that out of 37 persons tried before this court-martial 36 were hung, and one received a hundred lashes.*

This brings us to the turning-point in our narrative, when the insurrection had completely vanished, when all occasion for the further display of force had ceased, and when the authorities, in the words of Governor Eyre, 'had leisure to deal with 'and punish the insurgents.' This point, according to Governor Eyre's despatch, was fully reached by Sunday the 15th October. 'By that time,' he says, 'all our most important work being 'done, and the troops comfortably established in their barracks, 'we had, for the first time, a night of quiet and rest.' On the following morning he himself returned to Kingston, after appointing a court-martial to try the prisoners at Morant Bay.

'On that day twenty-seven prisoners were tried and hung' (we are quoting Governor Eyre's despatch). 'By October 18,' he adds, 'several courts-martial had been held, and capital 'punishment had been inflicted. . . . More rebels had been 'captured and shot. . . . Col. Hobbs had seen and shot a 'good many rebels.' Somewhat later on, he adds, 'A good 'many prisoners had been tried and hung, shot, or flogged.' A few extracts from the letters of the officers engaged, will sufficiently exhibit the mode in which they carried on the work

* It is reported that before the Commission the numbers were stated at somewhat less, but we have reason to believe that the above statement is the really accurate one.

of punishment. Here, for example, is one of Lieut. Adcock's despatches to Gen. Nelson. 'In the morning,' he says, 'I first flogged four and hung six rebels. At Leith Hall there were a few prisoners, all of whom I flogged.' And then he burned eleven houses and a chapel. He mentions that, on the previous evening, he found sixty-seven prisoners at Golden Grove, and 'disposed' of as many as possible, but was too tired to continue after dark. But, now, let it be observed that, in the same official despatch, he says :—' I consider the state of the country quiet through this district ;' thus demonstrating that he, at least, was not hanging and flogging as a precautionary measure. Again, at the end of October, Captain Ford states,— ' This morning we made a raid with thirty men ; back at 4 P.M., bringing prisoners. Having flogged nine men, and burnt three negro houses, we then had a court-martial on the prisoners, who amounted to fifty or sixty. Several were flogged without court-martial, on a simple examination. One man, John Anderson, a kind of parson or schoolmaster, got fifty lashes ; one man got one hundred ; the other eight were hanged or shot.'

The same man writes :—

'The black troops shot about 160 people on their march from Port Antonio to Manchioneal ; hanged seven in Manchioneal, and shot three on our way to Port Morant. This is a picture of martial law. The soldiers enjoy it ; the inhabitants have to dread it ; if they run on their approach, they are shot for running away.'

Now the very paper which inserts Captain Ford's letter, states that 'in the neighbouring parishes the greatest order prevails.' Well might the *Saturday Review* say of Capt. Ford,—' If Ford escapes hanging, except on full proof that he is a shameless liar, there is no justice in Jamaica.' So, again, we have Colonel Hobbs' official despatch, showing how he shot and hanged rebels on the authority of Paul Bogle's valet, 'a little fellow,' interrogated with a revolver at his head. His letter is dated on the eighth day after that of the outbreak, and he mentions that he is 'going to shoot some prisoners to-morrow morning.' On October 31st, no less than twenty days from the outbreak, we are informed by the papers, that, 'at six o'clock this morning,' the fifteen condemned to death on the previous day were hanged, except two, who received 100 and 150 lashes respectively. On that day, 'the court-martial resumed its sittings,' and thirteen more were sentenced to be hanged. 'The sentences were carried out the same evening, in the presence of the untried rebels.' The court-martial consisted of Lieutenant Brand, Ensign Taylor,

and Ensign Cole. On the 1st November, this court-martial hanged seven more; while (unless the newspapers tell lies) ninety-nine prisoners, 'against whom there was no proof that 'they were ever in arms or present at any murder, &c., were, 'with some exceptions, catted and sent adrift.'

Again, in the *Army and Navy Gazette*, of December 16, a brief summary is given of the services of the 6th, under Colonel Hobbs. The writer describes one negro settlement, which he helped to destroy. He says, 'It is three and a half miles 'long. . . . In Roos Island the rebels live in comfort; at 'Mount Lebanon in affluence; but in Somerset it was downright 'luxury; boarded houses, cedar tables and chairs, quantities of 'beautiful glass and china, carved mahogany bedsteads, &c., 'displayed an amount of comfort unknown in England even; 'and when to this we add poultry, the horses, mules, pigs, and 'extensive provision grounds, it makes it the more remarkable 'that people like this should rebel. 'The regiment,' he adds, 'passed through this beautiful spot, firing every house in it, 'except three. Afterwards, some negroes were caught sight of, 'and pursued. Captain Field showed extreme gallantry, and 'shot the rebels right and left, and a man named Conolly never 'ceased firing, killing a man at every shot. Captain Roworth 'leading on his men in his usual gallant style.'

They went to Monckland's, 'shot nine, and hung three; 'made rebels hang each other; effect on the living was terrific:— 'country beautiful; grazing lands; stock varied and abundant. 'Burned every house, except three widows.' 'Next day shot 'eighteen rebels.' 'Next day large numbers of prisoners shot; 'next day, many others were shot,' and so forth.

We could add largely, if necessary, to these extracts. They appear, however, to us to be sufficient to show the spirit by which the authorities were actuated in punishing the negroes after the outbreak was over. The general opinion of the upper classes of English society has, we regret to say, been on the side of those authorities, and the greatest rage and indignation have been warmly expressed by nearly all the Conservative press, and by a portion of that on the Liberal side, against those Englishmen at home who ventured to protest against these doings. It is not our purpose to defend those who were thus assailed. We merely seek to lay before our readers a brief but accurate account of what was done. One thing, however, we are bound to notice. It has been urged by Governor Eyre himself, and with still more vehemence by his defenders at home, that he was compelled to use these measures of apparent severity, in order to strike terror into the negroes of Jamaica,

on account of their overwhelming numbers, and in consequence of the extreme smallness of the force at his disposal. On this point we have already shown that from the first no resistance whatever was made by the negroes—no organization of any kind was found to exist amongst them; they had no arms except the cutlasses or hooks used in cutting the sugar-canes, and a few guns. On the other hand, we find from the Governor's first despatch that the force in his hands consisted of six men-of-war—the Wolverine, Onyx, Lily, Nettle, Urgent, and Steady—which number was soon increased by the arrival of several other men-of-war. He speaks in this same despatch of two regiments of regular troops, under the command of a Brigadier-General, of the Volunteers, the Pensioners, the Maroons, Mounted Police, and Royal Artillery; the Buffs came at once from Barbadoes, a black battalion from Nassau, while a large force of Maroons was supplied with arms, and were certainly not found deficient in zeal in the work of slaughter. It really seems to us preposterous to say that an English Governor, assisted by generals of experience in actual warfare, with a well-armed force of this kind; backed by an Admiral with several men-of-war, was in any risk of being driven out of the island by a mob of negroes armed with cutlasses. This plea, however, is still put boldly forward by those who think that Governor Eyre was justified in using these extraordinary measures of severity.

The real truth, however, appears to have been that the authorities were swept away at first by panic, and then by the frantic rage by which panic is almost always succeeded. They seem to have regarded the whole negro race as their deadly enemies, and to have revelled in the opportunity of wreaking vengeance upon them. This feeling was exhibited by Governor Eyre himself in his violent and undignified address to the Legislature after the affair was over; but still more strikingly in the shameful letter written by the Adjutant-General, Col. Elkington, to Col. Hobbs, and which ran as follows:—

‘11, a.m., 18th October.

‘Dear Colonel,—I send you an order to push on at once to Stony Gut, but I trust you are there already. Hole is doing splendid service with his men about Manchioneal, and shooting every black man who cannot give an account of himself.

‘Nelson, at Port Antonio, is hanging like fun by court-martial. I hope you will not send us any prisoners. Civil law can do nothing.

* * * * *

‘Do punish the blackguards well.

‘Yours, in haste,

(Signed) ‘JOHN ELKINGTON, D.A.G.’

One of the most striking incidents in this disgraceful history was that which we deliberately and confidently call the judicial murder of Mr. Gordon. This case stands by itself, and will assuredly be looked back upon with the same feeling of indignation and amazement as that with which we look back upon some of the infamous political murders which stain the annals of this country. Mr. Gordon was the illegitimate son, by a slave mother, of a much respected Jamaica planter, whose name he inherited. The Rev. Dr. King, who knew him well, writes, that, 'being a boy of good natural parts, he taught himself with 'very little difficulty to read, write, and cast accounts. By his 'dilligence and intelligence, he contrived to gather money with 'which he bought his freedom. Once free himself, he gained 'enough to emancipate his sisters, and afterwards sent them to 'Europe for their education, first to London and then to Paris. 'Through the reverses of the colony,' says Dr. King, 'the father, from being very rich, came to lose his all, and the 'coloured son bought his estate, not, however, to deprive him 'of it, but to leave him in occupancy, surrounded by the comforts he had been accustomed to enjoy. . . . Mr. 'Gordon was tenderly sensitive. One day as we were walking 'together he became pensive and absorbed. After a little 'while, stopping before a slight elevation of the grass, he said 'to me with great emotion, "My mother was buried there; she 'was a negro and a slave, but she was a kind mother to me, and 'I loved her dearly." As he uttered these words his tears 'trickled down upon her grave.'

'Mr. Gordon,' continues Dr. King, 'married a white lady 'who gave him her hand from respect for his noble character. 'All his tastes, habits, sympathies, and efforts attracted or impelled him to the white race; all his hopes for the negroes 'whom he loved so well were based upon the support or friendship of white friends.' An admirable letter from Mr. Gordon to the Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, dated March 24, 1865, has been published in the Blue-book, and in which he discusses the position of affairs in Jamaica with much ability. He especially refers to a recent act of the legislature by which fifty lashes might be inflicted for acts of petty larceny, and he goes on:—'Representations, unfounded and uncharitable, 'may be wickedly made against the peasants of this country, 'but in good truth, they are as peaceable, civil, and well-disposed as any people can well be, and their character cannot 'justly be unfavourably compared with those of the labouring 'classes of Great Britain, or of the continent of Europe or 'America. What they require is what has been neglected—

‘attention to their sanitary improvement and education, ‘parochial asylums for orphans and adults, and relief to some ‘extent from the excessive taxation on the necessary articles of ‘food and clothing, which in its tendency produced that destitution which leads here, as in other countries (to a great ‘extent) to petty larcenies. These are the points which ‘should have been attended to, but which are lost sight of, for ‘the debasing purposes of the whip, as if that will instil principles of morality or supply the mental and bodily wants of a ‘poor suffering community.’

He concludes his letter by saying, ‘I feel it a bounden duty ‘to bring these subjects to your notice. The consequences I ‘cannot control, but I sincerely trust that, notwithstanding any ‘explanation which will, no doubt, be tendered by the Governor ‘on these remarks, the facts only of the points may be considered. I have a conscientious assurance that I intend no ‘undue reflections, and only write from the stern obligations of ‘a sense of justice and common humanity.’

There can be no doubt that Mr. Gordon was a man of very benevolent feeling, of great liberality, and that he had a large measure of patriotic feeling, and a deep indignation against what he believed to be the misrule by which the people of the island were kept in a state of degradation and discontent. Like many other patriots, he, no doubt, was often carried away by his feelings into indiscretions of language, both in public and in private. These, however, were not sufficient to cause him to forfeit the friendship and hospitality of the leading men of the island; and we have rarely read a more admirable letter than the one which he addressed to Governor Eyre, refusing for the last time the Governor’s repeated invitations to Government House, upon the ground that Mr. Eyre had falsely accused him of misrepresentation, and had never withdrawn or apologised for the charge he had made. No doubt he had some bitter enemies, and we cannot forbear noticing the intense malignity displayed towards him by Dr. Bowerbank, who not only took an active part in his arrest, but has since been straining every nerve to blacken the character of his victim.

On the 17th of October, however, six days after the outbreak, and when, according to the statement in his own despatch, the rebellion was fairly crushed, Governor Eyre returned from Morant Bay to Kingston, where no riot of any sort or kind had occurred, and where martial law had not been proclaimed, and on the same day issued the order for the arrest of Mr. Gordon. Mr. Gordon had been warned that there was some likelihood of proceedings being taken against him; it had been suggested that he should

conceal himself. This, however, he refused to do; and, accompanied by a friend, he was actually calling on General O'Connor when the arrest took place. He was then hurried off on board a gunboat, and on landing at Morant Bay the sailors and others were allowed to treat him with shameful insolence, threatening him with the same fate as that of some of the so-called rebels, who were at that time hanging from the gallows. One of the sailors held up a cat, and said, 'Would you like to have a taste of this, old boy?' 'He will soon catch it,' said another; while a third added, 'We are getting ready for you; you have not long to remain here.' His coat apparently had been torn off his back, and a blanket was thrown over his shoulders during the trial. It lasted four or five hours, and the proofs against him consisted of a few bits of tittle-tattle, mostly repeated at second-hand, although in some cases witnesses, whose depositions were read, might have been brought before the court. The main evidence against him, however, was what was called his 'Proclamation,' which was simply an invitation, *issued some months before*, to a public meeting, held to consider the state of distress in which the people were; and we do not hesitate for an instant in saying, that this so-called 'Proclamation' did not contain so much as a single seditious or treasonable word. That, however, was not necessary. It was fully understood before Mr. Gordon was tried that he was to be executed, and it was not of the slightest consequence to the three youngsters who were appointed to try him, whether there was or was not evidence against him. As a matter of course he was found guilty, and condemned to be hanged. The proceedings of the court-martial were forwarded to Governor Eyre, and there was ample time for the Governor to stay execution, had he chosen to do so. On the contrary, however, he contrived to discover that the evidence laid before the court-martial was of a damning kind; but it is remarkable that in his despatch to General O'Connor, returning the proceedings of the court-martial, he actually dwells on the fact that Col. Hobbs had reported, 'that he had sufficient 'evidence to justify the execution of Mr. Gordon,' as being one of the motives for assenting to his execution! Accordingly, on Monday, October 23, *twelve days after the outbreak*, Mr. Gordon was hanged.

One shameful feature of this infamous transaction was the fact, that a letter addressed to Mr. Gordon by his solicitor, giving him excellent advice as to his line of defence, was deliberately kept back from him by General Nelson, manifestly from the base apprehension that it might be an assistance to him, and perhaps render his conviction impossible.

A still more shameful trait in the proceedings was, that an immense deal was made in the evidence of Mr. Gordon's having absented himself from the vestry meeting which was attacked by the negroes; but although he stated that he had been prevented solely by ill-health, and two medical men could have been brought forward to prove the fact, so hurried were the proceedings, that he was not permitted thus to overthrow even this vital part of the case alleged against him. Altogether, from beginning to end, there is scarcely in English history an instance of more scandalous perversion of the forms of law, for the sake of putting an innocent man to death, than this trial and execution of Mr. Gordon.

Such in brief outline is the story of the outbreak in Jamaica and of its suppression. The conclusions to which we are led by a very careful study of it are these:—

1. That however serious in some respects the riot at Morant Bay may have been, there is no evidence of any conspiracy on the part of the negroes to throw off the dominion of the Queen, or to exterminate the white population of the island.

2. That the riot or insurrection vanished away at once, and that not the shadow of an excuse can be made out for the proceedings of the authorities, even upon the ground that it was necessary to strike terror into the negroes in order to stay the further spread of the movement.

3. That the riot was not merely suppressed, but, after its complete extinction, was punished with atrocious cruelty.

Painful as the story is, it is made much more deplorable by the fact, which is, we fear, undeniable, that these atrocities, so far from being regarded with horror by all classes of society at home, were fully condoned—and, indeed, almost applauded—by the higher classes, and by a large part of the middle and working classes as well. Still, a loud cry of indignation was heard, and it was impossible for the Government to refuse a full investigation as to the alleged cruelties. A Commission was sent out; and its Report, though certainly leaning, as strict justice would scarcely have permitted, to the side of the authorities, yet summed up against them in terms of unmistakable condemnation. Governor Eyre was recalled; and one or two individuals—Ensign Lake and Dr. Morris—are to be tried by court-martial; but the Government have not hitherto shown any inclination to punish Colonel Nelson, General O'Connor, Lieutenant Brand, and others, who are personally guilty of some of the darkest acts impugned by the Report of the Commission. The subject, however, was brought before Parliament on July 31, by Mr. Charles Buxton; when Mr. Adderley, though in a very

reluctant and unsatisfactory manner, repudiated the idea that the Government did not sternly disapprove of what had been done ; Mr. Buxton withdrew his resolutions only upon the express understanding that the leading actors would be punished ; that compensation would be awarded to those who had suffered illegally ; and that those now undergoing punishment for complicity in the rebellion would have their sentences remitted, where it could safely be done. The question has been warmly discussed, whether the "Jamaica Committee" are right in the intention they have expressed of prosecuting Mr. Eyre, should their friends enable them to do so, which we believe is not probable, as the outlay would not be less than £8,000 or £9,000. No doubt, it is highly important that cruel acts, such as those of Mr. Eyre and his subordinates, should be declared illegal by an English tribunal, but, unfortunately, there is no charge upon which Mr. Eyre can be tried except that of "wilful murder ;" and, shameful as his conduct was, few would regard it as amounting to deliberate, wilful murder. Should Mr. Eyre be acquitted—by far the most probable event—he would, in reality, gain a triumph, which, in the hands of his injudicious friends at Southampton and elsewhere, would more than cancel all the good done by his dismissal.

It is now time to turn to the state of things in Jamaica, from which these events took their rise, and we naturally look first of all to the despatch from the Governor of the Island, in which he gives his own explanation of the causes which led to that which he calls 'this most wicked and wide-spread rebellion.' On this subject, Governor Eyre says :—

'I cannot myself doubt that it (the rebellion) is in a great degree due to Dr. Underhill's letter, and the meetings held in connection with that letter, where the people were told that they were tyrannized over and ill-treated, were overtaxed, were denied political rights, had no just tribunals, were misrepresented to her Majesty's Government by the authorities and by the planters ; and where, in fact, language of the most exciting and seditious kind was constantly used, and the people told plainly to right themselves, to be up and doing, to put their shoulders to the wheel, to do as the Haytians had done, and other similar advice.'

In passing we may observe, that Mr. Gordon utterly denied having used the expression about Hayti, to which Governor Eyre refers in the last sentence. Nor was there any evidence of its having been used, except that of one or two negroes, while it was distinctly denied by other auditors of the speech in which it was said to have occurred.

'The parties,' adds Mr. Eyre, 'who have more immediately taken part in these nefarious proceedings are, firstly, G. W. Gordon, a member of the Assembly, and a Baptist preacher; secondly, several black persons, chiefly of the Baptist persuasion, connected with him; thirdly, a few persons of better information and education; fifthly, a few Baptist missionaries who endorse, at public meetings or otherwise, all the untruthful statements or inuendoes propagated in Dr. Underhill's letter; and, lastly, a section of the press which is always endeavouring to bring into contempt the representative of the Sovereign, and all constituted authority.'

Subsequently, Mr. Eyre gives the Baptist ministers some little of the credit, which they so highly deserve, for their strenuous efforts on behalf of the Jamaica peasantry. It was, however, according to the official statement of the Governor of Jamaica, to the letter of Dr. Underhill, addressed to the Colonial Secretary, that this rebellion was mainly due! A more foolish—a more preposterous charge was never made. For what did Dr. Underhill actually do? We believe he happened to meet Mr. Cardwell in a railway train, and getting into conversation with him, mentioned to him the deplorable accounts that he was receiving from Jamaica, and made two or three suggestions to Mr. Cardwell for the improvement of the island. Mr. Cardwell asked him to put down his remarks on paper, which he accordingly did, and Mr. Cardwell then forwarded this statement to Governor Eyre, and requested him to report upon it. That is all that Mr. Cardwell asked the Governor to do; it was entirely Mr. Eyre's own notion to publish Dr. Underhill's letter, and circulate it throughout the island, 'among the custodes, 'judges, magistrates, clergy, and ministers of all denominations,' with a request for information. Naturally a good deal of interest was excited. The newspapers entered eagerly on the discussion; for several months the subject absorbed the attention of the public; and in all parts of the island public meetings were held to express the opinions of the negro population. But, obviously, if there was any harm in all this, if it was dangerous to hold these meetings, if seditious language was really used at any of them (and we would not take Mr. Eyre's definition of seditious language for granted), the whole blame rested with the Governor, and with no one else; and his attempt to throw the onus on Dr. Underhill was paralleled only by his subsequent attempt to throw the responsibility of the atrocities committed in suppressing the rebellion on the military authorities; although in his original despatch he had expressly claimed the credit of all that was done. Mr. Cardwell, however, has expressly relieved Dr. Underhill from all responsibility in the matter.

The statements of Dr. Underhill, with regard to the distressed condition of the island, appear to have been regarded by the authorities as an irritating reproach against themselves; and were met in many cases by loud invectives against Dr. Underhill and his letter, which, says Mr. Eyre, 'contains a very *'exaggerated view of the colony and of the labouring classes.'* He, himself, however, goes on to say, *'undoubtedly there is a considerable amount of distress amongst all classes, owing to the low prices of produce and to the dry seasons which have prevailed during the last two years;'* though he does not allow that it reached the extent pictured by Dr. Underhill. He further confirms Dr. Underhill's statement as to the large increase of the crime of larceny, though he does not, like that gentleman, attribute it to the starving condition of the people. At Spanish Town, a meeting unanimously passed resolutions stating, 'that this meeting views with alarm the distressed condition of nearly all classes of the people,' and complaining of the excessive taxation to which they were subjected. Similar resolutions were passed at parish meetings in Hanover and other places; and the ministers of the Baptist denomination state that they have collected information from nearly every part of the country, and declare that 'the proprietors and the peasantry are alike suffering. The merchants and storekeepers state that their trade is falling off; small tradesmen and others are reduced to deep poverty. Many small settlers are still represented to be in comparative comfort through their thrift and frugality, but the larger number of labourers are stated to have the greatest difficulty to support themselves and their families.' Mr. Underhill had himself quoted a speech delivered in the House of Assembly by the Hon. A. Whitlock, in which he gave a melancholy account of the poverty of the people, and of the severe pressure of taxation. Altogether there appears to be no doubt that in parts, at any rate, of Jamaica, the long droughts, superadded to all the other causes that co-operated to produce the decay of wealth, had caused a very considerable amount of suffering. But though the droughts had brought this distress to a crisis, those other causes had long been undermining the prosperity of Jamaica, and it is evident that the deplorable misgovernment of the island, the absence of sound legislation, the corruption and folly of the Legislature, and above all, perhaps, the miserable administration of justice, had produced their natural effect in creating discontent among the people. As to the character of the Legislature, it seems, at any rate, to have had one virtue—that of being conscious of its own vices; and in condemning itself to annihilation, after the rising was sup-

pressed, it admitted, in the most frank way, its own deplorable shortcomings; and its political suicide was hailed with unmingled satisfaction by every class of the community, from the Governor down to the negroes. It appears to have been, in no real sense, a representative assembly. By the Election Act of 1858, a voter must have a freehold of £6, or pay a rental of £20, or have a salary of £50, or pay taxes to the amount of 20s. in the year, or have a deposit of £100 in a bank for a year: but one provision was expressly intended to exclude the negroes from the suffrage, namely—that every franchise was required to be registered at a cost of 10s. a year.

Six years afterwards this duty was removed in two specified cases, viz., where the £6 freeholder also paid 20s. in taxes, and where 30s. in taxes were paid. This, of course, still left the negroes outside the franchise, unless they chose to pay 10s. a year for maintaining it. These provisions were perfectly successful in the object for which they were intended. Out of a population of 436,000 persons, only 1,457 voted at the election of the Assembly in 1864. We do not at all complain of the suffrage not being extended to the negroes *en masse*, but the skilful manipulation by which the whole negro class, with but few exceptions, was excluded from it, produced its natural effect on the policy of the Assembly, which was altogether directed to the advantage of the planters, with strangely little regard for the feelings or advantage of the negroes. As an example we find that in 1864 the Assembly actually passed an Act which enacts, not only that male offenders might be severely flogged on a second conviction for stealing fruit or vegetables, but that any person or persons under the age of 16 years, who should be 'convicted of stealing, or damaging 'with intent to steal, any tree, plant, root, etc,' might be taken away from their parents, and apprenticed to any householder carrying on any business of trade, or to any proprietors of plantations for a period of five years! This atrocious law does not appear to have been vetoed by the Home Government. At the same time the most extravagant and outrageous jobs were committed by members of the Legislature. The money wrung by heavy taxation from the earnings of the impoverished people was wasted in a way that added greatly to the prevailing irritation, while the immense subsidy given annually to the Established Church—which is not to any great extent the church of the people, but of the upper classes—further excited a very natural degree of discontent. The Governor, also, whether justly or unjustly, had made himself extremely disliked, or rather, we should say, despised. 'The feebleness

'of his understanding,' says the *Morning Journal* of July 8th, 1865, 'makes him unfit to represent the majesty of the Crown.' 'Governor Eyre,' says the *Jamaica Guardian* of about the same date, 'is daily becoming more unpopular, and nothing would give greater satisfaction to persons of all classes in the country than to hear that he has been recalled. Weak, vacillating, and undignified in his conduct and character, he has lost caste exceedingly.' 'The newspapers received by the packet,' says the *Morning Journal*, 'make no mention, whatever, of the recall of Mr. Eyre, an event to which the colonists have been looking forward with intense anxiety.' It is probable that much of the irritation against him was unjust, but we are merely giving an account of the causes by which the feelings of the people were chafed, and which contributed to bring about the terrible events that ensued. It is evident that the state of Jamaica was in every way most unsatisfactory; and especially that the negroes conceived it to be impossible for them to obtain redress for their grievance, or justice in their frequent bickerings with the planters; but, nothing appears to have excited so much exasperation as the attempts made, (amongst others, by Baron Ketelholdt and Mr. Hire) to expel them from the deserted plantations, on which they had long been settled.

In fact, however, there are two sides to the picture of life among the negroes in Jamaica. It is evident that many of them are extremely idle, and that employers find, as a general rule, much difficulty in obtaining a sufficient supply of continuous labour. This is especially the case on the sugar plantations. The fact is that the sugar crop requires to be got in and manufactured into sugar with very great rapidity. During the days of slavery in our own West Indies,—and the same is true at the present time in Cuba,—eighteen or twenty hours a day of continuous labour was exacted from the negroes, every moment being of importance to secure the sugar before the canes have had time to spoil. This stress continues for many weeks, and if at that time a sufficient supply of labour is not forthcoming the value of the crop may be immensely deteriorated; and yet, without the compulsion of the whip, it is almost impossible under a tropical sun to find any human beings who will give such strenuous and steady labour as this. It is, however, a mere illusion to suppose, as many appear to do, that the West Indies have been ruined by emancipation. The statistical returns show that in the last clear year of slavery, 1833, the amount of sugar imported into the United Kingdom from the West Indies amounted to 3,655,612 cwt., while the quantity imported in 1865 from those islands amounted to 3,563,664 cwt.; so that in

reality the West Indies are importing into this country about as much sugar as they were before slavery was abolished. This is a most striking fact, but its whole force is not perceived unless we remember at the same time that in 1833 our colonies had no export trade whatever to any other part of the world. At the present time the West Indies export a considerable amount of sugar to America and to other countries, of which, unfortunately, we have no account. These Parliamentary returns, as to the accuracy of which there can be no question, completely overthrow the assertions that are so commonly made as to the utter idleness and uselessness of the emancipated negro. No doubt a part of this sugar crop is due to the labours of the coolies who have been imported. Last year, however, the number of these hired labourers in the West Indies was small, and the amount of their labour is not to be compared to that of the negro women who were employed upon the plantations in the days of slavery; but everyone of whom—200,000 in number—at once retired from plantation labour the moment they were set free.

The prosperity of most of the other West India islands has far outrun that of Jamaica, but we believe that the difference has been almost wholly owing to the system of misgovernment to which that island has been subjected. Even in Jamaica, however, large numbers of the negroes appear to live in a very considerable degree of comfort. We have already given a description of the settlement destroyed by Colonel Hobbs' column, which shows a state of well-being, and indeed of luxury, among the peasant freeholders in that district to which no part of the working class in England has ever yet attained.

We are told by a recent traveller in the West Indies that

‘In general the cottages of the negroes are either neatly thatched or shingled with pieces of hard wood. Some are built of stone or wood, but generally are plastered also on the outside and whitewashed. Many are ornamented with a portico in front to screen the sitting apartment from the sun and rain; while for the admission of light and air, as well as to add to their appearance, they exhibit either shutters or jalousies painted green, or small glass windows.

‘There is usually a sleeping apartment at each end, and a sitting room in the centre; the floors are in most instances terraced, although boarded ones for sleeping rooms are becoming common. Many of the latter contain good mahogany bedsteads, a washing-stand, looking-glass, and chairs. The middle apartment is usually furnished with a side-board, displaying sundry articles of crockeryware, some decent looking chairs, and not unfrequently with a few broad sheets of the Tract Society hung round the walls, in neat frames of cedar. For cooking food, and other domestic purposes, a little room or two is erected at the back of the cottage, where are also arranged various

conveniences for keeping domestic stock. The villages are laid out in regular order, being divided into lots, more or less intersected by roads or streets. The plots are usually in the form of an oblong square. The cottage is situated at an equal distance from each side of the allotment, and at about eight or ten feet from the public thoroughfare. The piece of ground in front is, in some instances, cultivated in the style of an European garden, displaying rose-bushes, and other flowering shrubs, among the choicer vegetable productions, while the remainder is covered with all the substantial vegetables and fruits of the country heterogeneously intermixed.'

Unhappily, the accounts given us of the moral condition of the negroes in Jamaica are in many respects far from gratifying. The amount of petty larceny that goes on among them is a serious drawback, not only to their own comfort, but to the prosperity of the islands. A great deal of immorality exists, and appears to have been increasing rather than diminishing; while their reverence for their spiritual teachers, and their interest in works of charity and religion, seem to have declined since the abolition of slavery. In fact, in the days of slavery the negroes naturally looked to their spiritual pastors—and above all to the Baptist missionaries—as their only friends, and often regarded them with feelings of enthusiastic gratitude and affection. It is worth noticing, that the Baptist missionaries were always objects of the bitter hatred of the planting class during the days of slavery; but now the demoralization which is said to have extended among the negroes is generally attributed to the diminished influence of those very men whose labours in days gone by were so bitterly depreciated. The Established Church, in spite of the immense annual subsidy given to it, has never had more than a very faint influence over the negroes. Had not the Baptists and Wesleyans undertaken the spiritual charge of the peasantry in the West Indies, they would have been left almost altogether to themselves, and must have sunk into depths of superstition and immorality, of which we are enabled to form some conception from the accounts that have reached us of the state of the negroes in the outlying and neglected parts of those islands.

It is unfortunate that all travellers land at Kingston, and in that seaport town come across the very vilest specimens of the negro race that can anywhere be found. There congregates the very scum of the black population. The traveller lands, and perhaps the first object he sees is a negro loitering about in a few miserable rags, and yet refusing to put his hand to any labour in order to better his condition. The traveller offers him a shilling to carry his portmanteau. The 'sooty gentleman'

thanks him, but 'it does not suit him' to take the job. Thinking this fellow mad, he offers the chance to another, who, after long consideration, says, he will 'do anything to oblige massa; he hopes the Lord will bless massa and all his family, and that massa will soon find a person to do what he wants;' but he himself is going to attend a funeral in the evening, and follow his 'parted broder to de grabe.' No wonder that the fretted traveller at once concludes that all negroes are idle, impracticable rascals; and he starts with a prejudice against them which is not easily overcome, unless he has the opportunity of really studying their mode of life in the interior of the island. As regards the condition of the negroes in their own settlements, there is abundant proof that, except in years of drought, they are generally happy and thriving. Take, for instance, the testimony of the Archdeacon of Surrey in Jamaica, given in the *Jamaica Blue Books*, Part I. He says:—

'On Sunday and other holidays the labouring class invariably appear well-dressed—and I should say expensively. On a recent occasion I appealed to them on behalf of the "Jamaica Home and Foreign Missionary Society." There were between 600 and 700 labourers and artisans in and about the church, and they contributed liberally. Their very respectable appearance—and in very many instances expensive attire, viz., the women and girls of eighteen or nineteen with crinoline, chipped straw hats, trimmed with ribbons and artificial flowers; and the men with neat jackets, and many in the ordinary dress of a gentleman of the upper class attracted the notice of Europeans who happened to be present. Raggedness is seen in the towns only; it is attributable there, not to poverty, but to laziness, and to a determination not to seek work in the rural districts.'

The Rev. David Panton, M.A., also writes:—

'It cannot fail to be pleasing to the Government to know that the peasantry of the mountains of the parish of St. George are yearly becoming more wealthy. Each year more land is cleared for the cultivation of coffee, sugar, arrowroot, &c. . . . The peasantry here are as thriving as it is possible for any peasantry to be.'

The Archdeacon of Cornwall (Jamaica), writes that

'With the exception of the idle and wicked ones already spoken of, they are an industrious and contented people, and might, under proper and wholesome regulations, be made as good a peasantry as any in the world. I have had long experience among them, and my duties call upon me to make frequent journeys, and I consider myself competent to form a correct judgment on the subject.'

We could multiply in abundance such testimonies were it

necessary; while, on the other hand, as we have already shown, in many districts of Jamaica, there has been a considerable amount of distress, and the condition of the negro has been retrograding rather than advancing. Many causes have combined to produce this chequered result; but we fully share the opinion which has been expressed by those most intimately conversant with the island, that its greatest need has been that of a more patriotic and vigorous administration of its affairs. Deeply as we must deplore the insurrection, and the horrors by which its suppression was attended, it may be fairly hoped that ultimately much good may arise to the island from the crisis through which it has passed. The base and corrupt legislature has been got rid of. Governor Eyre, who, though not, we believe, a naturally cruel man, was weak and vain, and totally unfit for responsibility, has been removed. The selection of Sir John Peter Grant to succeed him is an augury full of hope for the future of Jamaica. Sir John's career in India has shown him to possess great ability, and he is not likely to follow Mr. Eyre's example by taking a violent partisan side in the miserable contests between the planters and the peasantry. His hand will be unfettered; he will be at liberty to inaugurate those improvements which are so grievously needed, and to cut down the innumerable abuses which have been allowed to spring up on all sides. A few years of strong administration by such a man may give a complete turn to the fortunes of the island. While many of the West Indian islands are examples of prosperity and progress, there can be no reason, in the nature of things, why Jamaica, of all islands the richest in resources and in the facilities for commercial intercourse, should lag behind. Let us trust that the terrible calamity of last autumn may prove to have been the 'blackness before the dawn' of a better and happier day.

ART. V.—*Les Apôtres.* Par ERNEST RENAN, Membre de l'Institut.
Paris: Michel Lévy, Frères. 1866.

It is with a feeling of no small relief that we now meet M. Renan on ground somewhat less sacred than that occupied by his first volume. The very ark of our faith was then assailed, and we felt that, while to defend it was a sacred duty, the task was one which might well give rise to a deep solemnity and even shrinking of spirit. The life and character of our Lord Jesus Christ are, in our estimation, so manifestly Divine, that it is almost presumptuous in any mere child of earth to

seek to defend them. The Gospel-narratives appear to us to bear so clearly the impress of their heavenly origin, that, in the words of the Wanderer, with reference to the outward glories of creation, we felt it hard to believe that these matchless records

‘Should exist
Only to be examined, pondered, searched,
Probed, vexed, and criticised,’

as it was, of course, necessary to treat them, while we followed M. Renan through that new and startling representation of the life of Jesus which he had presented to the world.

In this, the second instalment of his great undertaking, we have to deal, for the most part, with men of like passions with ourselves, and therefore we breathe more freely while we accompany our author through that critical dissection of their character and work, which they receive at his hands. The ‘Name above every Name’ does, indeed, again and again recur; and in two or three of the opening chapters it still forms the leading subject of remark. But, as its title indicates, the greater part of this volume is devoted to the apostles; and we are thus enabled more calmly to follow M. Renan in the theories he propounds, and the remarks which he makes, respecting these merely human founders of our faith.

The period here treated of embraces only twelve years, extending from the death of Christ, A.D. 33, to the commencement of the first Missionary journey of the apostle Paul, which may be probably dated in the year 45. In the opening sentences of his Introduction, the author thus describes the scope and design of this volume of his work:—

‘It is now necessary to take up matters at the point where we left them,—that is to say, at Saturday, April 4th, in the year 33. This will still be for some time a kind of continuation of the life of Jesus. Next to those months of joyous intoxication, during which the Great Founder laid the basis of a new order for humanity, these years were the most decisive in the history of the world. It is still Jesus, who, through means of the sacred fire of which He has deposited the spark in the heart of some friends, created institutions of the highest originality, influenced and transformed souls, while He impressed on all His own Divine seal. We have to show how, under this influence, always active and victorious over death, faith in the resurrection, in the influence of the Holy Spirit, in the gift of tongues, and in the power of the church, was established. We shall exhibit the organization of the church at Jerusalem, its first trials, its first conquests, along with the earliest missions which went forth from its bosom. We shall follow Christianity in its rapid progress through Syria

onwards to Antioch, where it formed a second capital, more important, in one sense, than Jerusalem, and destined ultimately to supplant it. In this new centre, where the converted heathen form a majority, we shall behold Christianity definitely separate itself from Judaism, and receive a name of its own; above all, we shall see the birth of the grand idea of foreign missions which are destined to carry the name of Jesus into the world of the Gentiles. We shall stop at the solemn moment when Paul, Barnabas, and John Mark, go forth for the accomplishment of this great design. We shall suspend our narrative for a time, to cast a glance at the world which these bold missionaries essay to convert. We shall endeavour to make ourselves acquainted with the intellectual, political, moral, religious, and social condition of the Roman empire, about the year 45, the probable date of the departure of St. Paul on his first mission.—pp. i. ii.

After an Introduction of sixty-four pages, in which the sources of information are criticised, our author devotes nineteen chapters to the fulfilment of the above design. Of these, the first three are employed in explaining the 'legend' of the resurrection. The next four give an account of the establishment and constitution of the church at Jerusalem. The eighth and ninth relate the first breaking forth of persecution, and the immediate results to which it led. The tenth comprises M. Renan's theory of the conversion of the apostle Paul. The remaining nine chapters are of a miscellaneous character, embracing sketches of the internal condition of the church in Judea, its extension to Antioch, the character and influence of Barnabas, the parallel movements to Christianity which arose, the state of the world at the period referred to, with many other points of various interest and importance. The volume ends with the following words:—

'But it is time to return to the three missionaries—Paul, Barnabas, and John Mark, whom we have left at the moment when they are setting forth from Antioch by the gate which leads to Seleucia. In my third book, I shall endeavour to follow the traces of these messengers of good news, over land and sea, through calm and tempest, in days of prosperity and in days of adversity. I am in haste to relate this unrivalled epic, to depict these endless journeyings in Asia and Europe, throughout the whole of which they sowed the seed of the Gospel, as well as those many voyages which they accomplished in circumstances so various. The great Christian Odyssey is now to commence. Already the apostolic bark has spread its sails; the wind gently blows, and its sole aspiration is to bear on its wings the words of Jesus.'

Before proceeding to the discussion of what we deem some of the fatal errors of this work, it is a pleasure to acknowledge those excellencies which it presents. The charm of its style is

as potent as was that of the previous volume. It seems to lead us through gardens of delight, in which the singing of birds and the trickling of streams are heard on every side. Powerful indeed is that enchantment which M. Renan exerts in virtue of the almost incomparable grace and beauty with which he writes. His diction is rich, yet pure; highly artificial, and yet possessing all the attractiveness of seeming easy and natural. There is a tenderness about it, which shows the author to be gifted with a deeply sensitive nature, and which excites very strongly the sympathies of his readers. Rarely, if ever, has criticism assumed a garb so pleasing; and one of the best wishes that could be expressed for orthodox church-historians (often, unfortunately, so noted for their dulness) is, that they might acquire some of the sparkling vivacity, and the rich, yet not meretricious, ornament, which are so strikingly characteristic of the work which is now to engage our consideration.

But this volume has still greater merits. It abounds with instruction which, if not always to be depended upon, is of the most varied character, and often, in the highest degree, valuable. As is well known, M. Renan is an Oriental scholar of the very first rank, and appears quite at home in some fields of literature with which few even of the learned are familiar. It is vain to deny or sneer at his learning, as several of his reviewers have recently done. No candid reader of his works can fail to be struck with the very uncommon stores of erudition which they exhibit. He moves at ease alike amid the classical and Talmudical writers. It has indeed been made a subject of reproach to him that he has not plunged more deeply into the later Jewish writings, and sought to educe from these, some account of the views and feelings prevailing among the inhabitants of Palestine in the days of Christ. But, in our judgment, such a complaint rests upon a total mistake. If anything, M. Renan errs rather in attaching too much importance to statements contained in the Rabbinical writers. Far more light, we believe, is to be obtained as to the real state of the Jewish people in regard to both principles and practice at the commencement of our era, from the Greek literature contained in the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, and the works of Philo and Josephus, than from the later Hebrew writings of the Targums and the Talmuds. The former naturally gather round the New Testament, and serve in many ways to explain it; the latter are separated by a tremendous national convulsion, as well as by a considerable period of time, from the age of Christ and His apostles, and will, in many ways, prove most misleading, if trusted to for information as to the nature of that

spiritual and intellectual atmosphere in which they breathed and lived.

Besides his acquaintance with some recondite fields of literature, known only to a few, M. Renan is also possessed of an original faculty which enables him to place the most familiar facts in a new light, and to derive from them conclusions which have generally been overlooked. We do not say that he is, in such cases, to be implicitly trusted; but his statements are, at least, always vivid and plausible, while they sometimes strike upon the mind with a kind of resistless power. We may refer, in illustration, to the account which he presents in this volume (chap. xvii.) of the state of the world in the times of the apostles. This is a subject which has been often treated, but it is handled by our author with remarkable freshness and power. We think it impossible for any one to read the chapter devoted to it, without confessing that his former ideas have been to some extent modified, even though he be far from accepting all the opinions which the writer has advanced. He exaggerates, we believe, the amount of morality and virtue then existing in the heathen world. It is a one-sided sketch of this subject which he presents. Without taking into account any statements of the inspired writers, he might have found in pages so familiar as those of Virgil and Juvenal, allusions and descriptions which must, in fairness, have constrained him to paint in far darker colours the state of society in the heathen world at the time when Christianity first began to exercise an influence upon it.

One other striking merit of this book is its transparent *honesty*, so far as that is compatible with the principles which M. Renan has espoused. All is fair, open, and straightforward. There is no disingenuous hiding of facts, no wilful distortion of evidence. We think, indeed, and shall have occasion afterwards to notice, that M. Renan sometimes endeavours artfully to pave the way for his more easy rejection of a narrative involving the miraculous, by a fancy sketch which rests upon no foundation. But we gladly acknowledge that the volume, when viewed in connexion with M. Renan's avowed principles, has impressed us with its fair and candid spirit. Everything that can by possibility be held, along with the author's denial of the supernatural, is accepted, according to the evidence by which it is supported; and that, although such acceptance involves the writer in great difficulty or even inconsistency. In spite, for instance, of the strong temptation which he must have felt to discredit the fourth Gospel, he reiterates in this volume the opinion which he had formerly expressed, as to its high

authority and substantial genuineness. 'The use of it,' he says (p. ix.), 'which I have made in my *Life of Jesus*, is the point on which learned critics have addressed to me the most objections. Almost all those scholars who apply the rationalistic method to the history of theology, reject the fourth Gospel as being in every respect apocryphal. I have anew reflected much on this problem, and I have not been able to modify in any sensible degree my former opinion.' Such a declaration is highly honourable to the integrity of the writer, and contrasts very strikingly with the disingenuous way in which many sceptical writers have dealt with the subject.*

But we must now come to close quarters with our author, and point out what we deem his most fatal errors and conclusions. In doing so, while we cannot but *feel* strongly, we trust no needlessly offensive or uncourteous expression will escape our pen. Those defenders of our faith can have learned but little in the school of the great Master and His apostles, who think to aid the cause of truth by violent invective, or by loud and sneering denunciation.

There are then three or four leading points which will fix the attention of every reader of this volume, and on which we differ *toto cælo* from its author. Two of these meet us in the Introduction, and two in the body of the work. To state them is sufficient to show their primary importance, and the necessity of attaining to settled and satisfactory views regarding them. The first refers to that capital article of our faith,—the resurrection of Christ. The second bears on the theory to be accepted as to the conversion of the apostle Paul. The third involves the genuineness and credibility of the book of the Acts of the Apostles. And the fourth has respect to the evidence for miracles,—a question which is, of course, bound up with the discussion of those already mentioned. These are the cardinal points suggested to us by this volume, and to these we shall in what follows principally restrict our attention.

It will be remembered that towards the close of his first volume, M. Renan promised to furnish in the next instalment of his work some account of the way in which he conceived a belief in the resurrection of Jesus to have arisen among his disciples.† Accordingly, he begins the present volume with an elaborate attempt to fulfil this promise. As was mysteriously hinted before, Mary Magdalene is now seen to have been the

* See e. g. Strauss, 'Das Leben Jesus für das Deutsche Volk bearbeitet,' pp. 62—79.

† 'Vie de Jesus,' p. 433.

leading spirit in that eventful period. She is declared by her single testimony to have settled 'the faith of the future;' and, however much one may hesitate before assigning her such a place, there can be no question that she is at least the heroine of M. Renan's narrative, the *Dea ex machina*, by whom every desired result is accomplished.

The book opens with a declaration that Jesus had never plainly declared he should rise again from the dead. Certain texts (Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 4, &c.), which seem very plainly to contradict this assertion, are set aside as additions subsequently made to the genuine evangelical narrative. The disciples, then, thought all was over when their Master was laid in the grave. They awoke from the dear delusion which they had cherished, and saw that the great hope of their hearts was completely extinguished. Such is M. Renan's account of the state of mind prevailing among the followers of Jesus immediately after his death, and there can be no doubt of its essential correctness. Every reader of the Gospels is aware that the grand fact of the resurrection, though it had been clearly predicted by Christ, was never thought of by his disciples until they learned it had actually taken place. So far, M. Renan is in perfect accord with the history: a blank despair had fallen upon the hearts of those who believed in Jesus when they saw Him expire upon the cross; and nothing was farther from their minds than any idea that He would rise again from the dead.

But the result, according to our author, was such as could have been looked for only had the case been totally different. If there had existed the greatest excitement, instead of the blankest despair, among the disciples of Jesus after his death; and if, instead of not having the most distant thought of His resurrection, they had been looking forward to it with the most feverish expectation, then what M. Renan supposes might naturally enough have taken place. According to him, they began to *imagine* an event of which they had never obtained any inkling from their Master, and which, till some time on the day after the death of Jesus, had never entered into their minds. A wonderful enthusiasm suddenly replaced the despair in which they had been sunk. In the course of a few hours, they had surrounded themselves with the liveliest hopes on that very point which had seemed to give the death-blow to all their expectations. While we should have imagined that with the views prevailing in their minds, the love which the disciples undoubtedly bore to Jesus would have led them to look forward simply to the discharge of such tender offices as those which the women came to the sepulchre to perform, the effect, accord-

ing to M. Renan, was altogether different. Contrary to their most settled convictions, they decided, under the influence of affection, that Jesus 'should not die.' What on Saturday morning was an unthought-of impossibility, had, by Saturday evening, become an almost absolute certainty. 'By this time,' writes our author, 'Jesus is, in a sense, already risen. Let but 'some trifling outward fact give any countenance to the belief 'that His body is no longer in the tomb, and the dogma of the 'resurrection will be established for ever.'

The way is thus paved for what next takes place. The women come early on the Sunday morning to the sepulchre, apparently untouched by that enthusiasm which has just been described, for they come with the expectation of finding the body of Jesus in the grave, and with the desire of expending on it the last melancholy proofs of their regard. Yet it is *their* excited imagination which is now to give rise to that belief in the resurrection of Christ, on which the Church has reposed down to the present day! M. Renan, indeed, almost compels Peter and John to declare themselves believers in the resurrection when they found the sepulchre empty; but the decisive utterance—'He is risen,' is not yet spoken. This first comes from the lips of Mary Magdalene.

'Peter and John had left the garden; Mary remained alone by the margin of the sepulchre. She wept abundantly. One thought only held possession of her mind'—(and that, not as might be supposed from the excitement on the subject which has been declared to have existed among the disciples, and without the admission of which M. Renan's theory falls at once to the ground—*not* any idea of her Master's resurrection, but)—'Where have they laid the body? Her woman's heart went no further than once more to clasp the beloved corpse in her arms. Suddenly she heard a light sound behind her. A man is seen standing near. She believes at first that it is the gardener, and exclaims, "Oh! if thou hast taken Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, that I may carry Him away." As the only answer, she hears herself called by Her name, "Mary!" It was the voice which had so often made her leap with joy. It was the tone of Jesus. "Oh! my Master," she exclaimed, and wished to touch Him. A kind of instinctive movement led her to kiss his feet. The ethereal vision drew back, and said to her, "Touch me not!" while, little by little, it disappeared. But the miracle of love is wrought. That which Peter could not do, Mary has accomplished: she has known how to bring life, and a sweet, affecting voice, out of the empty tomb. There is no longer need to deduce consequences, or to form conjectures. Mary has seen and heard. The resurrection has received its first immediate witness.'—Pp. 10, 11.

Such is the corner-stone on which M. Renan's theory of the

resurrection rests. We have at last been admitted to the great secret which our author promised to disclose. Christianity is at length traced to its foundation, and is discovered to rest on the enthusiastic mistake of one affectionate woman! Such has been the source of the mightiest moral and spiritual power that ever operated on the earth—such the basis of the Christian Church with all the virtues she has exhibited, all the sufferings she has endured, and all the victories she has won! Truly, if this be so, it is beyond comparison the most marvellous fact in history, and M. Renan deserves to be crowned as the greatest of discoverers for having now revealed it to the world.

But such an astounding announcement naturally excites questioning and consideration. When we are told that in the way above described the excited fancy of Mary Magdalene 'gave to the world a resuscitated God,' we cannot but pause at such a declaration, and look with the most careful scrutiny at the attendant circumstances. And no sooner do we begin to do so, than doubts press in upon us which threaten grievously to lower the value of M. Renan's discovery. 'She supposed him 'to be *the gardener*.' Never did we perceive the importance of that clause in the narrative until the theory of this writer forced it upon our attention. We must acknowledge that the statement has almost at times seemed to grate upon our ears; we were disappointed that Mary did not at the first glance recognise her Lord and Master and fall at his feet. But we are thankful now for the record as it stands, since this one clause is of itself sufficient to subvert that theory which would resolve the resurrection of Christ into a delusion of one fanatical woman. For, let it be observed that, if Mary had been wrought up to such a pitch of enthusiasm as to believe in a vision and a voice which were simply the product of her own imagination, she could never for a moment have supposed the person who stood beside her to be 'the gardener.' It must have been *Jesus* at once that she beheld, if the whole scene existed simply in her own heated fancy; and the prosaic, but most truthful, and in our present point of view, most precious statement that she supposed the person standing beside her 'to be the gardener,' dissipates at once into thin air the hypothesis of M. Renan that she was at the time in a state of the wildest excitement, and was determined to create a living Christ who should satisfy the yearnings of her heart. It is perfectly evident that up to the moment when Jesus uttered her name, Mary had no conception of His being risen from the dead; and, so far from her enthusiasm giving birth to the resurrection, it was the resurrection, suggested and implied by the recognised presence of the living

Redeemer, that excited the only evidences of strong emotion which she displayed, when, as was most natural in the circumstances, she first sought to embrace the Saviour, and then hurried off to proclaim the fact of His resurrection to the disciples.

We are now prepared for estimating at its proper value the following passage:—

‘The glory of the resurrection then, belongs to Mary of Magdala. Next to Jesus, it is Mary who has done most for the establishment of Christianity. The shade conjured up by the delicate senses of Magdalene still deceives the world. Queen and patroness of idealists, the Magdalene has known better than any other how to gain acceptance for her dream, and to impose on all the holy vision of her passionate soul. The grand assertion of this woman, “He is risen,” has become the basis of the faith of humanity. Get thee far hence, thou feeble power of reason! Seek not to bring a cold analytical process to bear upon this master-piece of idealism and love. If wisdom will not try to offer consolation to the poor human race, the victim of destiny, let madness attempt the enterprise. Where is the sage that has ever given so much joy to the world as has the possessed Mary of Magdala?’—P. 13.

Let the reader remember that, according to the account which M. Renan himself accepts as of the highest authority, Mary went forth to the sepulchre without the remotest idea of the resurrection in her head—that even the disappearance of the body suggested no thought of it to her mind—that, so far was she from painting to her imagination a living Saviour as not even to recognise Him when He stood before her, and then say, whether hallucination may not with greater reason be ascribed to M. Renan himself than to her to whom he has imputed it. We should have been glad to learn somewhat more distinctly whether or not our author believes in the reality of any of the incidents he has so strangely interpreted. At one time he expresses himself as if up to a certain point the narrative were one of facts; at another time, he writes as if the whole were due to the imagination. ‘Mary alone,’ he says, ‘had sufficient fervour of affection to lead her to pass the ‘bounds of nature, and to impart life to the phantom of the ‘incomparable Master.’ But at what point, we ask, did this frenzy of affection begin to work? Not when she went forth to the sepulchre, for her thoughts were then full of Christ as still lying in the grave. Not when she discovered that His body was no longer in the tomb, for her only desire then was to recover it. And not when she perceived that figure which suddenly stood by her, for she mistook it for that of the gardener, and expressed herself accordingly. Up to this

moment she thought as little of the possibility of the resurrection as M. Renan himself could have done, and it was not till she had resistless evidence presented to her by the tones in which she was addressed, that the conviction flashed upon her of Christ having risen again from the dead. Where then is there here the slightest trace of fanatical excitement?—where the least appearance of fancy being at work to summon Jesus anew into existence? Everything points to the opposite conclusion, and compels us to declare that M. Renan has completely misread the narrative, and that the true state of the case is that, instead of Mary being determined beforehand to find a living Saviour, it is the critic himself who is so violently prejudiced against the fact of the resurrection, that he will distort the narrative in every possible way rather than admit the force of the evidence which it presents.

We need not follow the writer minutely through what remains of his account of the formation of 'the legend' of the resurrection. He deals in the same arbitrary manner with the testimony of the other witnesses, as we have seen him do with that of Mary Magdalene. But he makes admissions, every now and then, which are quite fatal to the theory which he upholds. Thus he says (p. 16), 'If the whole of the little Church had been then united, the formation of legends would have been impossible; those who knew the secret of the disappearance of the body would have probably lifted their voice against the erroneous report which was circulated. But in the confusion in which they then were, the door was opened to the most numerous misunderstandings.' Here, there is a glimmering of common-sense, which is itself sufficient to expose the insufficiency of the theory in which M. Renan is content to rest. In his opinion, the enthusiastic and reiterated proclamation by Mary Magdalene of what she had seen and heard, led to the acceptance of a belief in the resurrection by all the other disciples then in Jerusalem. But how could this be? How was it possible that a fanatical and false report should at once be accepted by so many who must have had the best means of ascertaining the truth? Scattered as the disciples of Jesus then may have been, there were certainly enough of them in the holy city to act as checks on each other with regard to any baseless rumours that might then be circulated respecting their Master. The apostles were all there together, and it is sheer absurdity to maintain that they would have been carried away by the word of a woman to believe that their Master was risen again from the dead, unless they had possessed the surest and most satisfactory evidence of the fact.

Again, how does it tally with M. Renan's assumption as to the manner in which faith in the resurrection arose, that the most loving and loved of all the disciples describes no appearance of the risen Redeemer as having presented itself specially to him? This fact is admitted by our author as being 'a very remarkable one.' But it is more: it is entirely subversive of the theory which he has suggested. If belief in the doctrine of the resurrection were due to that enthusiasm of affection which then prevailed among the disciples of Jesus, and if the various appearances of the living Saviour are to be traced to the fanatical expectations which were thus enkindled, then, how comes it to pass that while Jesus is said to have manifested himself specially to Mary Magdalene, to Peter, and to James, no such event is recorded to have happened to John? One can conceive how triumphantly M. Renan would have disposed of it on rational grounds, had any such appearance been reported. 'Is not this,' it would have been asked, 'exactly what might have been expected? Do we not know that John, of all the disciples, cherished the deepest and most enthusiastic affection for Jesus? And is it not clear from the book of Revelation, which undoubtedly flowed from his pen, that he was accustomed to fancy himself a spectator of supernatural visions, in which Jesus was ever the most prominent figure?' Such, unquestionably, would have been the kind of way in which our author would have sought to set aside the testimony of John, had that been given to any special appearance of the risen Saviour made to himself. But while the apostle declares that, in company with others, he on several occasions met with Jesus after He had risen from the dead, and while he relates as indubitably true the appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene on the morning of the first day of the week, he says not a word as to any manifestation of the Saviour having been made peculiarly to himself. Nothing surely could be more conclusive against the theory of M. Renan—nothing more fitted to deepen the conviction that those appearances of Jesus after His death were no mere phantoms due to the enthusiasm of affection, but positive facts, which were accepted on the best of evidence by His disciples.

M. Renan allows the highest historical authority to that most interesting account contained in Luke xxiv. 13-33. And we shall here quote his explanation of what then occurred, to illustrate the difficulties (we may say absurdities) into which he is driven by a rejection of the simple narrative as it stands.

'On the same Sunday,' he says, 'at a late hour in the evening, when already the accounts of the women had been circulated, two

disciples, of whom the name of the one was Cleopatros or Cleopas, took a short journey to a village named Emmaus, which was situated at a small distance from Jerusalem. They talked between themselves of the events which had just occurred, and were full of melancholy. By the way, an unknown companion joined them, and inquired the reason of their sadness. "Art thou then," they said to him, "the only stranger at Jerusalem, so as to be ignorant of that which has there come to pass? Hast thou not heard tell of Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet, mighty in deeds and in words before God and the people? Dost thou not know how the priests and chief men have condemned and crucified Him? We hoped that He was to deliver Israel, and behold, to-day is the third day since all this came to pass. Moreover, certain women who are of our company, have this morning thrown us into the greatest perplexity. They came before daybreak to the sepulchre, and found not the body, but affirm that they saw some angels, who declared that He was alive. Certain others of our number then went to the sepulchre, and found it to be even as the women had said; but Him they saw not." The stranger was a man of piety, well versed in the Scriptures, and able to cite Moses and the prophets. These three good and simple persons contracted a friendship. On their approach to Emmaus, when the stranger was going to continue his journey, the two disciples entreated him to sup with them. The day came to a close, and the memories of the two disciples assumed a very painful character. This supper-hour was the one which they recollected with the greatest delight, yet the deepest melancholy. How many times had they not seen their beloved Master forget at this moment the heavy cares of the day, while He abandoned himself to cheerful discourse, and animated by some drops of right-noble wine, had heard him speak to them of the fruit of the vine which He would drink new with them in the kingdom of his Father. The gesture which He made when He broke the bread and gave it to them according to the custom of the master of the house among the Jews, was deeply engraven on their memory. Full of a sweet pensiveness, *they forget the stranger: it is Jesus whom they see holding the bread, and then breaking it and giving it to them. These remembrances pre-occupy their minds to such a degree, that they scarcely perceive that their companion, compelled to continue his journey, has left them.* And when they emerged from their reverie, they exclaimed, "Did we not experience something peculiar? Dost thou not remember that our heart was, as it were, on fire, while he talked to us by the way?"—"And the prophecies which he quoted clearly proved that the Messiah had to suffer in order to enter into His glory. Didst not thou recognise Him in the breaking of bread?"—"Yes; our eyes were closed up till then; they are opened now when He has vanished." *The conviction of the two disciples was that they had seen Jesus.* They returned with all haste to Jerusalem.—Pp. 18-21.

This is reason in its highest display! This that philosophic

wisdom which is to replace the folly which has hitherto rested in a simple acceptance of the Gospel narratives! Thanks for the specimen of its exercise which is afforded. One such example is sufficient. It makes us cling all the more tenaciously to our former faith. Such a *reductio ad absurdum* of the rationalistic principle has rarely been given as is presented in the preceding extract. It is quite worthy of being set side by side with that famous *natural* explanation of the Ascension, which declares it to have merely consisted in Jesus going up one side of the hill and down the other!

In truth, we have felt in reading the three chapters which M. Renan has devoted to an account of the resurrection and its attendant events, that these form the most effective contribution which has of late been made to the Christian argument. They are so full of absurdities and inconsistencies, that it is often difficult to believe the writer can be serious. We have several times been tempted to think that his real object must be to turn infidelity into ridicule. How can any one gravely read his account of the various 'apparitions' of Jesus? Is it possible to believe that so many independent witnesses could all have come under the same delusion? Had there been only a single case in which it was thought that the Saviour appeared alive after his death, some plausibility might have been given to the hypothesis, that the phenomenon was simply an example of self-deception. But when we reflect that not only to Mary Magdalene, but to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, to Peter and James separately, to the ten apostles, and other disciples, on the evening of the first Christian sabbath, to above five hundred brethren at once, to the eleven apostles on the evening of the second Sunday, to seven of the apostles by the lake of Galilee, to the eleven apostles again on the day of the Ascension, and last of all, long afterwards, to the apostle Paul, our Lord manifested Himself after His resurrection from the dead, we feel that there is no fact in history so certain as that He did indeed rise from the grave; and we can only pity those who, in spite of evidence so overwhelming, will still endeavour to explain away that glorious event, which is the sole foundation on which we can build our hopes of a blessed and heart-cheering immortality.

Space will not allow us to dwell longer on these three remarkable chapters. Every page of them might be made the subject of criticism, and all together they form one of the most conclusive demonstrations of the imbecility of unbelief that ever fell under our notice. They have powerfully tended to confirm our faith in the Resurrection, by the ludicrously feeble effort which they make to explain it away; and thus, as in many

similar cases, 'out of the eater has come forth meat;' the enemy has unwittingly helped to strengthen that cause which he had it in his heart to destroy.

We next proceed to a consideration of M. Renan's theory with respect to the conversion of the apostle Paul. It offers nothing of essential importance which differs from the old naturalistic explanation. The principal point of variation is found in the fact that our author dwells more upon internal than external causes, as the means of bringing about the marvellous event which now took place. We have long been familiar with the idea of a violent thunderstorm—the lightning of which blinded Saul, while the thunder stunned him—as being all that now occurred, and had the effect of turning the furious persecutor into a fervent apostle. But M. Renan is far too fine an artist to be satisfied with any such coarse representation. He is strong in the region of psychology, and delights in playing with the emotions. While, therefore, he does not disdain altogether the aid of a storm and its accompaniments—the agency trusted to exclusively by most of his predecessors in the naturalistic school—he is far from being satisfied with these things, or even assigning them any decisive importance.

'It was,' he writes, '*the state of St. Paul's soul*, it was his *feeling of remorse* when he approached the city where he was to give the finishing-stroke to his misdeeds, that formed the true causes of his conversion. For my own part, I much prefer the hypothesis that something personal to Paul then occurred, and something perceived by him alone. It is, however, not improbable that a tempest may all at once have burst forth. The sides of Hermon are a place for the formation of thunderstorms unequalled in violence. Even the least impressive persons cannot pass without emotion through these frightful showers of fire. We must remember that all antiquity held occurrences of this kind to be divine revelations; that, according to the ideas which they then entertained of Providence, nothing was accidental; and that every man was in the habit of referring to himself those natural phenomena which took place around him. The Jews, in particular, regarded thunder as being always the voice of God, and lightning as the fire of God. Paul, moreover, was then labouring under the very greatest excitement. It was, therefore, natural that he should attribute to the voice of the storm that which existed only in his own heart.'—Pages 180 and 181.

The reader will not fail to observe in this extract something which he has probably never before dreamt of in connexion with

Paul's conversion. The tempest, the thunder and lightning, the possible fever and delirium to which our author refers, are all familiar concomitants of the scene as generally depicted by rationalistic writers. But though these things are still permitted to figure in the account given by M. Renan, he looks upon them with a kind of contempt, and is far from allowing them any important or decisive rôle in the event which now took place. He also dismisses with utter scorn the idea suggested by some of his predecessors, that the brain of the persecutor may have been suddenly deranged by a violent fall from his horse. No such hypothesis seems at all satisfactory to our author. It is the *mental condition* of Saul at the time—the 'remorse' which was, according to M. Renan, then stirring in his heart—that is fixed upon as having been the great *primum mobile* of his conversion. And, on hearing of this, the reader will, doubtless, pause in astonishment. It forms a decidedly new element in the scene, one which, so far as we know, has never been conceived of before, and which, if it can be shown to rest on any substantial grounds, may fairly be claimed by M. Renan as an original contribution to the solution of one of the most remarkable events in history.

But how has M. Renan discovered the existence of this 'feeling of remorse' in Saul's bosom as he approached Damascus? There is not a word said about it in the sacred text; on the contrary, it seems to be evidently excluded by the whole strain of the narrative. This, however, causes no difficulty to our author. He has determined to give a new *rationale* of Paul's conversion, has resolved that his theory shall be a psychological one, has, moreover, settled that 'remorse' shall be the magical power which is appealed to in explanation of the effect produced; and, lo! without further ado, we find Saul labouring under the most pathetic regrets for the fate of the Christians, and the most heartfelt admiration for their virtues, even while, with blood-thirsty animosity, he is persecuting them 'unto strange cities.' We must say that the manner in which these feelings of remorse are attributed to Saul by our author, constitutes one of the most delicious specimens of 'castle-building' which we have ever encountered. Very artfully is the first hint of such a state of mind, as existing in the persecutor, suggested to the unsuspecting reader. A whole chapter intervenes between the earliest intimation of it and the detailed account which is given of Saul's conversion, in which it is then taken up as if it were already a point which had been proved and accepted. In the description which M. Renan gives of the first persecution that arose at Jerusalem, we

find the following sentences in reference to 'the young fanatic Saul':—

'This infuriated man, furnished with an order from the priests, entered into the houses which were suspected to contain Christians, laid violent hold on both men and women, and dragged them to prison, or before the judgment-seat. Saul boasted that no man of his generation was so zealous for the traditions as himself. *Often, it is true, did the sweet resignation of his victims astonish him: he felt a kind of remorse; he fancied that he heard those pious women, hoping for the kingdom of God, whom he had cast into prison, saying to him during the night, in a sweet voice, "Wherefore dost thou persecute us?"* The blood of Stephen with which he had almost been bespattered, sometimes troubled his sight. Doubtless some of the things which he heard tell of Jesus went to his heart. This superhuman being, in his ethereal life—whence he came forth at times to reveal himself in brief apparitions—haunted him like a spectre. But Saul repelled such thoughts with horror; he strengthened himself with a kind of frenzy in the faith of his traditions, and he dreamed of new cruelties against those who attacked them. His name became the terror of the believers; they feared on his part the most atrocious violence, as well as the bloodiest treachery.'—Pages 148-9.

On first reading the words which we have printed above in italics, we felt considerable surprise, and glanced instinctively to the foot of the page for any authorities on which the statements might rest. M. Renan, as is well known, is lavish of his references, and there is scarcely a page in this volume which does not bristle with them. But in the present case, in which they are so much desiderated, none are to be found. We were disappointed on discovering this, but passed the matter over as a little harmless freak of fancy in which the writer had indulged. But on passing on to M. Renan's theory of Saul's conversion, our attention was recalled to the statements in question, as being, in fact, possessed of most essential importance. We found them there reiterated, and made the very corner-stone of that hypothesis by which our author explains, on *rational* grounds, the conversion of Saul.

'He yielded,' we are told, 'to the charm of those whom he tortured. The more one knew them—these good sectaries—the more one loved them. Now, no one knew them so well as did their persecutor. At certain moments, he believed that he saw the sweet figure of the Master who inspired such patience into His disciples, looking at him with an air of pity, and with a kind of tender reproach. The stories which they were accustomed to narrate of the appearances of Jesus, conceived of as an aerial, and sometimes visible being, greatly impressed him; for at epochs and in countries where people believe in the marvellous, miraculous accounts are equally accepted by the most

adverse parties; Mussulmans, for instance, are filled with terror by the miracles of Elijah, and implore, like Christians, supernatural cures from St. George and St. Anthony. Paul, after having traversed Iturea, had entered on the great plain of Damascus. He approached the city, and was, in all probability, already involved in the gardens which surround it. It was mid-day. Paul had several companions with him, and apparently travelled on foot.'—Page 176.

Then follows one of those descriptions of natural scenery for which M. Renan is famous. A very graphic account is given of the route from Jerusalem to Damascus, and our only objection to it (an objection which applies to some other similar descriptions in the volume) is, that it is so elaborate as to seem the principal object in view of the writer, and to cast the narrative, which it should simply have illustrated, altogether into the shade. But what we have to do with is the theory of Paul's conversion which our author presents. We have quoted enough to convey a clear idea of that to our readers. He supposes that it was due, above everything else, to those *feelings of remorse* which had long been agitating the bosom of the persecutor. From the death of Stephen onwards, M. Renan imagines that the heart of Saul had been torn with pity for his victims; that the Master whom they served had for long been receiving the secret homage of his soul; and that, at length, under the influence of these emotions, a total revolution of character occurred in him as he approached Damascus: he believed himself addressed by the voice of Jesus from heaven, and he passed from among the enemies of the Cross to become its most energetic and successful apostle.

Need we do more than appeal to the narrative contained in the Acts in order to show the baselessness of this hypothesis? Where is there a single hint there given of any such conflict of feeling as that which M. Renan describes? He does not venture, as we have already remarked, to appeal to a single text in confirmation of his theory; and we might if necessary, quote scores to overthrow it. Look at Saul on the occasion of Stephen's martyrdom. He is described (Acts viii. 1, *συνευδοκῶν*) as then feeling and acting in thorough unison with the murderers of that servant of Christ; and the peculiar participial form of expression employed suggests that such was his *abiding* frame of mind. In accordance with this, we next read (verse 3) that 'Saul made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison.' No sign of compunction here, but the most persistent and even pleasurable persecution of the followers of Jesus. And then look at the picture of this man which the historian presents as

he sets out on his memorable journey to Damascus. 'And Saul,' we are told (Chap. ix. 1), 'yet *breathing out threatenings and slaughter* against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest and desired of him letters to Damascus unto the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.' If ever there was a portrait painted of a ruthless, blood-thirsty persecutor, in whose heart no spark of remorseful feeling can be detected, surely we have it set before us in these words. The whole being of Saul was evidently absorbed in detestation of the disciples of Jesus, and in a desire to exterminate them from the face of the earth. *Totus in illo*, completely under the influence of that religious hatred which he bore them, nothing would satisfy him but that he should be armed with authority to search them out and seize them, not only in Jerusalem, but in Damascus. As he himself afterwards most pathetically and penitently described his conduct (Acts xxvi. 11), he 'punished them oft in every synagogue, and compelled them to blaspheme, and *being exceedingly mad against them*, he persecuted them even unto strange cities.' Where then is there the slightest foundation for that theory of the gradual growth of regretful feelings in his heart, by which M. Renan seeks to solve the problem of his conversion? We are compelled to pronounce this as baseless a fiction as ever entered into a poet's dream; and we can now understand how, with that power of idealism which our author himself so largely possesses, he may have been tempted to regard that as having had so much to do with the establishment of the doctrines of Christianity, and the foundation of the primitive Church.

Many other difficulties, of course, meet M. Renan in his further explanation of the narrative. The account which he gives is, indeed, one lengthened chain of improbabilities, not to employ stronger language. Referring to those three days which Paul spent in such anguish of mind at Damascus, he remarks:—

'Among the images which chased each other through his brain, he believed that he saw Ananias enter, and make to him the gesture (imposition of hands) familiar to the Christians. From that moment he was persuaded that he owed his cure to Ananias. Ananias was informed; he came, spoke sweetly to the sick man, styled him his brother, and laid his hands upon him. At that very instant tranquillity returned to the soul of Paul. He believed himself cured, and his disease being chiefly nervous, he really was so. Some small scabs or scales fell, they say, from his eyes; he ate, and recovered strength.'—Page 185.

Comment on this is needless. The reader has now fully before him our author's contribution to the explanation of Paul's conversion, and will not, we think, have much difficulty in rating it at its proper value. We have read it with a mixture of both sad and rejoicing emotions. We regret that so gifted a writer should allow himself to be deceived by such transparent fallacies, while we rejoice that such a striking testimony should unintentionally have been borne to the simple veracity of the narrative, as it stands on the sacred page. Admit the true historical character of the record, and then everything is satisfactory and harmonious; but begin to frame an hypothesis which excludes the miraculous, and then difficulties arise at every step—difficulties which will not be conjured away by any exercise of fancy however graceful, nor by any display of philosophic wisdom, however apparently distinguished for its profundity.

Before passing from this point, we would simply remark further, that M. Renan leaves entirely untouched the celebrated argument of Lord Lyttleton in his 'Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul.' To that treatise, as Dr. Johnson remarked, 'infidelity has never been able to fabricate a specious answer.' The author shows in it very decisively that Paul was neither an enthusiast nor an impostor, and thus shuts the reader up to the conclusion that his conversion actually took place in the miraculous manner narrated in the Acts of the Apostles. But the admission of this fact clearly involves the divine origin of Christianity; and, indeed, we may say that, after the character of our blessed Lord Himself as depicted in the Gospels, there is no one of the internal evidences of our faith that is felt to be possessed of more resistless power than that which is found in the conversion and future conduct of the great apostle.

Having thus examined our author's account of Paul's conversion, we now come to consider his views as to the general authenticity and credibility of the Acts of the Apostles.

It is, in one sense, altogether idle for M. Renan to trouble himself with evidences as to the authority of any such work. He has one short and easy rule which supersedes all processes of criticism or investigation. 'The first twelve chapters of the Acts,' he tells us (p. xliii.), 'are one tissue of miracles. Now, one absolute rule of criticism is not to allow a place amongst historical accounts to any miraculous circumstances.' The door is thus curtly and peremptorily closed against any witnesses to the supernatural who might come forward. No

matter how direct or decisive may seem their testimony, judgment has been given against them ere they are allowed to speak; it is enough that whatever they have to narrate implies the putting-forth of miraculous power on the part of God; that is declared impossible, or, at least, incredible, previous to all inquiry, and it would be a waste of time to take any trouble in examining credentials which have *a priori* been pronounced the necessary offspring either of an easy credulity or a deliberate falsehood.

Now, it must at once strike the reader how opposed such a principle is to those rules of inquiry which, since the days of Bacon, have been applied to all the departments of human knowledge. It runs in the very teeth of the inductive philosophy. It springs from that very same habit of prejudgment which shackled all the sciences until the grand principle of *first* inquiring, and then deciding had been established. It is, in fact, the absolute dogmatism of infidelity, a dogmatism as unreasoning and entire as any to be found in the pages of Romish theologians, or as is to be illustrated by the most arbitrary and inconclusive of their decisions.

M. Renan, indeed, still professes himself ready to accept a miracle, provided it were wrought under the conditions which he is pleased to appoint. 'A single miracle at Paris,' he says, 'before a body of competent philosophers, would put an end to all doubts.' But let it be observed what such a demand implies. Without speaking of the way in which it would derogate both from the majesty of the Deity, and from the moral dignity of man, were a miraculous event to take place in order that it might be made the subject of cool scientific investigation, it is plain that the principle of M. Renan tends to throw discredit on the evidence of testimony in general, when that is not corroborated by our own observation or experience. His rule, if carried fully out, would invalidate by far the greater number of the facts recorded in history. Many of these are of a kind which have never been again repeated, and the same scepticism which prompts him to set aside the testimony for miracles, should also lead him to discard everything vouched for in the past history of the world which is not verified by what he now sees taking place around him. Because *modern* pretensions to miraculous powers cannot stand the test of inquiry, he concludes that *all* such pretensions must necessarily rest upon no solid foundation. He therefore refuses so much as to examine the evidence by which they are supported; and it is of this we complain; it is by this that he runs counter to the principles of all true philosophy. He is at perfect liberty to say, after having

candidly made the examination, 'The proof for these miraculous phenomena is not sufficient;' but neither he nor any other man is warranted in piling all professed miracles in a mass together, and because some may have been clearly false, at once pronouncing a sentence of condemnation upon the whole.

Waiving, however, further discussion of his general principle as to miracles, let us see how it serves him in dealing with the Acts of the Apostles. As on several occasions of a like nature, we here find him considerably puzzled. He is involved in much the same difficulty as in treating of the fourth Gospel. He looks at the plausible objections which some German writers, such as Baur, and Schwegler, and Zeller, have got up against the authorship and date of the book, and the bait appears at times almost too delicious not to be swallowed (pp. xiii., xiv.). But, again, his sense of honesty triumphs. His conclusions ultimately are, that the work is by the same author as the third Gospel, and is meant to be a continuation of it (p. x.); that the writer of it throughout was no other than Luke, a veritable disciple of Paul (p. xviii.); and that its date was most probably somewhere about A.D. 80. Let us quote a paragraph bearing on this last point:—

'To what date,' asks M. Renan, 'may we refer the composition of this important writing? Luke appears for the first time in the company of Paul, at the time of the first journey of the apostle into Macedonia, about the year 52. Let us suppose that he was then twenty-nine years of age, and it will in that case be nothing more than natural that he should have lived to the year 100. The narrative of the Acts stops at the year 63. But the publication of the Acts being evidently later than that of the third Gospel, and the date of the publication of the third Gospel being fixed in a manner sufficiently precise, to the years which followed the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), one cannot dream of placing the publication of the Acts earlier than the year 71 or 72.'—Page xix., xx.

The author refers, in connexion with the statement here made as to the date of Luke's Gospel, to his 'Life of Jesus,' p. xvii. On turning to the passage, we find nothing but an assertion to the effect that since Chap. xxi. of the Gospel is an integral portion of it, and contains a clear prediction of the fall of Jerusalem, it *must* have been written *after* that event. And thus the date of the Gospel being settled by an arbitrary principle of M. Renan's, the date of the Acts must be dragged down to a sufficiently late period to correspond with it. Is this criticism? Is this a fair mode of settling any literary question? It may be troublesome to M. Renan to find prophetic passages

in the Gospels which events have fully verified, but it is too much to proceed on such a manifest *petitio principii* as at once pronounces these passages destitute of all authority. As to the date of the Acts of the Apostles, we agree with those critics who place it about A.D. 63. Everything seems to lead to this conclusion. Had it been published later, it would have been strange that the narrative should stop with Paul's arrival at Rome. And nothing could be more natural than that Luke should employ the period of leisure which he enjoyed in the imperial city before Paul's cause was heard, in writing this precious book, which contains an outline of the most important events that had occurred in the Church from the close of the Gospel-history down to the time of its composition.

We have several times already found M. Renan involving himself in difficulty from the admissions which he feels bound to make as to the authority and accuracy of the documents with which he deals. And another example now occurs in connexion with his statements regarding the historical worth of part of the Acts, and the position which he holds with respect to miracles.

'In reference to historical value,' he says, 'the Book of Acts divides itself into two parts : the one comprising the first twelve chapters, and recounting the principal events in the history of the primitive Church ; the other containing the sixteen remaining chapters, which are consecrated exclusively to the missions of St. Paul. This second portion itself comprehends two kinds of accounts, the one comprising those of which the historian declares himself to have had ocular testimony, and the other treating of events which he simply relates from the reports of others. It is manifest that, even in this latter case, the authority of the book is great. The conversations of St. Paul must frequently have furnished the accounts. Towards the end especially, the narrative assumes an astonishing air of precision. *The last pages of the Acts are the only pages, completely historical, which we possess bearing on the origin of Christianity.* The first pages, on the contrary, are more exposed to attack than any others in the whole New Testament.'—Pages xxvi., xxvii.

It is here declared that the last pages of the Book of Acts are 'completely historical;' that is, we presume, are to be regarded as being absolutely free from all legend, all idealism, all fable, and as narrating, in simple, trustworthy prose, events as they actually occurred. Thanks for the concession; but was M. Renan aware of what it involved when he made it? Did he overlook the fact that 'miracles' have an undeniable existence in these 'completely historical' chapters? We rejoice in the frank admission which he has made as to the unquestionable authority pertaining to the closing pages of the Acts, and we

think it highly creditable to his candour that he has expressed himself in such terms regarding them. It is, indeed, difficult to see how any man can read over the narrative of Paul's voyage and shipwreck, written as it manifestly has been by one who witnessed all that he relates, and doubt the trustworthy character of the record. M. Renan, at least, disclaims all hesitation as to its faithfulness, and proclaims in the most emphatic terms the opinion which he has formed of the high historical value which is to be ascribed to it.

But, without taking any undue advantage of his candour, we are surely warranted in pressing some facts recorded in these chapters upon his earnest consideration. Luke, he admits, accompanied the apostle in that voyage from Palestine to Rome, and has penned a faithful account of the incidents which, in the course of it, occurred under his own observation. Did, then, Paul actually address the desponding crew in the terms described? (Chap. xxvii. 22-26.) And did the event (ver. 44) entirely accord with his predictions? Is the story of the viper (Chap. xxviii. 3-6) the record of a positive fact? And are the miraculous cures referred to (ver. 8, 9) to be accepted as the historian narrates them? We put these questions, scarcely doubting as to the answer which M. Renan will feel bound to give them, after the manner in which he has already characterised the record. He has pronounced it 'completely historical,' and has thus voluntarily shut the door against the intrusion of those critical principles by which he seeks in other cases to eliminate all that is miraculous from the accounts which are contained in Scripture. Has he not, then, at last come over to our own side? Has he not confessed that there may be evidence of a documentary kind sufficiently strong to substantiate a miracle, nay, that there is such evidence in the chapters now under consideration? We know not how otherwise to interpret his words. If the pages referred to are, as he affirms, 'completely historical,' then, of course, he accepts them as they stand, with the express attestation which they bear to the fact of miracles having been wrought by Paul. But, in that case, he has most effectually refuted himself. His grand principle of invariably rejecting the supernatural is abandoned. He admits, it seems, after all, that on the evidence of credible witnesses, even miraculous events take their place in history. Luke *saw* those suffering Maltese flock around Paul and receive a cure. He has inserted an account of what he saw in the narrative we possess from his pen; and, according to M. Renan, with whom we have now the pleasure of most heartily agreeing, that narrative is to be accepted without reserve or qualification, as being of a 'completely historical' character and value.

We are not called upon, at this point, to enter on any formal or lengthened defence of the Acts of the Apostles as a whole. M. Renan points out what he deems some palpable errors in the narrative (mentioning nothing, however, we may observe, to which the most satisfactory answers have not, long since, been given), but he avowedly reserves a detailed examination of the book (page xxxix.) for his next volume. In the meantime, he simply refuses to allow it the character of a veracious history. With respect to this, as to several other points, he presents a modified view of the theory of the Tübingen school. While refusing, as we have seen, to bring down the date of the book to the second century as Baur and his followers do, and while admitting it, in opposition to them, to be an authentic production of Luke, the companion of Paul, he nevertheless agrees with them in branding it as one of those *Tendenz-Schriften*, which were written under the influence of a kind of pious fraud, in order to smooth away difficulties and reconcile differences which existed between the leaders of the primitive Church. In accordance with this view, M. Renan thus expresses himself as to the position occupied, and the plan followed, by Luke in the composition of this work. 'Too loyal,' we are told (page xxiv.), 'to condemn his master, Paul, and too orthodox not to range himself on the side of the official opinion which prevailed, he effaced the differences of doctrine which had existed, so as to let appear only the common end which all the great founders of the Church in effect pursued, by means of views so opposed to each other, and in the face of rivalries in so constant operation.' Again, he sums up (page xxix.) on this point, as follows:—'The Acts, in one word, are a dogmatic history, so contrived as to uphold the orthodox doctrines of the time, or to inculcate those ideas which were most agreeable to the piety of the author.' Reserving the details, as has been said, for his third volume, he tells us that, 'in the meantime he has only brought forward some examples of the manner in which the author of the Acts understands history, of his system of conciliation, and of his pre-conceived ideas;' and then reveals what he thinks should be the practical result, in the following sentences:—

'Must we, therefore, conclude that the first chapters of the Acts are totally destitute of authority, according to the opinion of some celebrated critics, and that fiction here proceeded so far as absolutely to create the personages who are introduced, such as the eunuch of queen Candace, the centurion Cornelius, and even the deacon Stephen, and the pious Tabitha? I am by no means inclined to believe this. It is probable that the author of the Acts has not invented his personages

(I will, however, readily sacrifice Ananias and Sapphira) ; but he is a skilful advocate who writes to prove his point, and who seeks to bring forward such facts of which he had heard as would serve to demonstrate his favourite propositions, viz., the lawfulness of the calling of the Gentiles, and the Divine institution of the hierarchy. Any such document requires to be employed with great caution ; but absolutely to reject it, is as uncritical as blindly to follow it. Certain paragraphs besides, even in the first portion, have a value recognised by all, and represent authentic memoirs which have been extracted by the last editor of the work. The twelfth chapter, in particular, is of excellent quality, and appears to have come from John Mark.'—Pages xxxix. xl.

Thus does M. Renan coquette with the Tübingen school, while, at the same time, resolutely declining to be identified with it. But we are afraid that the compromise at which he aims is one absolutely impossible, and which may be proved to be untenable with even less trouble than the full-blown theory of Baur and his satellites. When the composition of the Acts is relegated to the second century, a good deal that is plausible may be said in favour of the hypothesis that it was written in the interests of what is called the *Catholic Church*, that is, of the one Church supposed to have been then formed by the union of the long divergent parties of Peter and Paul. But when its date is fixed as M. Renan fixes it, not later than A.D. 80, we cannot conceive what object the author could have contemplated in his pious fraud, nor can we believe in the existence of such audacity as would have led him to venture on it. Were not some of the apostles still living, who had the best means of discrediting any false account of the early days of the Church ? Yea, were there not multitudes, scattered everywhere throughout the Christian world, who would at once have protested against such a wilful perversion of facts which had come under their own personal knowledge ? And why should Luke publish this book at all, unless simply to narrate the truth ? He had no personal end to gain by it, nor will it be pretended that any ecclesiastical fusion, such as is supposed by Baur and others afterwards to have happened, took place, or was aimed at, before the end of the first century. We look into the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, written about that period, and we discern no trace of that deep design to reconcile the followers of Peter and Paul which is attributed to the author of the Acts of the Apostles.* And, then, need we call attention to the

* We are aware that Schwegler ('*Nachapostolisches Zeitalter*,' ii. 128) pretends to find, in the Epistle of Clement, traces of an honourable compromise between the Petrine and Pauline parties. But we claim the

arbitrary plan of accepting certain portions of the narrative, while rejecting others, to which, under the name of criticism, M. Renan has recourse? No principle appears to guide him but his own autocratic will. It is simply by a *macht-spruch*, as the Germans say—by a mere subjective opinion which is allowed magisterial authority—that he pronounces the twelfth chapter to be trustworthy, and the fifth chapter to be an invention of the writer. Most of our readers, instead of listening to the utterances of such an oracle, and accepting them at their own valuation as infallible, will probably prefer resting in the conclusion of the Church from the beginning, that in the simple, natural, and most instructive record contained in the Acts, we have a true, unvarnished, and unbiassed account of the principal events which took place in the Church during the first thirty years which followed the ascension of her Divine Author to heaven.

We cannot dwell upon the many erroneous, or one-sided, statements which occur in the remainder of the work. There is not a chapter, hardly, even, a page, which does not furnish matter for criticism.* But we must be content with having noticed, as was proposed, what seem to us the leading fallacies of the book.

Without alluding to the many other minute points which call for criticism, we shall now conclude with a few remarks on the general character of the work, and on the position which its author claims while following out the undertaking in which he is embarked.

As to the work itself, we cannot suppose that any one will ascribe to it the least scientific value. It is throughout redolent of romance, and an effort is constantly required on the part of

liberty of looking at this Epistle with our own eyes, and venture to say that nothing of the kind is to be seen. Any difference of view that may have existed between Peter and Paul speedily vanished; and to represent the church of the early part of the second century as divided into two sections holding the peculiar doctrines of these two apostles respectively, is a mere dream of certain German critics.

* It is but fair to except from the above general condemnation the remarks which M. Renan makes on the character and influence of Barnabas. He has set in a very striking light the obligations under which the early church lay to that admirable man. While he somewhat exaggerates, we think, the power for good which Barnabas exercised over Paul, we cordially agree with him that 'Christianity has been guilty of some injustice towards this great man in not placing him in the front rank among its founders.' Barnabas was singularly distinguished by that charity which 'thinketh no evil.' His largeness of heart, as well as liberality of view, can scarcely be over-estimated; and we rejoice that M. Renan has brought him forth from the shade cast over him by his still greater contemporary and friend.

the reader to keep in mind that its object is serious—its theme the most solemn and sacred which the history of the past can furnish. Not one of the problems with which it deals receives any approach to an adequate solution. We have seen how M. Renan accounts for a belief in the Resurrection having arisen in the Church; and if we have suppressed a smile in perusing the pages he has devoted to this subject, nothing but the intrinsic gravity of the question has enabled us to do so. Men are not in the habit of acting in real life as he has here represented them. To leap in an hour or two from the deepest despair to the most bewildering excitement—to convince themselves, with an assurance which henceforth smiled at suffering and death, that fancy was fact, and that, because a woman asserted it, an event had really taken place of which they had never till then imagined the possibility—to conjure up apparitions, and conceive of discourses, admonitions, instructions, and promises as being addressed to them by the creature of their imagination—to paint that fancied Being as eating in their society, as breathing upon them and blessing them, and as at last guiding them out to a well-known spot, and there, as they looked, ascending into heaven—to go forth in consequence of their belief in all this, to preach the Resurrection to the world, and, if need be, to seal their testimony to this *delusion* with their blood; this is a tissue of improbabilities so startling, that they would be denounced as incredible if they appeared in the chapters of a novel, and are utterly contemptible when gravely set forth in what professes to be a rigidly philosophical and historical work. The same fantastic character pervades the book throughout. We have considered at some length the manner in which Paul's conversion is accounted for, and have seen the romance which M. Renan weaves around the persecutor, while, in opposition to every known fact, he describes him as melting with pity for his victims, and secretly adoring the sweet name of Jesus. And so he goes on, the world being described as eager to welcome Christianity, while yet, by some unaccountable mistake, it bitterly hated and persecuted the Christians; and the 'colleges,' or 'burial-clubs,' of Rome furnishing the model, and, to some extent, the means, by which the Church gradually advanced in its career of conquest. This is what is now proposed in preference to a belief in the Gospel as divine, and to a conviction that it owed its astonishing triumphs to the promised presence and blessing of its heavenly Author! What would Gibbon have said had he seen his famous 'secondary causes' thus eclipsed and superseded? We shall not conjecture; but shall simply say for

ourselves, that we deem it infinitely more easy to accept those many miracles of divine grace and power which are recorded in Scripture, than to perform that one astounding miracle of credulity, by which alone it is possible to rest in M. Renan's explanation of the manner in which Christianity made its way in the world.

As to the author himself, we desire to speak of him with that respect due to his undoubted ability and acquirements, as well as to what is still more honourable to him, the candour of spirit by which he is in general distinguished. But we fear he must be regarded as destitute of that spiritual earnestness which is an essential requisite to success in such an enterprise as that in which he is now engaged. He seems to have no conception of the tremendous import of those problems which he has placed anew under discussion. Several paragraphs of his introduction force this thought very painfully upon the reader. He tells us (page liii.) that such works as his should be written 'with a supreme indifference, as if one wrote them for a deserted planet.' And this, while the question in dispute is, whether or not our heavenly Father has ever spoken to His children upon earth? whether or not we know anything certain of the past history of mankind, or anything satisfactory as to the future which lies before them? whether or not we have any Bible, any Church, any sanctuary, any Saviour? The man who can investigate such points as these without deep emotion, and who can demand that they should be treated with as cool a head and as insensible a heart as are brought to the comparatively trifling questions of science, is a man, we must take leave to say, destitute of proper feeling, and one who need not henceforth hesitate to 'botanise upon his mother's grave.' We cannot, therefore, yield to that demand which M. Renan makes when he exclaims, in his closing paragraph, 'Paix donc, au nom de Dieu!' and by which he would have the infidel and the Christian quietly to proceed in their respective paths, each practically regardless of the other. Not thus lightly do we hold our faith in the Gospel. It is to us all in all. And we cannot consent to be silent when it is assailed; we cannot grant M. Renan the license which he craves, of being permitted to publish theories which tend to destroy our dearest hopes, without addressing to him words of earnest reasoning and rebuke. The Gospel may, alas! be nothing to him, but it is everything to us. And even he, we think, should show greater respect to the feelings of those whose most precious treasure he seeks to take away, than to ask them to sit passively by while the process is being accomplished. May he yet come

to bow with ourselves at the feet of the Divine Man, and to acknowledge Him as the living embodiment of both truth and love, as the Light of the world, as the Saviour of the lost, as the Author of peace and purity, and as the only Guide of blinded and perishing souls to a blessed and rejoicing immortality !

ART. VII.—(1). *L'Armée Prussienne*. Par MICHEL CHEVALIER. Paris : Dentu. 1856.

(2.) *War Map of the German States*. London : Nelson & Sons.

THE present age has been singularly prolific in political revolutions. It has been the lot of no other to witness the accretion of two minor States into extensive kingdoms, upon the downfall of an empire which for centuries had treated them as rebellious vassals. One of these States, who now speaks to Europe in the name of Germany, and who certainly bids fair to unite the whole of Germany under her sceptre, was unknown at the Reformation. The other, who now directs the destinies of Italy, was unknown as an Italian power previous to the Treaty of Utrecht. It is remarkable that these, the last comers into the group of principalities, of which they formed the least promising units, should have finally absorbed the greater portion of their neighbours, within the limits of our generation, and finally laid prostrate their imperial enemy, who had so often cudgelled them into subjection. There is a connection between these two states, an identity of principle and a uniformity of action, independent of the similarity of their destinies and of their recent alliance, which may throw some light on their marvellous success. If they now find themselves at the head of their respective races, the causes which have led their steps from the cradle of barren provinces to the summits of flourishing empires have not been divergent.

The Counts of Savoy, like those of Hohenzollern, trace back their lineage to the tributaries of King Otho, and Charlemagne. For a long period they maintained a precarious existence ; Prussia as a fief of Poland, and Savoy as a satrap of the German Emperor, only too happy, under the shelter of such powerful patronage, to escape the fangs of annihilation. Both States, from their beginning, appear to have acted upon the principle of clutching land wherever they could get it, seizing little parcels of territory here and there, and leaving it for time to consoli-

date the fragments thus acquired into one compact dominion. If the intervening proprietors could not be ejected by conquest, they were cozened by barter. Those whom neither the sword nor money could subdue were caught in the meshes of Venus. The value of lives was calculated with the accuracy of a modern insurance office, and by the marriage of a young scion with the heir apparent of the property, the reversionary interest of the coveted prize was secured. By adroit tactics of this sort, as well as by military service, the Counts of Savoy extended their sway from Maurienne to Susa and Montserrat, and from Montserrat to Turin. An entrenched position on the northern slopes of the Alps, led almost by a natural consequence, to a position equally fortified with castles on the south; and the command of the mountain passes soon resulted in encroachment on the plain. By similar strategy the Counts of Hohenzollern, from the swamp of Brandenburg, hardly bigger than an English county, dotted the western and northern parts of Germany with demesnes, which served rather to map out the frontiers of their prospective kingdom than as vital members of the same corporate body.

The Jülich and Cleves Duchies were leagues away from Brandenburg, as Brandenburg was from Stettin, and neither of these had any topographical connection with East Prussia. Yet at each European treaty both Prussia and Sardinia came in for some make-weight, which served to round off their dominions, till both were allowed, at the commencement of the eighteenth century, Prussia, by direct stipulation with the Emperor of Austria, and Sardinia, by consent of the great powers, to assume the state and dignity of royal kingdoms. This was the great turning point in their respective destinies. The sword of Frederick, by adding Silesia to Brandenburg, and filling up the gap between East and Central Prussia with Posen, lifted Prussia from the humble condition of a feudatory into that of a rival of the House of Austria. The Congress of Vienna, by adding Genoa to the dominions of Piedmont, enabled her to pursue in Italy a line of her own, free from the tutelage of the same imperial house. In the rest of the rôle there is a perfect identity of means, as well as of ends. Austria, with all the obstinacy of the Hapsburgs, hugged to the last the old principles of an effete feudatory government. Her two young rivals adopted every principle which modern reason and experience prove to be essential to political progress. Prussia, by becoming the arbiter of the commercial, paved her way to become the arbiter of the political destinies of Germany. Sardinia, also by commercial reforms, taught Italy to inaugurate the reconstruction of her

old constitutions. Both states, by an enlightened system of national education, by commercial codes based upon strict reciprocity, by representative institutions, and by the widest religious freedom, appeared in startling advantage by the side of surrounding despotisms. The contrast was one of light and darkness, of science and ignorance, of integrity and corruption, of modern improvement and blind retrogression. The ill-governed were naturally taught to look up to incorporation with the well-governed people as their only chance of escape from political servitude. The first opportunity for political stratagem which presented itself to Cavour dissolved, as if by the stroke of enchantment, the effete governments of Italy, and led to the incorporation with his government of three-fourths of the Peninsula. The first opportunity for political stratagem which presented itself to Bismarck has enabled him to repeat the same process in Germany.

But though there are many remarkable points of similarity between the fortunes of Prussia and Italy, these are not unaccompanied with differences which may serve to explain the political situation. The princes of Sardinia have generally proved faithful to the code of honour. Their history is stained with fewer crimes than that of any every other in the annals of Europe. They have been guilty of neither spoliation nor treachery. Indeed, in the wars of Europe, regardless of their political interests, they have generally sided with Austria, to whom their fealty was pledged against France. Prussia contrariwise has been guided in her alliances by no principle, but that of selfish expediency, changing sides in every quarrel she has espoused with the same facility as if the belligerents were only partners in a dance. We do not know that Sardinia, even in her early course, ever annexed a town without the consent of the inhabitants. But Prussia has ruthlessly kidnapped the places she could not obtain by fair means, turning the same deaf ear to the remonstrances of the annexed state as she did to the tall recruits whom she used to kidnap for her army. There is no principle of international law upon which she has not trampled, no act of robbery or perfidy which she has hesitated at perpetrating to accomplish her objects. She first suggested, and was the most unscrupulous agent in carrying out the partition of Poland. The very fief from which she derives her name was obtained by ejecting the knights, whose vested interests she, as the chief of their body, had undertaken by the most solemn obligations of guardianship to defend. Two of the most important limbs of the empire, Posen and Silesia, were seized by acts of buccaneering unsurpassed in the history

of nations. While, as a member of the third coalition, receiving money from Great Britain to equip and despatch 90,000 troops, to Austerlitz, she entered into a stipulation with Napoleon, by which she was allowed to annex the British Hanoverian dominions as the price of her abstention from the conflict. When Napoleon entered on his Russian campaign, Prussia bound herself by solemn compact to guard his rear on the banks of the Vistula, with a force of 30,000 men. She fulfilled her engagement by turning against his outfrozen army the very bayonets he relied upon for its defence. Her last raid against Schleswig Holstein is of a piece with her previous history. She took upon herself, as agent of the Germanic Confederation, to claim these Duchies as members of the Bund. Having, with the assistance of Austria, seized the spoil, she quietly appropriated it to herself, kicked Austria out, and hurled the Confederation into the dust.

This unconquerable craving for expansion and remarkable tenacity of grip, which have characterised the House of Hohenzollern from its earliest years, have been accompanied with a characteristic which might redeem worse faults than rapacity, and certainly presents Prussia in favourable contrast with Sardinia and surrounding nations. She has loaded her subjects with no debt worth mentioning, but has carried out a rigid economy in every department of the State. The kings and electors of Prussia have been the most parsimonious princes who ever occupied a throne. They have reduced their household expenditure to the lowest possible limit, not simply to hoard up wealth for their successors, but to lighten the burdens of the state, and to provide the country with an efficient administrative system, and with a strong arm of defence. The princes of Prussia have been known to melt down their plate, to sleep on camp beds, to dress in frieze, to live on peasants' fare, with a view to keep the national expenditure within the limits of the yearly receipts. The economy they practised themselves, they forced upon every officer in the public service. It is amusing to hear Voltaire describe his disappointment on his first interview with Frederic, when he found that prince in a bare room, with his bed in one corner, and a naked table, lighted with a single taper in the other, when he expected, Frenchman-like, to see him surrounded with gilt trappings and upholstery magnificence of every kind. His father sold his jewels, sent his spoons to the mint, abolished the expense of court ceremonials, and even forewent the use of peruke maker, and of tailors in order to establish a breeding seminary for the army, which the son turned to such notable account. The frugal habits Prussia observed in her im-

poverished state she has not lost sight of in her prosperous years. Even yet the Finance Committee of Prussia exhibits yearly the cleanest balance sheet in Europe. The country, considering its extent, is the lightest taxed and the cheapest to live in in the world. While other nations have contracted large debts in times of peace, she has made her yearly resources provide for her yearly exigencies in times of war. After the recent conflict, she quartered her troops for weeks upon her prostrate opponents, besides mulcting them in heavy expenses, by which, if she collects the proceeds, the late campaign instead of imposing a loss, will confer an actual gain upon her treasury. The States she has incorporated have always been made to pay for the privilege of being annexed, and for the expense which that operation has entailed. By refusing to anticipate her revenues, and to entangle herself in expensive loans, she has been enabled to keep her metallic far ahead of her paper currency. It is this regard for her financial soundness which has made Prussia the most hopeful country in Europe. For her trifle of twenty millions of debt she has provided a sinking fund, which promises to rid the nation of it in twelve years; while Austria and Italy, staggering under the load of immense debts, have no escape from financial beggary, except by heavy national taxation. The consequence is, that the Prussian people find themselves in possession of empire without the pecuniary exigencies and the burdensome debts, which are generally the price at which empire has been purchased. They enjoy all the advantages of a great nation along with the social ease, and freedom from grinding taxation which have been hitherto the exclusive privilege of a small nation. If, therefore, Prussia has evinced a riotous predilection for absorbing surrounding principalities, it has not been without putting in the most incontestable credentials for governing them to the best advantage. If she has forced her rule upon others it has been more to the advantage of the governed than of the administrators. The latter have had more work without increased pay. The States violently incorporated, like the Sabine women, may have screamed out at first, but their subsequent contentment only shows that they have no other wish than to live upon terms of the closest intimacy with their violators.

It is this absorption of the personal interest of the Prussian monarchy in that of the State which gives to that country a peculiar freedom, unrestricted in its social and religious elements, and yet modified by that parental care which the Government, as the father of the State thinks it ought to exercise over every subject. Italy, with all its freedom, has a state religion which

as the guardian of national morality it is pledged to support. Prussia has none. She cares no more about a man's religion than about the colour of his coat. Every religious denomination has a clear stage, and no favour. Even a Jew may guide her Parliament, and a Roman Catholic may mount her throne. Yet her princes have had no notion of subjecting themselves to inconveniences on account of the welfare of the State, without making their subjects do so likewise. If they have disciplined themselves, they have also insisted upon disciplining their people. The State is, therefore, as a corporate entity, intruded upon every subject's attention at the critical stages of his life, exacting from him certain duties, and compelling his obedience thereto. Prussia claims twelve years of the life of every one of her male subjects, for moulding his mind and drilling his body. As soon as a child of either sex arrives at the age of seven years, to school it must go, and be initiated there for seven years more, not merely in reading and writing, but in the elementary principles of mechanics, in the handling of tools, and in the nature of the relationship which exists between its own body and the surrounding universe. At twenty-one the State interferes again. Every male adult must be initiated for three years into the functions of a common soldier. Even the princes of the blood are not exempt from the general law. To the exigency of this service every domestic tie, private compact, and professional engagement must adapt itself. The State will insist upon three years of every subject's life being sacrificed to itself, on the threshold of manhood. Having then fixed her mark upon him, she retains him in her service for the rest of his life. In two years afterwards he is drafted into the reserve force, which, however, leaves him ample space to follow his occupations as a private citizen. He is then held to the State by looser ties, as a part of the landwehr (militia), though still liable to be called upon for active service in cases of emergency. Having passed through the first ban of the militia at thirty-one, he becomes a member of the second, which though entailing the same duties, has less chance of having its services called into active requisition. He finally passes into the landsturm, as a member of which he always continues liable to be called out for garrison duty whenever the State has need of his services. By this connection between her main army and its reserves, the State is enabled at a moment's notice to convert her population into a vast camp, in which every man's strength is utilised to the utmost, and each performs the service most fitted for his season of life. Her military force has the flexibility of a lady's fan combined with the properties of the King of Lydia's

ring. Fold it up, and the army is lost in the population, extend it, and the population disappears behind the army.

Perhaps in no country in the world has the blending of the military with the ~~commercial element~~, of the paternal form of government with the largest amount of social freedom, been so felicitously realised. This arises from the fact that the paternal government does not take care of the individual for himself, but for the State. His liberty is interfered with only so far as may be necessary to enable him to perform the duties which he owes to society. The soldier is never allowed for a moment to forget that he is a citizen, or the citizen that he is a soldier. Even in time of peace the army is employed upon public works. It may seem a great hardship for a man to be torn from the bosom of his family and made to shoulder a musket, but the training thus received is only a further extension of schooling. He learns sword exercise, and acquires methodised habits. He accustoms his body to hardships. He goes through all sorts of gymnastics. We are not, therefore, quite sure, that, apart from its military purposes, it may not be the very best preparation which a nation can receive for the duties of manhood. At all events the Prussian drill system, combined with the Prussian school system, is the readiest means of approach yet devised to the realisation of the sound heathen maxim, '*Mens sana in corpore sano.*' What is best for the individual is undoubtedly best for the community. People who have this discipline hanging over them are not disposed to indulge in premature marriages. The sexes do not join in Prussia until they are able to procreate a robust offspring. If the Prussian soldiery handle their gun better, and are readier at their sword and lance than any other, it is the natural consequence of their military training acting upon the strongest constitutions in Europe.

It is singular that this flexible system of military organisation should have been the result, not of reason selecting the best of many elaborately devised theories, but of iron necessity. The armies which the great Frederic led to battle were composed mostly of foreigners officered by the native nobility. Instead of the soldier and citizen being combined in the same person, there was a wall of separation between them. The army was a separate caste from the population, and consumed four-fifths of the revenues of the State. A master mind like Frederic's, who could infuse life into anything, got what he wanted out of so cumbrous an instrument, but the whole thing fell to pieces when brought into collision with a nation of soldiers. The battle of Jena showed Prussia that she was lavishing her resources upon a delusion, and depending for her military strength upon a

broken reed. At the treaty of Tilsit she was stripped of one-half of her dominions, and obliged to submit to the condition of not keeping a numerical force on foot greater than 70,000 men. But that which Napoleon thought would deprive the Prussian Eagle of its talons, in reality proved to be the multiplying of those talons a hundredfold, and the endowing of each with renovated strength. Steinborst, the war minister, while keeping down the standing army to the prescribed amount, by enlisting recruits for a short term of service, and afterwards drafting them into the militia, soon passed three-fourths of the adult population of Prussia through its ranks. Martial exercises, systematically repeated, made the citizen an adept in the functions of a soldier long after his discharge from the exclusive duties of the profession. The Prussian army resembled a little lake, constantly receiving and disemboguing its waters, yet liable at any moment to have its limits swelled out into an immense sea, by its discharged currents being flung back into its basin. The first mighty gathering took place in the campaign which ended in the field of Leipsic. The little force of 40,000 men, in the course of a single night extended itself into a force of 220,000 men. Napoleon was not more surprised at the suddenness of this apparition than Fitz James, when the warriors of Rhoderic Dhu, emerging at his shrill whistle from the ferns of Benledi, converted a slope of mountain heather into a camp of bristling steel. The army at Quatre Bras and Waterloo proved itself quite equal to the results expected from it. In those bloody conflicts, Prussia was, after Great Britain, the principal agent, in releasing Europe from the thralldom of France.

When Prussia took her seat at the Councils of Vienna, her territories were in the condition of a man whose right arm is separated from his body, and whose legs appear to belong to other bodies wedged between them. Hanover still erected a barrier between the Westphalian Duchies and the main body on the north. On the south, a knot of minor principalities intercepted all communication between the eastern and western provinces of the kingdom. Prussia now required not only that her former territories should be restored to her, but that some of these minor principalities should cease to exist. True to the grasping instinct of her dynasty, she demanded not only the incorporation of the whole of Saxony and the entire country between the Weser and the Elbe, but that the electorates of Nassau and Mayence should be annexed to her dominions. Hanover, doubtless, would have been in the coveted list, had not Hanover at that time been an appanage of his British Majesty. These demands Austria resisted. Her

chief had already parted at Presburg with the imperial mantle, as Emperor of Germany, by right of which she claimed the fealty of the Prussian princes as possessors of the fief of Brandenburg, and no superiority now was left to her, except such as accrued from the dislocated state of her rivals, and the compact strength of her own possessions. If Prussia, therefore, was to be aggrandised, it must not be in the way of consolidation. She got a piece of Franconia here, and a bit of Saxony there, and from France, the left bank of the Rhine, in return for giving up a slice of Poland to the new province of Warsaw—ample indemnities for disgorging a part of what she had acquired by robbery and spoliation, but still leaving her territories a more curious assortment of odd and dislocated parts, than the most broken piece of tessellated pavement in the world. Still further to protect the interests of the weaker States, Austria interlaced them in one confederation, in which she assigned Russia a place inferior only to herself. Prussia, therefore, was bound by double trammels. She could not gain a single inch of territory without arraying against herself, not only the forces of Austria, but those of the entire Bund. But expansion was a necessity of her existence. The parts of which the Prussian monarchy was composed were continually gravitating towards each other. The gigantic obstacles which opposed their union, when the time came, were as suddenly pushed aside as a mass of rock upheaved by a piece of water seeking to find its own level.

Prussia, in her time, had experienced enough of confederations. She could not form any for herself, and was perpetually excluded from others, or admitted only on condition of playing a very inferior part. In the old Bund of the Empire she was almost lost, as a unit among some two hundred and fifty principalities, bound by ties of homage and military wardenship to the imperial house she has now laid prostrate at her feet. When Napoleon broke up the old Bund and constructed the Rhenish Confederation out of its fragments, Prussia found herself rigorously excluded from the alliance. The territories of which she had been stripped had gone to swell the estates of petty principalities who yesterday had been content to lick her feet, but who now, through the indulgence of their conqueror, affected airs of magniloquence and grandeur even superior to herself. She had previously struck the patriotic note, seeking to patch up another confederation upon the basis of the exclusion of the foreigner, of which she was to be the head: but no one could be found to commit themselves with an erratic but aspiring State, which left them no option but being swallowed up by their protector, or crushed to the dust by the

overwhelming weight of Napoleon. The substitution of the Germanic Confederation for that of the Rhine did not much improve her prospects in this direction, as she found herself shackled with treaties and conventions which left her no possible outlet for the accomplishment of her destinies, except by revolution. It, however, kept alive the feeling of 'Germany for the Germans,' which she so vainly attempted to arouse for her own purposes in 1806, and which, as the State containing most German souls, invested her pretensions with an air of reasonableness before the world. Besides, the confederation which Metternich constructed was a military confederation, based upon rearing an insurmountable barrier against the inroad of the Frank, rather than a confederation determining the external relationship between the States themselves. Such an omission could not escape the notice of so astute a power as Prussia. She determined to supplement the confederation of Metternich with a confederation of her own. If Austria was at the head of the military, she resolved to place herself at the head of the social and commercial organisation of Germany.

Although the greatest necessity for a commercial league existed between the different States of the Confederation, the task was one by no means easy of accomplishment. The jealousy with which the minor States regarded Prussia induced them to repudiate her supremacy in everything. But by patience and stratagem Prussia overcame all obstacles. It was not until 1825 that she could prevail on Hesse Darmstadt to adopt her scheme. It took seven years more to induce Bavaria and Wurtemberg to follow in the wake of Darmstadt, and then, not until she had removed from the cabinet of Munich her keen-sighted opponent Count Armansperg; Saxony, after some hesitation, and then Baden, joined the league. Frankfort was compelled to accede by the superior strength of her antagonist. But Hanover, Brunswick, Hesse Cassel, and Oldenburg stood out to the last. They got up a league of their own, evidently suspecting, with Count Armansperg, that Prussia had some political motive in imposing her tariff upon the whole of Germany. But Prussia could wait. As Hanover was connected with England, she first endeavoured to detach that kingdom from its allies; but only succeeded with Hesse Cassel, who violated the pact it had formed, and joined the Prussian union. By these isolated efforts, pertinaciously pursued, Prussia, in 1839, became the arbiter of the national resources of the vast territory which extends between the Baltic and the Alps. She dictated the law in all essential points, and moulded the commercial institutions of four kingdoms, one electorate, three grand dukedoms, and more than twenty

smaller principalities. This was not merely a shadow of the political supremacy to which she was aspiring, but a very large instalment of it. It was a gigantic stride in the path which the Princes of Hohenzollern had early struck out for themselves, of making the increase of their own power proportionate with the advantages conferred upon those whom they had induced or compelled to submit to it. Formerly, a bale of goods could hardly traverse two hundred miles of German territory without being stopped at some half-dozen different custom-houses by legalised bandits, who came forth to rifle its contents, and mulct the owner in harassing imposts. But now, goods could be sent from Lake Constance to the banks of the Niemen without stopping once in their route, or being subject to any but one uniform toll for the entire transit.

The consequence was as rapid an increase of the industrial wealth of the members of the union as took place in this country when steam engines supplied the place of hand labour or mail coaches. But we do not believe that Prussia would have cared a straw about one bale the more or one freight the less of cotton or isinglass, or drysaltery, poured into the German States, had it not been for the political power masked behind it. She had no inducement to swell the coffers of her neighbours, except to captivate their people. By stimulating the productive energies of 8,654 German square miles of territory, she taught the twenty-seven millions and a quarter of their inhabitants, to regard her as the creator of their material prosperity, and to look to the reservoirs from which their wealth flowed as situate at Berlin. Nor were their princes unfettered by the union. Prussia, by making them feel that their continuance in the Zollverein depended on her option, could command their votes in the Diet, under the thumbscrew of diminishing their material wealth.

There was, however, one little difference between the great confederation organized at Vienna, and its supplement organized at Berlin. While Prussia was included in the one, Austria was shut out from the other. Indeed, the feeling of Germany for the Germans, which the establishment of the Zollverein had intensified so much, was hardly one in which her great southern rival could participate; keeping Italy dismembered in order to add a limb of the Peninsula to the motley group of Czechs, Hungarians, Istrians, Dalmatians, Illyrians and Styrians, over whom she ruled, and linking the destinies of some eight millions of Germans to this piebald assemblage of nations, Austria could hardly throw in her lot with any national party without spreading disaffection to her rule.

In fact, it was putting a light to the very explosive materials on which that rule was erected. By this engine Prussia held Austria at an immense disadvantage, and she never failed to use it when she meant her rival any mischief. For, if Prussia raised the national cry, Austria could not stand aloof, nor pretend to be indifferent to its meaning. She was obliged to bid against Prussia for the leadership of Germany, and play and coquet with an instrument which threatened her with death. When Prussia raised the cry, at the commencement of the century, the feeling was too weak, and the Gallic power in Germany too strong for it to be turned to account by either party. When she raised the cry in 1813, Austria, in consequence of the sacrifices she had made, was allowed to embody the feeling in a permanent organization and place herself at the head of it. When the cry was next raised in '48, Prussia had taken steps that no one should reap the fruit of her own shouting but herself. For it fell upon the ears of a population, whom, for the last quarter of a century, she had taught, not only to collect the material fruits of union without the assistance of Austria, but to look upon her as the great obstacle which impeded their full realization. The sound also came thundering across the Alps of 'Italy for the Italians,' with which the existence of Austria was regarded as equally incompatible. Here were two countries in fear of each other, whose establishment was based upon the annihilation of a common enemy. But the movement was associated with a wild spirit of democracy, which struck at the conservative basis of her institutions, and Prussia did not care about being carried to the summit of her wishes by an agitation which threatened to undermine the foundations of her monarchy. The fact is, Prussia found, that in the phantom of national unity, she had raised another Frankenstein which threatened to make short work of the author of its own existence. Had her councils been guided by a bold minister, Prussia might have reaped the advantages which she has at present obtained, and helped to complete the edifice of Italian liberty without French interference. But, scared by the bold attitude of German democracy, she contented herself with petting the unitarian movement by invading the Elbe Duchies, thinking her great rival sufficiently damaged by having to call in Russia for the suppression of the popular party both in Hungary and Italy. The odium Austria thus acquired made her anxious to regain lost ground by flinging herself unreservedly into the agitation for German unity, and which the failures of '48 rather smothered than subdued. By prolonging the Schleswig Holstein dispute, to which Prussia had given such prominence, with that view, Austria was in the

condition of the bird who hugs to its own destruction the shaft which the artful fowler has winged with a feather from its own breast.

There cannot be a doubt that about the Elbe Duchies, Prussia, from the time the quarrel broke out, had clearly made up her mind. The end was, in accordance with the ancestral rapacity of her power, to pocket these duchies for herself, and to stimulate the old cry of Germany for the Germans for that purpose. The troops she had marched into Schleswig on the first opportunity in '48, were withdrawn only in obedience to Russia. Nor did she retire without leaving behind her in the heart of the territory secret committees of insurrection, and all the organised machinery of revolt which she afterwards fed with men and ammunition from Berlin. When the Great Powers in London thought they had settled the dispute, and decreed the terms which should pin the duchies to Denmark on the accession of the new dynasty, Prussia was the only one of the high contracting parties who refused to sign the protocols. As soon, therefore, as breath was out of the old king's body, Prussia repudiated the convention of '52, and declared herself unfettered by its provisions. She could not sign away the German's birthright to the tutelage of his countrymen without, indeed, renouncing her own claims to the guardianship of his race.

It is commonly supposed that in the events which followed, Prussia was the unwilling agent of the German democracy, backed by the agitation of the minor States, anxious to strengthen their influence in the Bund by the addition of another member to their body. But this is a notion quite of a piece with that which never saw in the Dano-German dispute anything more than the trifling question whether the handful of Germans who inhabited the Duchies should have their interests stultified at Frankfort, or eclipsed at Copenhagen. The interminable manner in which this business turned up some half-dozen times after it had been dead and buried, the reams of papers wasted about it, the numerous protocollings, the books and the pamphlets employed in its obscuration, which would cover an area greater than the entire of Germany, the correspondence of crowned heads, the disputes in their respective cabinets, and the assembling of the representatives of those cabinets in stormy congress both at London, at Frankfort, and elsewhere, the menaces of war arising out of it, which thrice threatened to wrap the whole of Europe in flame; all this, when contrasted with the insignificant matter ostensibly in dispute, seemed very much like shaking a hemisphere to pieces in order to connect two dilapidated sheds out of its ruins. The whole

thing seemed a profound enigma, to the ordinary mind. Even astute statesmen who probed the bottom of every other mystery, never pretended to fathom that. But what seemed dark and opaque to everybody else, was to Prussia instinct with light and intelligence. The Elbe Duchies, insignificant as they seemed to others, were, to her, the fulcrum upon which, firmly planted, her single lever might move the world. They would give her the possession of the mouth of the Elbe, and a wide sea coast, indented with numerous harbours, both on the North Sea and on the Baltic.

Their seizure was not simply important from the territory they would put in her possession, but from the further acquisitions to which they must lead ; for it was only following out the old policy of her house, to absorb border states by first clutching others on the opposite side of their frontiers, and so reducing the intervening proprietors to nominal subjection. In this instance, indeed, the princes of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Strelitz, who alone separated her from Holstein, were already her satraps, so that possession of the coveted prize meant nothing less than an accession of territory nearly equal to her Rhenish dominions. That Prussia, therefore, should have moved heaven and earth about this business, that she should have kept it dangling before the world as the only thing fit for human disquisition, that she should have allowed Europe no peace, either day or night, as long as there was a chance of the prize slipping from her grasp, is to us perfectly intelligible. If the minor States, with German democracy took up the question on the accession to Denmark of the dynasty of Glucksburg, it was because at that critical period Prussia had set the agitation afoot with more vigour than ever. She first let loose as much of the popular current about German unity as sufficed to stir the Bund into action, and then placed herself at the head of the movement. But Austria, as usual, would not allow her to monopolise all the credit of the adventure, but must accompany her in this hypocritical crusade in quest of what neither wanted, and in the prosecution of which both were resolved alike upon plundering the Danes, hoodwinking the Germans, and cheating each other. For the minor States to embark in this perilous enterprise was rash enough. But to Austria, once more confronted, not as heretofore with the phantom of Italian unity, but with the substantial embodiment actually in arms, this act of temerity was equal to that of a man who with an avalanche hanging in his rear rushes to a pitfall in front. When the booty was captured, and the prey came to be divided, Austria, as might have been expected from the distance of Denmark from

her dominions, could not obtain a single inch of territory, but was offered in requital a mere money payment; as if the great inheritors of the Cæsars had dwindled into Swiss mercenaries, ready to assist ~~their neighbours~~ to any plunder they pleased at so many guelders a campaign. Austria rather ingenuously appealed to the Bund, but Bismarck, having only to stamp his foot to bring an Italian army to his assistance, set both the Bund and Austria at defiance.

When the alliance was finally determined upon between Italy and Prussia, we do not pretend, any more than the Austrian embassy at Berlin, to say; but what seems pretty clear is this, that for the last five years such an alliance had been entertained by both Courts as a very likely event. There were indeed too many analogies between the two countries for the utility of a league between them to escape even common observation. Both had sprung from the north; both had converted sandy swamps into flourishing gardens and corn-fields; both had the same enemy to defeat, the same aspirations to realize, the same destiny to accomplish. But while the fate of Italy hung in the balance between the will of the autocrat at the Tuileries and the revolutionary committees of Piedmont, Prussia held aloof, thinking her neighbour not respectable enough for any notice beyond that of censure and rebuke. She protested against her annexation of Tuscany, and of the Legations. She even stigmatised, with singular effrontery, her invasion of the Pontifical States as a wanton infringement of international law. It does not appear that until Cavour placed his Italian kingdom firmly upon its legs, and showed its competency to stand, that the eyes of Prussia were open to the fact, that Italy was a country, not only whose nationality she might safely recognise, but whose example she might wisely follow. Sardinia, while a petty State, had in the course of a few months, amid the applause of Europe, bowled over some half-dozen principalities, and incorporated their domains with her territories. What was there to hinder Prussia, a powerful State, fortified with the same political weapons, from accomplishing similar results in Germany? Even that question of the Elbe Duchies, which she seemed to consider so paramount, Cavour had looked into, and actually pointed out as an instrument which, if dexterously handled, might help Italy to Venice while at the same time it established the supremacy of Prussia in Germany. Cavour's sagacity, and the great reputation he left behind him in Europe, were not lost upon Bismarck, who transferred his tactics to Berlin. From this time the *rapprochement* between the two nations became an accomplished fact. The mode, and the how of the compact, the number of men to be furnished, may not

have been adjusted, but with regard to the broad features of the alliance, that Italy was to have Venice, in return for aiding Prussia to get the Elbe Duchies, and to reconstitute herself in Germany, ~~that is believed to have~~ been perfectly understood by the two Courts, before a shot was fired across the Düppel, as firmly as anything can be believed by the legations of Europe. Hence, for the last few years, Italy kept enlarging her armaments far beyond her actual means or requirements, and to an extent which those of her admirers, not in the secret, pronounced to be downright insanity. Those Elbe Duchies, from putting a great many pens, had come to put a great many swords in motion. Big floundering generals, with saucer eyes, had come to peer into that unfathomable abyss, and thought that the cavity might very possibly be filled up, with advantage to Europe.

The Italian armaments, though on a colossal scale, were by no means greater than were required by the pressing nature of the emergency. For, as was all along foreseen, when the decree of the Diet left Prussia no alternative but an appeal to arms, the powers arrayed against her in Germany were of a very formidable character. There was first the great army of Austria, numbering, apart from its Lombardo-Venetian contingent, some 600,000 men. There were then the separate forces of Bavaria, Saxony, Wurtemberg, Hanover, and the little cluster of northern States, which could not amount to less than 130,000 more. Finally came the united army of the Confederation, which, exclusive of Prussia, may be set down as an actual force of 200,000 men. To cope with this formidable military array, Prussia could not bring more than 550,000 men in the field.

It was, therefore, quite on the cards that Prussia should be outflanked in Germany; in which case there would have been no other redemption than for the Italians, having secured the Adige, to have poured their conquering legions through the passes of the Alps, and to have afforded some breathing-time for Prussia to recover lost ground in her own provinces. To achieve these results, the Italians must put an army in the field which would swell that of Prussia to an amount quite equal to the combined force of her adversaries. But in every eventful campaign there is always some fate at work disabling the arm which threatens to achieve the utmost, and unveiling sources of weakness in quarters which seemed to be invested with gigantic strength.

The Italians, notwithstanding their blustering preparations could not win a single inch of territory from their adversaries, while the Prussians found the forces of the enemy so charmingly arranged, as to secure for them an unexampled succession of

easy victories. It is not saying too much, that had the disposition of the troops of Austria and her confederates been the work of Prussian agents, the soldiers could not have been more promptly conducted to capture or defeat. There was no plan or concert between them. Each expected the enemy upon its own soil, viewing its ally's destruction with indifference, and waiting to be cut down or dispersed in turn, whenever the Prussians found it convenient to take it in hand. The Hanoverians were surrounded at Neustadt, the Saxons driven out of Dresden, the Bavarians defeated at Kissengen, the army of the confederation dissolved into sheer air at Aschaffenberg, without the slightest effort on the part of any to rescue its neighbour from destruction, or to cause even a diversion in his favour. Such an idea as acting in concert never seems to have crossed their minds. As to Austria, who should have been the soul of the confederate body, infusing organisation down to its minutest parts, she not only gave up her allies piecemeal to destruction, but made a generous sacrifice of herself at the same time. She allowed the Prussians to ride triumphant through the north and central parts of Germany, to occupy Dresden without a struggle, to seize the passes of Glatz and Nachod undefended (a blunder, which in the days of Frederic cost her Silesia), to pour the two great divisions of their army into her territory, through defiles where a handful of men might have overmatched a regiment, without planting a single vidette, and finally she allowed those divisions to unite on her front, and invited them to attack her in a position which was assailable both in flank and rear, and upon which the whole fortune of the conflict was staked. It would be too complimentary to the Austrian generals to say that a herd of reckless schoolboys would have managed matters much better, for a staff of drunken lunatics could hardly have managed matters worse. Yet at the opening of the campaign, the world heard nothing talked about except the great plans of Benedek, which were to annihilate the Prussian army long before it could possibly come up to the strength of the Austrian position. He was to win the day by strategy alone. French commissioners who had arrived from Paris in a state of lively curiosity to look into the nature of these plans, were forbidden access to the camp where they lay shrouded in impenetrable mystery. Even newspaper correspondents were not admitted within the entrenchments, without first binding themselves under a form of ceremonial freemasonry to reveal nothing of anything they heard. Something grandiloquently awful was expected to instal the Croat in the palaces of Berlin. When the field of Sadowa had shown the moonshine of which these expectations consisted,

Benedek, in answer to questions about his plans, averred he never had any, except the erratic one of fighting the Prussians whenever they happened to come his way, and as ill-luck would have it, ~~he had been~~ rather damaged in the collision. He was in the condition of Canning's knife-grinder, who rather damped the ardour of the curiosity he had excited as to the cause of his dilapidated condition by affirming—'Plans, Lor bless ye, I have none to tell sir'—and he was dismissed by his employers, as speedily as Canning's hero after the revelation of his misfortune at the Chequers. The Austrians in front of an enemy rapidly advancing upon their capital, were obliged to change their commanders and reconstitute their army, and to give up Venice, while poor Benedek retired to shoot birds in upper Istria, and console himself with bagging game for the reflection of having lost an empire.

The material advantages which resulted to Prussia from the effects of this campaign were hardly more signal than the moral advantages. At the commencement, the general feeling in this country was that the Prussians deserved to be worsted in the struggle. They had set public treaties at defiance: nay, were the real aggressors. Austria appeared as the champion of international right and of the past prerogatives of the Bund. Yet, when the independence of the minor States was overturned, and Vienna lay at the mercy of Berlin, hardly any one in these islands, except those interested in papal politics, wished to see the position of the parties reversed. The blundering stolidity of Austria and her allies, their supine remissness in matters affecting their dearest interests, proved their own incapacity to govern anything, quite as loudly as the vigilance and foresight of Prussia, the vigour and wisdom of her councils, the decision and promptitude of her action, proved her capacity to govern everything. Hence, when Prussia insisted, as the price of her success, upon the exclusion of Austria from any future confederation of Germany, she only insisted upon her retiring from a post the duties of which she had proved incompetent to fulfil, and in which she could no longer continue to act without detriment to the radical constitution of things. When Prussia likewise decreed to annex or mediatize such of the minor States as either bordered, or interfered with the continuity of her frontiers, she simply enforced the principle that the prerogatives of the few must yield to the convenience of the many, and that a powerful State, endowed with an exquisite combination of material and intellectual strength, must of inevitable necessity absorb little States embedded in its territories, who possessed neither one nor the other.

Indeed, the independence of the minor States contiguous to Prussia was lost as soon as Austria was overthrown. They existed, like the little States of Europe, only by the jealousy of the great powers in their immediate vicinity. In fact, while the dualism between Prussia and Austria existed, these minor States were masters of the situation; for, by leaning to one side or the other in the Diet, they virtually decided which should for the moment have the supremacy in Germany. Those fatal Elbe Duchies, however, lured them to their ruin. By hastening on a crisis which left them no outlet of escape except by alliance with the weaker party, and by taking no steps to make that party competent to cope with its antagonist, they prepared for themselves the shroud and the winding-sheet from which there can be no resurrection, for no earthly power, after the influence of Austria was annihilated, could prevent their absorption in Prussia, any more than a ukase or rescript imperial could prevent the moon from tumbling to the earth after the opposing influence of the sun was withdrawn. The intervention of a foreign army might retard, but could not defeat the inevitable necessity, for Prussia, by generations of economic management, of teaching and drilling, of productive energy, combined with administrative skill, had endowed herself with the gravitating power necessary to incorporate every body which came within the whirl of her influence.

It is this very soundness of her administrative system which has enabled Prussia to achieve more results in a ten days' campaign than the great Frederick achieved throughout the period of a long and triumphant career. Austria was overcome in the battle-field, but Germany conquered in the bureau. And if Austria was overcome in the battle-field, a century of good schools and prudent statesmanship had as much to do in securing the victory as the efficiency of her military service. In the results which followed from the victory they accomplished everything. If Prussia conquered Schleswig-Holstein for the Confederation, she had not, after Königgratz to conquer them for herself. The German residents were not dissatisfied at finding themselves members of the best-governed States in Väterland, rather than the weak dependants of a loose organization of autocrats. In the annexation of Nassau, Hanover, and Hesse-Cassel, Prussia had simply to hunt out the reigning princes. Their subjects seemed in no wise discontented with the change of masters. If Frankfort was obstreperous, it was because it lost its prestige as the seat of a confederation of sovereigns, and of the numerous embassies and legations accredited to it. But even the people of Frankfort, with far greater cause of umbrage than those of Turin

at the transfer of the seat of the Italian government to Florence, did not fire upon the military. They went no further than to remonstrate at being fleeced for their adherence to the old order of things. With this single exception, as slight as it is transient, Prussia will become a compact State, connect her Westphalian provinces with the main body of her territories, and add a head to those territories abraiding upon two seas, without causing a single murmur among the four millions of new subjects whom she has brought under her sceptre. Though for a year they are to be governed by Royal rescript rather than by Prussian law, they are likely to prove as Prussian to the backbone as if they had been integral portions of the new Empire from the dissolution of the Teutonic knights.

These results, startling in themselves, are but the prelude of others more startling still. This enlargement of empire is but the vestibule or approach to empire of far more imperial dimensions. The absorption of these five States with the Elbe Duchies is accompanied with the mediatization of some score of others.* Prussia will take upon herself the command of their military forces, the occupation of their garrisons, the performance of their diplomatic functions, the management of their telegrams and railways, and the regulation of their posts. Their coins also will be stamped in the mint of Berlin. In everything which touches their relations with the outlying world these States will be governed by Prussia. In everything which is confined to their internal organization, the police of their towns, the business of man with man, Prussia will generously concede to them complete liberty of action. The determining the manner of sweeping their streets, or the amount of imposts to be laid on their granaries for keeping their drains in order—these are matters about which Prussia will not concern herself. It is only when anything Royal is to be done; when muskets are to be fired, or any exhibition of force is to be made, that she insists upon the main wires of the machine being pulled from Berlin. The seventeen princes of these mediatized States,

* Saxony with 2,343,944 inhabitants; Mecklenburg-Schwerin with 552,612 inhabitants; Saxe-Weimar with 280,281; Saxe-Meiningen with 178,065; Saxe-Altenburg with 141,839; Mecklenburg-Strelitz with 99,860; Saxe-Coburg-Gotha with 164,527; Oldenburg with 301,812; Anhalt with 193,046; Schwarzburg-Sonderhausen and Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt with 66,189 and 73,752; Reuss-Schleitz and Reuss-Greiz with 43,929 and 86,972; Schauenburg-Lippe with 31,382; Lippe-Detmold with 111,336; Hesse-Homburg with 27,374. Then there is Brunswick which, as soon as the present old duke dies, will naturally fall to Prussia as the possessor of Hanover; the Free States of Bremen, Lubeck, and Hamburg, making altogether a population of five and half millions.

therefore, sink at once into mere prefects; the sovereigns of armies, who are to swear allegiance to their enemy, the wearers of the insignia of Royalty, with the limited functions of town clerks; such are the gentlemen who have actually consented in the school of nominal independency to prepare their subjects for final incorporation with Prussia. They have, in fact, allowed their subjects to be manacled not merely singly but collectively. To bind the united with the same iron bands as the individual interests of these mediatized States to Prussia, they are to return deputies to a grand northern confederacy, by separate scale, so graduated to their inhabitants as will enable Prussia to outvote them by five to one. Here, therefore, are twenty-one States, exclusive of three free towns, reduced at one stroke into subjection. Their autonomy is in the will, their military power in the hand, their industrial resources at the feet of Prussia. Instead of ruling over nineteen millions of scattered people, she will now rule over some twenty-nine millions of a consolidated people. Formerly she could place only 600,000 men upon a war footing; now she will be able to command a million.

But even this lordly stretch of Imperialism does not comprise the limit of the advantages gained by Prussia. She has not only gained the allegiance of those States immediately in contact with her frontiers, but she has so divided those beyond, that their absorption is only a question of time or opportunity. She is, indeed, carrying out in Germany the tactics of the old Roman senate, which consisted in dividing outlying states, or setting them by the ears, as a prelude to mediatization, just as mediatization was a prelude to complete subjection. Nearly every Roman war ended with annexing states already prepared for that step by being divided one against the other. The three processes were perpetually going on, as if by force of some natural law, until the frontiers of the Roman Empire were continuous with Caledonia in the north, and Parthia in the east. Divide, protect, absorb, was the policy by which the Roman Republic conquered the west, and by which Russia is gradually incorporating the east. Such is the policy by which Prussia, in a few years, has placed herself in a position to reduce the whole of the Teutonic race under her sway. So great has been the success already achieved, that she has been enabled to exclude Austria from all alliance with the States to the south of the Maine. She has given these States permission—such is the imperial language of Prussia—to form a little confederacy of their own, with Brunswick at their head, knowing full well that without Austria the members of the Southern Bund, with their eight millions of subjects, will be as impotent to resist the

encroachments of Prussia, as a small dam-stream the inroads of the mighty ocean, whenever the two come into collision. That European diplomacy should have looked upon these changes with more or less of indifference; that it should have allowed Prussia to tear up treaties to which its seals had been affixed, without even one word of protest, is a fact entirely novel in history. For it is not merely the annexation of five, innocuous states, or the mediatization of twenty others, or the dictating to and the pulverizing of the rest which is at stake—though the power so acquired is far greater than any which has been ever achieved as the result of one campaign, but it is the fact that these changes are only meant to have one result, and that is, the placing of Prussia at the head of the greatest monarchy in Europe.

The great lever on which Prussia relies for lifting her to the topmost peak of imperial greatness is doubtless the convocation of deputies from all the Diets of Germany. A gathering of such deputies, in addition to the Northern Parliament, we already hear of as being about to take place at Berlin, to deliberate upon the best course to adopt, considering the actual position of affairs, to ensure the commonweal of Germany. Both the place of meeting and the subject alike point to one result as alone possible,—that Prussia will be invited, if not seemingly constrained, to permit the states south of the Maine to form one confederacy with their northern brethren, under her tutelage. The permission Prussia has accorded to these states to form a Bund of their own is somewhat analogous to that accorded at Villafranca, to the dispossessed princes of central Italy, to return to their palaces. The princes, doubtless, are willing enough to enter into such a confederacy, but their subjects are as likely to assent to such an arrangement as the Modenese and the Tuscans were to have their ducal governors back again. In both cases there is the same desire for unity, the same consistent resolve to sweep away every barrier, whether in the shape of treaties, or kings which stands between them and their object. On the adoption of such resolution the southern states of Germany will fling themselves into the arms of Prussia, just as the central states of Italy flung themselves into the arms of Piedmont, with the simple difference, that a federal tie will be interposed, as a prelude to final annexation. The bundle of states now mediatized, those most saturated with Prussian ideas, will be annexed, in order to make room for the new postulants for mediatization. If even a German Parliament should not do her work, Prussia can easily accomplish the desired end, by means of liberal committees in those capitals of the Southern Bund which are most eager to amalgamate with Prussia. These liberal

committees she may feed with money and ammunition until they are ripe for revolt, when her minister, like Cavour, in the case of central Italy, will have nothing to do but open his arms to receive the subjects who have flung themselves into his embrace. But there is every probability that both instruments will be employed;—the secret committee, as an undermining agent, the Parliament, as the consummator of the plans it prepares.

The present situation of affairs, as defined by the treaty of Nickolsburg, and as patched up between Prussia and the minor powers is therefore the most unstable in the world. Even if Bismarck wanted to maintain it, the task would be beyond his strength. But he has openly avowed from the Prussian tribune, that the arrangement is only transitional, out of which something better must arise for Prussia and for Väterland. It would indeed be odd if Bismarck invited his countrymen to accept of unity in a trinity of powers having no inter-dependence on each other. The old confederation, with all its faults, imparted a sort of factitious unity to Germany. If it was not a union of people, it was, at all events, a union of princes, who represented the military strength of their States, if they stifled their political aspirations. But in the place of the old confederation we now get three powers, perfectly unrestricted as to their foreign alliances, and without the remotest relation with each other. The situation, therefore, would be anomalous, were it not for the Prussian key which interprets the whole position. Bismarck has not shivered a powerful confederacy into fragments without the intention of piecing together the dislocated parts under the ægis of the house of which he is the Minister. From unity of a low order, under the House of Hapsburg, he has led the German people into disunity, in order that they may reach unity of a higher order under the dynasty of the Hohenzollerns. It is the bit by bit process. The absorption of the whole thirty-five German states at once would be too much even for the digestion of Prussia. Were she also to attempt it European diplomacy might have a word to say upon the subject. She therefore moderately bolts twenty-five at a single meal, relying upon the favourable confirmation of events, to strike in for the remaining ten afterwards.

Prussia, in stopping where she did has been praised for her moderation; but the fact is, she has not checked herself until her work was virtually accomplished. It appears to be a new principle in politics not to do more to accomplish your ends than is sufficient to bring them up to that point so as to render their realization by the sheer force of circumstances a matter of absolute necessity. By this means extraneous diplomacy is

disarmed, and invited to settle the matter quietly with the fates. This principle, so very astutely adopted by Cavour in his development of Italian unity, has now been adopted with still greater astuteness by Bismarck in his very portentous grasp after German unity. That minister, no less than Cavour, is perfectly alive to the fact, that the passion of his countrymen for a unified state, embracing the whole of Väterland, is stronger than any instinct of his own nature. Liberty, wealth, municipal privileges, even social rank, he is prepared to sacrifice to attain it. Now in apportioning Germany, while bringing within her dominion the largest portion of its inhabitants, Prussia has made them more dissatisfied than ever with their condition. She at the same time leaves them no possible chance of achieving their darling unity, unless by arranging themselves under her standard. The supremacy of Austria is impossible. Her condition is too rickety, her German population too weak and too few to prove a central point of attraction. The supremacy of the Southern Bund is likewise for the same reason impossible. But the supremacy of Prussia is not only possible, but an accomplished fact. With her great Northern Confederacy she will outnumber her two southern neighbours by a population of five to one. She also possesses a government of enormous vigour and activity, disencumbered by debts, and enthroned upon every wise law which modern science or experience has placed within her grasp. She, emerging from the recent conflict even fresher and more elastic than when she entered into it, while all her rivals are staggering and bleeding under her blows, alone offers to the disciples of German unity solid ground upon which they can plant their foot. Prussia, therefore, may, with an appearance of passive acquiescence, safely rely on the national spirit for the completion of the fabric she has partly reared. For she will be driven to place the roof on the edifice by the very necessities of the position. Frederic Wilhelm, like Victor Emanuel, will be able to say to remonstrating European diplomacy, if European diplomacy does remonstrate, 'You see, gentlemen, I cannot help myself. It is in vain to resist the crowd pushing me forward to eminence. I must either be trampled in the mire, or wear the imperial purple.' And to say the least of it, extraneous diplomacy is sadly at fault in keeping back its remonstrances until national pressure is irresistibly driving a man to the accomplishment of his wishes.

The idea of a national parliament as a means of extending her supremacy over the whole of the German race has long been a favourite idea with Prussia. If she has applied the instrument rather bunglingly before, it was on account of her

defective experience, her want of military ascendancy, and the violent struggles of the extreme radical party to wrest it to their own purposes, who thought that unity meant something more than the aggrandizement of the House of Hohenzollern; just as in the case of the Mazzinists in Italy, who thought that unity meant something more than the mere aggrandizement of the House of Savoy. When the fall of Louis Philippe in '48 shook Germany to the centre, Prussia at once appealed to the public of the different states to replace the old Diet by a national assembly.* Germany must have one executive, one federal flag, one 'commander-in-chief,' and a national fleet to make its name respected on the ocean. Prussia got the parliament, but did not get what she wanted through the parliament. The assembly went beyond her. In fact, it was the case of the engineer hoisted by his own petard. The presidentship of its sittings was conferred on a radical scion of the House of Austria, its constitution was modelled after the fashion of a republic, the equivocal dignity of being its chief minister was made elective, and then its support was offered to Prussia only on condition of her adapting her institutions thereto.

In repudiating these insidious overtures, and with them the authority of the Frankfort parliament, the Prussian King, in place of the old Diet, drew out a constitution for Germany which attached the dignity of the president of the empire irrevocably to the Crown of Prussia, and confined the power of initiating measures to a council in which his own creatures predominated. When this scheme failed for want of support, Prussia, still relying on her scheme of a national parliament, convened a meeting of deputies from all the states of Germany, to be held at Erfurt. But this summons being ignored by the larger states, Prussia failed to get together an assembly which had the slightest pretension to speak in the name of Germany. In 1848 she had the lever, but wanted the fulcrum. At Erfurt she wanted both lever and fulcrum, yet with the pertinacity of a man who has a tolerably clear idea of the instrument wanted for his purposes, Prussia did not abandon her idea of a national assembly, but on the next occasion of difference between her and the Diet, in reference to the Elbe Duchies, she audaciously appealed from its judgment, to a German parliament, in defence of a buccaneer act of state butchery and spoliation. By a dextrous manipulation

* 'Above all, we demand that Germany shall be transformed from a confederation of States into one Federal State. We acknowledge that in order to effect this, a temporary federal representation must be formed out of the Chambers of all Germanic States.'—*Royal Proclamation of Prussia March 18th, 1848.*

of events, she obtained the fulcrum of military ascendancy before the lever, reversing her old course of proceeding; and she is now waiting only for the lever to be placed in her hands. This time she occupies a position in which she never was before, which will enable her to use that lever for the extension of the Prussian flag from the banks of the Eider to the shores of the Adriatic.

As far as the Southern States are concerned the problem is in its last stage of solution; they are already *in articulo mortis*. Prussia has only to hold out her hand to pluck any fruit from the bunch she pleases, or to bag them altogether. When these are mediatized or annexed, the question will be with Austria, and with Austria alone. Even now, that State is thoroughly incompetent to prevent its German subjects from sending representatives to Berlin, and becoming the means of introducing Prussian laws and customs into one-fourth of its own dominions. If Prussia foregoes her claims to such deputies at present, it will be because she is anxious to build up the edifice of German unity by degrees, and to allow the structure to be completed by the spontaneous course of events rather than by her active intervention. But when she directs the government of thirty-three millions of German people, it would even be beyond her power, if she willed it, to prevent the fusion with the great mass, of the out-lying fraction of her countrymen. The force of the law of political gravitation would be so strong that no artificial power could resist it. But with Prussian scheming to bring it about, the fusion is pretty certain to occur precisely in the manner she wishes it, first by a federal tie, and afterwards by complete amalgamation. The Schleswig-Holstein interlude will be played over again, only upon a larger scale, with one of the oppressors in the former contest as the victim. Austria will be first told that no part of the empire can be united into a single State with countries not German; that a purely personal union connects her German provinces with Vienna, and that their real government must be at Berlin. This, in fact, is the real meaning of that clause in the treaty of Nikolsburg, which excludes Austria from all future concern with the government of the Germanic Empire. By signing that treaty Austria, in reality has abdicated her sway over her German subjects, and made a free gift of the imperial crown and mantle, with all the territory appertaining thereto, to her great rival. She has laid herself open to the stroke which will pinion her German provinces to Prussia, and reduce her to a purely Slavonic power. Such stroke will be given with far more semblance of reason and propriety than that by which she severed the Elbe duchies from Denmark.

For as the acknowledged chief of the German people, Prussia will have a natural right to govern them upon whatever territory they exist. And since by the new code of international politics, the subjects of a kingdom have become the arbiters of their own destinies, Prussia will have little difficulty in convincing the world that in aggrandizing herself with their assent she is only accomplishing the sacred behests of Providence.

That these gigantic results in the very heart of Europe are being accomplished, that the colossal dream of Prussian ambition is being realised, without exciting further passion in surrounding States than if the princes of Germany were engaged in a game of quoits, is a fact of a momentous character. Upon former occasions the slightest concussion of arms on the Danube or the Rhine was the signal for a general appeal to the sword throughout Europe. The slightest crack in the structure of the German Empire generally brought the edifice to the ground, and where so many fragments were lying in a dislocated state, everybody thought he had something to gain by appearing in the *melée*. No sooner did warriors of Saxony measure swords with Tilly and Wallenstein, than France, Sweden, Spain and Savoy rushed to the encounter, thinking, in the same spirit which conducts plunderers to a wreck, that, where so much booty was floating about, a very handsome thing might be made out of the transaction. It was precisely the same spirit of cupidity, when Daun and the great Frederick were pitted against each other, which led the Emperor Paul and Louis XIV. to take part, and ultimately to change sides in the quarrel. In fact, when a musket was fired on the Rhine, the quarrel, like a Celtic row, went on multiplying itself until the whole of the New as well as the Old World was involved in the struggle. We, allured into the Sicilian wars by some miserable hope of annexing Bremen and Verden to our Hanoverian dominions, found France engaged on the opposite side, whom we persisted in fighting, upon the principle of seconds in an Irish duel, long after the principals in the combat had made up their dispute. But the interests for which Daun, or Maurice, or the great Frederick fought, though they set the world by the ears, were small in comparison with the tremendous stakes for which Prussia is playing, with the eyes of European ministers fixed upon her as indifferent spectators of the event. Why has a spark in previous instances excited a general conflagration, while in the present instance a flame of most portentous character can excite no conflagration at all?

The difference, doubtless, may partly receive some explanation from the new sphere which modern commerce has opened

for the energies of governments; but the main solution of it must be sought in the advanced education of the people, and in the enlarged influence which public opinion consequently exercises through a Briarean-handed press, as well as through representative institutions, upon the main-spring of politics. The Greek destinies are not so great a myth as they may at first sight appear. There are certain inexorable laws in the moral as well as in the physical world, with which even crowned heads have at length thought it bootless to interfere, having after much profitless experience, gained a clear perception, that those laws only acquire greater force from the effort of resistance. One of these laws is, that people of the same race have the greatest affinity for each other; that it is totally impossible to keep such people asunder by factitious barriers under conflicting governments, which treat one section like Medean slaves and another like enlightened freemen. Another is that there is abundant progression in races either to decrepitude or vigorous adolescence, and that when these tendencies have resolutely set in, not all the bayonets in the world can resist the healthy growth of the one, or prop up the tottering steps of the other. The consequence of the public recognition of these principles is, that it is thought by both rulers and the ruled to be the wisest policy, to leave foreign nations to settle their own disputes among themselves, and to adopt whatever institutions are congenial to their tastes, provided these do not become a nuisance to their neighbours. These views have, in the present instance, been very much favoured by the peculiar situation of the great Powers. Spain weakened; Britain pacific; Russia too glad to have a strong barrier against France, in Prussia, and a weak barrier, in Austria against her own aggressions in the East, to support the ascendancy of that power in Germany; Italy, which formerly fomented German quarrels, by entangling them with some dozen quarrels of her own, only interfering in the dispute to secure Venice as a keystone to the edifice of her own country,—all these things gave uncontrolled action to the new principles of international policy which the favouring elements of society have thrown on the world. France alone, at the threshold of the dispute, with her hand on her sword, spoke about the necessity of a rectification of frontiers in the event of an aggrandized Prussia. But the French emperor, isolated, felt too weak to struggle alone with the law of inevitable necessity. He therefore wisely refrained from sending his French legions, in the face of enlightened public opinion, to prevent forty millions of Germans from accomplishing their own destiny. Outwitted by Cavour in Italy, and foiled by Bismarck in Germany, he has, by the moral

forces which these ministers have arrayed against him, been rendered incompetent to prevent the countrymen of either from rallying round the only government fit to give them liberty upon a constitutional basis.

The position of France with reference to Germany, in this struggle, is complicated by the interests of the Napoleonic dynasty, which, in the eyes of a belligerent nation, must doubtless have been weakened by the sacrifice of its military ascendancy, as well as by witnessing a great nation constitute itself upon its borders, and the note of hand which the minister of that nation paid as the price of French neutrality, return dishonoured to the Tuileries. To have opposed, however, the fulfilment of the obligation by an appeal to arms would have been to sacrifice the lives of thousands of men for a spot where forty cannot feed. For, of the coveted districts, those of Sarre Louis and Philippeville, were alone in Prussia's and Bavaria's power to yield. The two other towns, Landau and Luxembourg, which would have been required to restore to France the frontier she possessed in '89, were in the territories of Belgium and Holland. Where then was the use of expending upon a bootless expedition five times more than the wretched objects of it were worth? If Napoleon must have unsheathed the sword at all, it could only have been to maintain the *status quo* until something tangible could be clutched for his neutrality, or to have struck for the left bank of the Rhine. The adoption of the latter course would have arrayed against him the jealousy of most, and the armed hostility of some, of the European powers, in addition to the whole Germanic population, to a man. Could Austria have afforded to aid him in the struggle which would have risen, she would have been obliged to draft her regiments from her Slavonic frontiers. There can hardly be a doubt that the issue of such a struggle would have proved disastrous to France, besides aiding Prussia to realise with greater promptitude that scheme of genuine imperialism which she is now accomplishing by gradual annexations. The only question, then, is, whether it would have been more conducive to the interests of France to maintain the *status quo*, rather than to have remained with folded arms a passive spectator of the establishment of a great empire on its frontiers which must place limits to its power.

The maintenance of the old state of things in Germany could be regarded as profitable to France, only upon the principle that a flourishing State always derives *prestige* from the weakness—as a wealthy individual from the poverty of his neighbours. It proceeds upon the assumption that there is only a certain amount

of political power and riches in the world, and that where new claimants for these objects come into being, they can have their demands satisfied only by detracting from the stores enjoyed by the present possessors. But surely there is a great fallacy underlying this reasoning, which supposes there is a limit to political power and industrial wealth, and that such limit has been already attained. If a people acquire fresh strength by centralising their energies, developing their resources, and opening out new fields of industry, the advantages thus acquired, instead of being a detriment, must prove eminently beneficial to their neighbours, by increasing the value of their exchanges, and by stimulating them to move more quickly along the path of political eminence. The accession of power thus acquired by a new State, instead of detracting from the *prestige* of its maturer neighbours, only enables them, by invigorating their energies, to maintain the same *prestige* from a higher platform of excellence. In this respect, the modern family of nations, interlaced as they are in a reciprocal network of interests, flourish to some extent simultaneously, like the branches of a tree : a weak member cannot have fresh vitality infused into it without increasing to a proportionate extent the strength of the whole. But this proportionate accretion of strength refers only to the sound elements in a state, and by no means implies an increase in its standing armies, which are often a direct cause of its weakness.

The new organization of Italy and Germany confronts France with military levies, even superior to its own ; but this limit to its fighting power is the very thing wanted to eradicate from the French mind the mediæval notion that the greatness of a nation must depend upon its power of bullying its neighbours. The old cabinets of France appear to have acted upon the assumption that their country had no internal resources ; that its treasury could be enriched only by foreign plunder, for which purpose it was always of momentous importance to keep its military supremacy, that it might be ready with numerous forces to pounce upon any country whose internal dissensions afforded it an easy opportunity of conquest. And these false ideas of increasing the greatness of their country by a menacing attitude have, unfortunately, become too deeply rooted in the minds of the present generation, from the military achievements of Napoleon. But what has all this stirring of armies, this movement of muskets done for France ? What advantage has she derived from her frequent invasions of Holland, her periodic raids into Italy, and her numerous aggressions on the Rhine ? The tide of conquest has only advanced one

one day to be rolled back the next, until she has come, in this present year of grace, to have pretty nearly the same frontier that she had before she was haunted with the mad idea of dominating over Europe. With the exception of the deadly swamp of Algeria, we know of nothing that France has conquered, beyond her own territories, which she has been able to retain. Even the prize of her last military achievement, Mexico, is about to follow in the wake of all the others which have slipped from her grasp. What human force could do to interfere with the general law of national developement, France has effected; but that general law has baffled all her efforts, which, as if directed against the rock of inexorable destiny, have only recoiled on herself. Even when her military strength was directed by the genius of Napoleon, the empire he constructed was but for a day. The fates again rose up, and persisted in confining France within her old limits. But now, when his nephew is restored to the throne, for the purpose of resuscitating that empire, he is driven by the course of events, even in the zenith of his power, to become an agent in raising up barriers against the encroachments of his country, stronger than those which his uncle's enemies constructed when France lay bleeding at their feet.

If France, therefore, has gained nothing by her military ascendancy, we do not see that she has anything to lose by forfeiting it. But in no other point of view can the recent changes in Italy and Germany cause any diminution of her powers; while the fresh accessions of wealth which must accrue to these nations from their improved organizations must overflow their boundaries, and pour a new stream of riches into the treasuries of France. There will also be the advantages resulting from mutual rivalries between the three nations, not in the battle-field, but in the fruitful paths of commerce and the arts; where the exchanges will not be in the shape of mutual wounds but of reciprocal profit, and where if any ascendancy be acquired it can be based only upon the general prosperity. There can then be little doubt that the real interests of France will be benefited by the change. For the series of advantages attending the new is still further enhanced by the series of disadvantages attending the old state of things. What France will gain from a united Italy, and a united Germany, may be counted in increased argosies, in overflowing exchequers, in the augmented refinement of her cities, and in the multiplied comforts of her population. But what she has lost from a fractionized Italy and Germany can be computed only by years of energy misapplied in fruitless struggles for their dislocated territories, by hecatombs of subjects slaughtered to

no purpose, by millions of treasures wasted in equipping armies, either to gain fruitless victories or to be beaten back to their homes.

Whatever disasters France may have to suffer, in the opinion of her Orleanist statesmen, from a united Italy and a united Germany, these can hardly be worse than the wounds she has been led to inflict unwittingly on herself in the fatal enterprises in which the dismembered state of these countries has led her to embark. With the forces of Italy and Germany lying in compact masses upon her frontiers, such enterprises would have been impossible in the past. There is, then, so much gain for France, in being secured against such mad expeditions in future. But there is likewise gain of a very positive character, even so far as herself is concerned; for when an unquiet nation, like France, cannot employ its energies in an evil direction, it is forced by the very restlessness of its nature upon good paths. The mere fact that Italy and Germany possess political organisations as strong and vitalised as her own, is the best gauge which Europe can receive that France will abandon her besetting sin of military glory, and employ her energies, not in constructing magazines and in butchery, and in making periodical forays in quest of plunder among her defenceless neighbours, but upon the peaceful arts, which she is as well qualified to cultivate for the improvement of mankind as she is the warlike, for their destruction.

For ourselves, who have no interests on the continent but those that are in unison with the progress of humanity, we cannot but be satisfied at the results which have been so far realised, notwithstanding our disgust at the chicanery and the coolness employed in bringing them about. With France accepting her Prussian rebuff with patience; eating her leek in humiliation, while the Emperor lectures her upon the advantages of the position as the very state of things which his uncle desired to bring about; with a united Italy; with Austria excluded from Germany; with a population of 29,000,000 directly or indirectly brought under the government of Prussia, and a prospective addition of some 22,000,000 more as a certain result, all these are an index that European State organisations are developing themselves after natural laws of brotherhood and fraternity, that must redound to the general weal. If it were only for the settlement of the Austro-Italian quarrel, there would be much cause for gratulation. But in addition to this, there is the sacrifice of French ascendancy upon the continent, the cooping up of that effervescing people within their own boundaries by barriers far stronger than those erected at Vienna, because they are natural and not factitious; there is the promise of a compact German state, which will give Europe as

little cause of uneasiness in its external relations, or as little cause for interference in its internal affairs, as Great Britain has done for the last 100 years, or is likely to do for 100 years to come. Now, there is no nation on the continent to whom we would accede more readily the government of such a state than Prussia, because there is no other which has displayed more aptitude for directing the energies of large masses of people to useful ends; more skill in reconciling the greatest liberty of individual action with the loftiest requirements which can be exacted from its subjects by a state; more generosity in sharing with those subjects the sacrifices demanded, or supporting the burdens which are imposed for the good of the community. The welfare of the state is so identified with that of the subject, that a man cannot perform the duties he owes to the Government without advancing his own interests, just as he cannot discharge the duties he owes to himself without advancing those of the common weal. We have no fears at beholding Prussia take her place in the vanguard of political power, because she is already in the vanguard of civilization. She is the only country which has obtained empire without contracting debt, or which can maintain the ascendancy of a great military nation at the expenditure of a small one, because she has solved the problem of the maximum of political strength with the minimum of standing armies. Even the men whom she has under arms, she makes the best behaved portion of the community, by turning them into the most industrial. Looking at these results, we are half inclined to endure the infamy with which Prussia has covered herself in rising to her present pitch of greatness. We welcome the advent of Prussia to the front rank, not with unmitigated pæans of gladness, but just as we would welcome the advent of a man who has achieved greatness by means which, if generally followed, would be highly prejudicial to society, but who is content to spend what he has plundered from individuals upon advancing their corporate prosperity.

For it cannot be overlooked, whatever advantages Prussia has bestowed or may be destined to bestow upon Europe, that the example she has more recently set of the wanton infringement of the law of nations, her utter scorn of treaties when they stood in the way of her selfish purposes, her masking of private cupidity under the cloak of patriotic ends, has introduced further lawlessness of action into international statecraft, and inclined each kingdom to its own selfish ends, irrespective of its past engagements or its present obligations.

Russia, seeing that no regard is paid to treaties, that each nation is allowed to follow whatever course is conducive to its

interest, has openly avowed that it also feels itself, in the promotion of its own designs, as unshackled as its neighbour. Now this silence, with the guns of Candia booming in our ears, is a harbinger of future mischief, not less to be attributed to the success of Prussian spoliation, than to our indifference as to whatever State should turn up the trump card on the Continent. We have openly avowed, or at least the present ministry have done so for us, that we have no concern with the political transformations on the European Continent, but that quite secure in our rock-built isle, we are alone concerned with the guardianship of our Indo-Colonial dependencies. This appears to us only a general invitation to any European State which harbours mischief, to carry its plans into effect without the slightest prospect of armed intervention on our part, even where we are bound to interfere, not merely by moral obligations, but by the solemn stipulations of treaties. Now, though the English nation may permit evil to be done, when certain good is to result from it, we cannot think it desirable to permit evil to be done where our interests are concerned, when greater mischief is certain to result from it. To act up to the full extent of the doctrine of non-intervention would be as effectually to shut ourselves out from European, as Austria has excluded herself from German confederacies; for our presence therein would not be of the slightest account, if it be trumpeted forth that there is no possible readjustment of European territory, no matter by what means brought about, which would warrant us in unsheathing the sword. But even apart from our special interests, we have an interest, in company with all well-meaning States, in the general preservation of peace, and in punishing any maurauder who endeavours to interrupt the general harmony for the gratification of his own rapacious purposes. Instead, therefore, of abandoning the field of European politics at this turning-point in a new era of diplomacy, it behoves us to enter into those alliances which will enable us to resist lawless aggression, to build up an equitable system of federative law in Europe, and to assist the development of nationalities upon the basis of representative institutions. We have long since made the advancement of our material interests one of the vital constituents of modern progress. France is also rapidly acquiring the conviction that she can have no prosperity apart from the European common weal. Unity of ends ought to inspire mutual confidence and support. If the newly-constructed nationalities will act in unison with two such powerful nations, a confederacy of European States would no longer be a chimera, but a reality, which would render war only a remote possibility, and disencumber modern communities of those vast armaments which are a disgrace to their civilization.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

www.libtock.com.cn

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TRAVELS.

The Oberland and its Glaciers; Explored and Illustrated with Ice-Axe and Camera. By H. B. GEORGE, M.A., F.R.G.S., Editor of the 'Alpine Journal.' With Seventy-eight Photographic Illustrations, by ERNEST EDWARDS, D.A.; and a Map of the Oberland. London: Alfred W. Bennett.

It is a primary article of faith with the Alpine Club, that mountains were made to be climbed, and that it would be almost a reflection upon Providence to suppose that any mountain had been created without a path to its summit, a faith which has been wonderfully strengthened since the ascent of the Matterhorn. This granite obelisk successfully scaled, what peak can call itself invincible?

All the great monarchs of the ice world, Mont Blanc, Monte Rosa, the Matterhorn, the Jung Frau, are now vanquished, and the detailed exploration of their respective territories is all that is left to the enterprise of Alpine heroes; and assuredly they will not rest so long as a snow fortress holds out against them, or an ice cave remains unknown. Judging from the progress of the last quarter of a century, long before our coal fields are exhausted, every district of the Alps will be as familiar and commonplace as Snowdonia. A new Alp will be as rare as an old Dodo; even the Dolomites will have become household words; the salt of the Alpine Club will have lost its savour, and one shudders to think of the ambitious Alpine adventurer, moodily eating his own heart, and weeping at the London Bridge Station because there are no worlds left for him to conquer. Happily, there are the Himalayas and the Andes, which may then be relatively as accessible as Switzerland was half a century ago, and Chimborazo and Dhawalagiri will be to us what Mont Blanc and Monte Rosa are now.

Mr. George selected the Bernese Oberland for his campaign in 1865; a district yielding to none in Switzerland in sublimity, and perhaps, surpassing all others in beauty; and despising the mystery and pretence of great achievement, he organised a party of eight or ten persons,—some of them ladies,—half pic-nic, half scientific. They assailed the country with appliances, which achieved for them what the needle-gun achieved for the Prussians. Christian Aylmer was guide, photographic apparatus was provided, and the camera was successfully carried wherever they went. Grindelwald was made head quarters; the Jung Frau was ascended, also the Esmeer, the Lauteraar Joch, the Eschner See, the Bell Alp, and the Nest Horn,—the latter, a virgin peak, perhaps the last in the Oberland of any importance,—and the territories which they ruled were explored. The Oberland, therefore, is now used up as far as Alpine adventurers are concerned, and will soon have to be left to Cockneys. The Lauteraar Joch will soon have as many visitors as the Mer de Glace.

In the scientific portion of his work, Mr. George gives in his adhesion to Professor Tyndall, and in a pleasant, popular way, reproduces his theories of glacier formation and laws. He skilfully blends scientific information with personal incidents. His book, therefore, is addressed

to a large circle of readers, whom it will both interest and instruct. The photographic illustrations are not large, but they are very artistic and beautiful. They are illustrative rather than scenic, and enable untravelled readers to realise in a very vivid way the characteristics and marvels of the ice world. Often, only a little bit is selected, but it exhibits as nothing else could exhibit, what ice needles, ice falls, moraines, and moulins are. It is difficult to say whether the text is intended to be illustrative of the photographs, or the photographs of the text. The text is sufficiently vigorous, informing, and picturesque to justify itself. The photographs are sufficiently artistic and novel to form a most interesting Swiss album. The volume is a very attractive one; it will greatly delight those, to whom the Oberland is familiar, while it will read like a fairy tale of ice palaces to those who are not. It is thoroughly scientific; but it is science popularized; it will, therefore, be equally welcome in the study and the drawing-room. In publishing it just before the summer time, Mr. Bennett provides an admirable Christmas book, for those who seek Christmas scenes and sensations in August.

The Life and Death of Jeanne D'Arc, called The Maid. By HARRIET PARR, Author of 'In the Silver Age.' 2 vols. London: Smith & Elder.

There are problems connected with Jeanne D'Arc's character, achievements and martyrdom, which it is, perhaps, impossible now to solve. What was the inspiration under which she acted? What the secret of her marvellous success? Who were chiefly guilty in her death? These are questions of which only a partial solution is possible; and, in our conclusions concerning them, we must necessarily be greatly influenced by the sympathies of her biographer, and the colouring given to her narrative. The careful collection, in five volumes, of all known authentic documents connected with her history, by *La Société l'Histoire de France*, has greatly facilitated the task of her biographer; and Miss Parr has been fortunate enough to be the first English writer to bring their results before English readers. This she has done with great conscientiousness and skill. Resolutely excluding all secondary representations, she has sought to delineate Jeanne in the simple light of these important state papers. The result is a portraiture singularly beautiful and heroic—and in one sense original. The Jeanne of Miss Parr's volumes is neither the prejudiced conception of Shakspeare, the imaginative creation of Schiller, nor the statuesque goddess of Southey; least of all is she the vile courtesan of Voltaire,—the unclean credulity which accepted La Pucelle as even an approximation to the truth, being but the reflection of an immoral age, and an expression of its inability to believe in what was nobler than itself.

Miss Parr has, we think, for the first time, at any rate to English readers, embodied the simple humanity, the goodness, unselfishness, and heroism of Jeanne's remarkable character; her own womanly instincts have interpreted for her the purity and perfect womanliness of her heroine. Simply and gracefully written, her volumes have all the seriousness of history, all the interest of romance, and all the charm of a work of successful literary art.

Whatever the secret of Jeanne's inspiration, every record, and every impression concerning her, attests the most perfect sincerity, goodness, and nobleness. Always, and in everything a woman, she was yet a woman of heroic mould; she was endowed with considerable physical

beauty, agility, and strength, with intellectual abilities of a very high order, clear and decisive judgment, single and indomitable purpose, remarkable eloquence, and a voice singularly rich and beautiful. Indications of these are seen throughout her history,—in her clear penetration of character, her almost instinctive perception of the thing to be done, her great power of reticence, and her determined perseverance when she was opposed,—first by her relatives at Domeroy, next by the counsellors of the king, and by the generals of the army. Whatever her inspiration it was purely her own; for a long time no one believed in it, and to the last it was made use of rather than credited. So far from being an instrument employed by the Armagnac party, her constant complaint was of opposition. At her trial she expressly affirmed that she alone was responsible for what she had done, and only a few moments before her death, she exonerated Charles by declaring that it was not he who had counselled her.

In a character of the 15th century, her hallucination is not so difficult to understand; her heated imagination no doubt interpreted as Divine intimations many things that to another temperament, or in a subsequent age, would have had no significance. She followed her 'voices' with simple implicitness—not as a policy but as a faith. Her enemies did not question her inspiration, only they attributed it to witchcraft. What but a malign power could oppose *them*! With the mass of her countrymen she obtained a ready credence; and her convictions tended to justify themselves.

Her work was simple, patriotic and noble; sublimely indifferent to personal interests, she was intent only on the deliverance of her country from the English. 'The only peace for them is that they begone into their own country.' Her efforts to reunite the alienated Burgundians and the king, were untiring and very noble. She urged the latter to the freest and most generous forgiveness.

The noblest men in the French army—those who became the great commanders of their age—and the most virtuous women, were her firmest friends; she won respect and love in every household—from matrons and little children alike. Her achievements prove that success in war depends upon much more than needle-guns. The English were the finest archers in the world; no soldiers could struggle more bravely, and yet they could not resist the enthusiasm which Jeanne inspired.

Her trial and death are one of the most disgraceful chapters in history. The chief guilt rests, not with the English, whose culpability consisted mainly in delivering her over to the ecclesiastical tribunals, but with her own countrymen—with the University of Paris, who instigated it—with the oily, treacherous, and unscrupulous Bishop of Beauvais, who conducted it, who denied her all legal assistance, with diabolical ingenuity sought to entangle her in the casuistry of forty or fifty ecclesiastical assessors, plotted to destroy her by a perversion of the forms of law, and brutally denied to her the consolation of praying before a church on her way to the court; and above all, with her dastardly and ungrateful sovereign and the Armagnac party, who heartlessly abandoned her to her enemies, and who did not move a finger or utter a word on her behalf; the indolent poltroonery of Charles, always her greatest obstacle, had here its crowning shame. Neither Charles nor France was worthy of the heroine, whose exploits crowned the one and delivered the other.

Mission Life in the Islands of the Pacific, being a Narrative of the Life and Labours of Rev. A. Buzacott, Missionary of Rarotonga. Edited by Rev. J. P. SUNDERLAND, and Rev. A. BUZACOTT, B.A. With Preface by Rev. HENRY ALLON. London : John Snow & Co.

In spite of the detraction which certain High Church dignitaries are pleased to lavish on Puritan Missions, few things in the History of Christianity are more wonderful than the work which they have effected in the Islands of the Pacific. Transformations, more magical than are found in the fables of Eastern romance have been effected by agencies that to the limited wisdom of some critics, and of all worldly men, seem entirely inadequate to the result. Mr. Buzacott was the honoured coadjutor of John Williams, shared in his work, lightened his toil, contributed to his success, and carried on his enterprise. He was abundantly fitted by God's providence to undertake the varied toil of the South Sea Mission. Nothing came amiss to him: he could fashion tools and use them; build ships and launch them; superintend the architecture of houses, churches, and colleges; and then direct the social, religious, and literary work to be done in them. He could catch the fleeting vocables of savages, and create his grammar and lexicon out of them: he could first translate, and then print, the Holy Scriptures in the dialect of Rarotonga; and, by his extended journeys, his admirable power of organisation, and his simple, earnest, holy, consecrated life, he could commend his great work to the sympathies of the Christian Church. The volume before us is interesting and fresh in its presentations. The pictures of savage life, of Pacific hurricanes, of missionary enterprises, of Divine transformations, is modestly and beautifully told; the narrative consisting to a large extent of extracts from Mr. Buzacott's Diary. A right noble and useful life is chronicled here, and the chronicle has the rare merit of condensation and brevity; while none can rise from perusing the details of the work done, without a sense of the awful grandeur of the operations of the Holy Ghost, when struggling under such conditions with the unrelieved corruption of our common humanity.

Venetian Life. By WM. D. HOWELLS. London: Trübner & Co.

Mr. Howells is an intelligent and vivacious American, who resided three years in Venice as consul, and who is, therefore, fully qualified to write concerning it. He has written a clever, sensible, and amusing book, free from all offences against good English and good taste, free also from all affectations of either sentiment or anti-sentiment. The spell of Venice is upon him; but it finds expression in a healthy, sensible way. It is not the glamour of the Venice of romance and poetry, nor is it the dark intrigue and tragedy of the Venice of Darú. To Mr. Howells, Venice is a city unique in its picturesqueness, rich in its art treasures, and interesting in its historical association, otherwise a city of ordinary men and women, exhibiting an average variety of human character, and witnessing an average diversity of human passion. Venice is very dear to its own citizens; a tolerable proof that its government and social life—conditions of foreign oppression like that of Austria excepted—are as tolerable as in other places. We need not say that Mr. Howells does not see in the Cybele of the Adriatic, the Venice of Byron and Rogers—an anachronism in history, a solecism in life. He has no romantic

sentiment for that 'pathetic swindle' the Bridge of Sighs, which is associated with neither patriot nor hero, with the mysterious despotism of the Three, nor with anything notable in the history of the Republic. Like the passage from the prison at Newgate to the Old Bailey, it is consecrated only to rogues and murderers. Nor is the Rialto, which now spans the Great Canal, in any way connected with the merchant life of the old commercial emporium; nor is the statue which, according to Byron, Faliero addresses as one of his ancestors so old as Faliero himself by a century and a half. Byron has much to answer for in the false Venetian history and sentiment to which he has given existence.

Mr. Howells does not wholly escape the fatal tendency of his countrymen to pronounce verdicts on works of art, we suppose on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle; but, happily, he does not inflict upon us very much in this way. Until Americans are as much imbued with it, they had better leave art to the 'Roba di Roma' of Mr. Story, and the 'Transformations' of Mr. Hawthorne.

Mr. Howells more wisely turns to the social life of Venice as it is. He tells us about the theatres, dinners, housekeeping, social life, love-making, holidays, the lagoons, the nationalities, and memorable places of Venice; and concerning these, he writes with an intelligent appreciation, thorough good sense, and cleverness of good-humoured touch, which leave nothing to be desired. His volume is a collection of sketches, making no pretence to handbook completeness, or to historical dignity; but it is as bright and pleasant and instructive a book as one need wish to read.

Cosas de España, Illustrative of Spain and Spaniards as they are.
By Mrs. WM. PITT BYRNE. 2 vols. London: Strahan.

Mrs. Byrne has taken very great pains with her book, and has strung upon her thread of travel a good deal of information, especially in her preface; but the sense of every excellency is overpowered by manifold defects. Her inherent prosiness, for instance, is only intensified by her strenuous efforts to be brilliant. She is ingenious in making vile puns, and industrious in scraping together polyglott quotations, which are not very accurately given, and which are an irresistible suggestion of 'scraps' stolen from some 'feast of languages.' There is a tawdry incongruity about them, like the holiday dress of a fast negro. For plain, honest, sensible dulness we have much forbearance, none for dulness trying to be lively in a very deadly way. Mrs. Byrne gives us a topographical list instead of a landscape, a passport description instead of a portrait. Much as she says about Biarritz, San Sebastian, and the Escorial, she gives us no impression of the places, partly through lack of observing, partly through lack of recording power. The chief information that she does give, is that which is reproduced from the observations of others. We have read on and on, hoping to find some relief to the dull platitudes, the vague descriptiveness, the weary small talk, the inconsequential adventures, and the tiresome repetitions of her book, but encountered nothing but bad puns and wild quotations. Our first shock, was the declaration that she was not speaking *ironically* when speaking of iron in its relation to railways; not contented with this, she tells us two or three times that this is an *iron* age. Our next was to read about Biarritz, a luminous description like this: 'There is a factitious watering-place aspect about the spot, reminding one perhaps chiefly of Spezzia, but *more still* of the Spas of Germany (which?), and sometimes even of

'Folkestone and Tunbridge Wells.' We wonder she did not add also of Macedon and Monmouth. And as the third stroke is generally fatal, we fairly gave in, when we found the programme of a bull-fight called a *bull-etin*; we, therefore, gladly hand over her pretentious and ponderous volumes to such sympathisers among our readers, as Mrs. Byrne describes, when she says they 'dip the tips of their hose into the 'cerulean ink-bottle.' Her preface is comparatively free from affectation, and justifies us in entreating her in the additional volume which she promises, to apply her commendable industry to the useful collection of facts, rather than to the wanton collection of quotations.

Vignettes. Twelve Biographical Sketches. By BESSIE RAYNER PARKES. London: Alexander Strahan.

This is a very charming volume, made up of biographical articles contributed to a serial publication. It will make many acquainted with persons worthy of being known, who have hitherto been names and nothing more. Three of the sketches, viz., those of Madame Luce, Madame Pape-Carpantier, and Mrs. Jameson, are strictly original. Five others, those of Madame Swetchine, La Sœur Rosalie, Harriot K. Hunt, Madame de Lamartine, and Madame Mojon, are translated and abridged from books almost entirely unknown to the English public. The remaining four—Mrs. Winthrop, Miss Cornelia Knight, Miss Bosanquet, and Mrs. Delany—are biographical reviews. The first sketch in the volume, that of Madame Swetchine, is, perhaps, the most interesting. The young wife of an elderly Russian officer, banished to France, she was full of intelligence and goodness, and speculated in her letters on many of the great religious, or rather politico-ecclesiastical, problems of the day. She died in 1857, and was intimate with most of her celebrated contemporaries, especially with De Tocqueville, with whom she had many thoughts and sympathies in common; some of her most interesting letters were addressed to him. She did not always agree with him, but she shared all his noble aspirations for liberty and worthy national life; she thought, however, that the Italians should have trusted Pio Nono, and was of opinion that the Papacy should remain permanent in a national Italy. Inferior in sagacity and force to Madame de Stael, she was a remarkable woman and thinker, and was as good as she was clever.

Miss Parkes writes gracefully and tenderly, and she skilfully delineates the characteristic features of her heroines. Her womanly heart is in sympathy with all that is womanly and pure. We cannot sympathise with all her theories of what women ought to be and do, but she has written an attractive and valuable book for girls growing into womanhood.

The Last Days in England of the Rajah Rammohun Roy. Edited by MARY CARPENTER. London: Trübner & Co.

Rammohun Roy was in some respects one of the most remarkable men of his race, in modern times. The intelligence, independence, and candour which enabled him so early to emancipate himself from the superstition of his caste, the wisdom and moderation with which he held his new opinions, the earnestness and judgment with which he sought to propagate them, his great learning and intellectual power, and the moral elevation, magnanimity, gentleness, and piety of his character were

equally extraordinary. No wonder that such a man excited in English Christians, and in English statesmen, an unusual degree of interest. There are, of course, indications of imperfections; his passionate enthusiasm, for instance, about the Reform Bill of 1831, and his exaggerated estimate of the issues involved in it, not only for England but for the world. His estimate again of the Unitarianism which he had embraced, an estimate which his Unitarian friends apparently endorsed, that, to 'these men (enlightened Hindoos) the idea of a triune-God, a man-God, and also the idea of the appearance of God in the bodily shape of a dove, or that of the blood of God shed for the payment of a debt, seem entirely heathenish and absurd, and consequently, their sincere conversion to (Trinitarian) Christianity must be morally impossible.' A sufficient refutation of which is an appeal to actual facts,—to the comparative fewness of Unitarian compared with Trinitarian conversions. Bammohun Roy, if living now, would be too candid even to insinuate that such conversions are not 'sincere.' Facts, however, are very awkward things for *doctrinaire* theorists. We regret that Miss Carpenter has not given to the world a complete biography of this remarkable man. The present volume consists chiefly of extracts from contemporary reviews, newspapers, and funeral sermons, simply strung together, and involving much tiresome repetition. Few readers, we fancy, will get through these without skipping. The chief interest of the volume is in the details of the Rajah's death.

POLITICS, SCIENCE, AND ART.

A Practical Treatise on Banking, Currency, and the Exchanges.

By ARTHUR CRUMP, Bank Manager, formerly of the Bank of England. Longmans & Co.

Results under the last Bank Charter Act of 1844. By CHAS.

M. WILlich, late Actuary University Life Assurance Society. Longmans & Co.

Mr. Crump's 'Treatise' is full of interesting facts upon all subjects connected with practical banking. The law, as it affects cheques, bills of exchange, and bills of lading, is very fully stated, and we hardly know where so much sound information and advice upon general banking matters can be found as in this comparatively small volume. The chapter on foreign exchanges contains a lucid and succinct explanation of phenomena, which, although founded upon perfectly simple and well understood principles, are to many minds very puzzling and intricate.

In what may be termed the theoretical parts of his book, Mr. Crump is not so successful as in the practical. He produces upon us the impression of a well-informed bank manager rather than of a clear thinker upon banking and currency; indeed, his style sometimes leads us to suppose that he has not made up his mind clearly on some of the subjects about which he writes. In pages 238 and 239 he gives two diametrically opposite opinions on decimal coinage, and leaves us in ignorance as to his final judgment. In the chapter on currency, he says, 'Agricultural countries progress slower in the accumulation of wealth, on account of the circulation of their currencies being more languid.' We have no idea what this means, and cannot conceive

how the mere circulation of currency can produce wealth. It is a mistake of the result for the cause. In illustration, he says that Poland is poor, and England and Holland are rich. But in the most important sense England and Holland are more agricultural than Poland, because they have a much more skilfully developed agriculture. The truth appears to be, that no country with a skilful and productive agriculture can be otherwise than wealthy. Mr. Crump attributes far too much power to the banking establishments of London, when he assumes that they can guide the course of the money market, and regulate the rate of interest. He consequently proposes to call together a banking council in London, which by its foresight and prudence, should *prevent overtrading and avert panics*. He candidly admits, however, that, 'In order to effect such an object so that it might work harmoniously in itself, and the members of such council be in a position calmly and with matured judgment to deliberate upon the course to be pursued under any circumstances, every feeling of jealousy would have to be set aside.' Now, considering that the members of the council would be rivals in business, we fear this condition requires a standard of excellence and self-abnegation which our commercial men have hardly attained. However, we have read the paragraph with pleasure, because it shows how high an opinion Mr. Crump has formed of the city men among whom he moves. The truth probably is, that the rise and fall of the rate of discount are governed by laws quite out of the control of even the most able and disinterested council of bankers. To those of our readers who wish for information and guidance on the details of banking and currency, we cordially recommend this treatise. We think its style might be greatly improved by some careful literary revision, and we fear some fallacies lie hidden in the theoretical parts of the book. These happily do not invalidate the valuable information and sound advice given by Mr. Crump when confining himself within the domain of the practical bank manager, and which, in our view, constitutes the value of his contribution to banking literature.

Mr. Willich's pamphlet is a very useful and seasonable production. Perhaps the title is not strictly accurate, because it assumes that the changes in the rate of discount, &c., recorded, are the *results* of the Bank Charter Act of 1844. Probably the framers of that act would utterly disclaim any intention directly to affect by it the rate of discount or the value of money. Their object, they would say, had relation to the security of the paper currency of the country, and has been completely attained. However, it may be fully admitted that a knowledge of the facts recorded in Mr. Willich's tables is highly desirable to any one attempting to estimate the 'Results of the Bank Charter Act of 1844.'

Letters on the Social and Political Condition of the Principality of Wales. By HENRY RICHARD. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

Within the compass of a hundred pages, Mr. Richard comprises an amount of information concerning the Principality which will not only surprise and delight even the best-informed among us, but which constitutes an argument for the power of voluntarism in religion that is simply irresistible.

Certain supercilious churchmen, unable to dispute the fact of the Non-conformity of the Principality, have set themselves to the Christian task

of vilifying it. They have accused it of a bad pre-eminence in immorality generally, and in illegitimacy in particular; and in the last session of parliament, no less a person than Mr. Gathorne Hardy had the hardihood to say, that the chapel-building enterprise of Wales was simply a building speculation. Mr. Richard had an easy task in refuting, by official and other statistics, both these accusations, and in proving the inhabitants of the Principality to be among the most moral, religious, and liberal of the empire. But few, we apprehend, are prepared for the facts which he proves, viz. ;—that, whereas two centuries ago there was scarcely a Nonconformist in Wales, the Nonconformists, now, are 80 per cent. of the population, and that, according to Mr. Horace Mann, the Nonconformists of the Principality have furnished 'all the accommodation for worship 'the population of Wales requires;' the multiplication of their congregations has been as follows :—

1742.	1775.	1816.	1861.	1866.
110.	171.	993.	2,927.	3,107.

The Nonconformists of Wales have within the last fifty years, built or rebuilt more than 3,000 chapels, at an estimated cost of nearly two millions. The aggregate amount raised by them for religious purposes is about £300,000 per annum—a sum nearly equal to all the endowments of the Establishment. They support seven colleges for the education of their ministry. They contribute to the Bible Society more than any equal population of the kingdom. They have important educational agencies, and an extensive newspaper and serial literature. And all this is done by a poor agricultural population, and in spite of the opposition, and sometimes persecution, of the landlords—most of whom are Episcopalians. These facts are a sufficient answer to the objection, that while voluntarism may do for a civic and wealthy, it can never suffice for a rural and poor population.

Mr. Richard puts his facts in a simple, terse, and telling manner. His little book is a manual which both statesmen and ecclesiastics will do well to ponder. Anomalies like the Established Churches of Ireland and Wales—to say nothing of that of England—cannot continue long in a free and enlightened age. The designation which the *Times* newspaper applies to the former, 'a gigantic confiscation,' is equally applicable to the latter.

Notes on Epidemics, for the Use of the Public. By FRANCIS EDMUND ANSTIE, M.D., F.R.C.P. London: Jackson, Walford, & Hodder.

Dr. Anstie has expanded, in a very complete and useful little manual, the article bearing the title of 'British Epidemics,' which appeared in the January number of this REVIEW. It has the great advantage, in a time of epidemic like this, of furnishing all the caution and suggestion that the general public need for the preservation of health; while it avoids those details of specific disease which only the medical man can wisely deal with. Dr. Anstie's great knowledge, good sense, and varied experience, qualify him, above most men to give advice to the public on such matters. Side by side with Miss Nightingale's 'Notes on Nursing,' and Dr. Brown's 'Five Lectures on Health,' his little manual should have a permanent place upon every cottage book-shelf. Dr. Anstie's practical suggestions are founded upon the statement of just as much scientific information as will enable an intelligent confidence and attention to them. He points

out the chief causes of the more important epidemic diseases, and the means by which they may be prevented. Were the simple principles laid down in this little work acted upon in households, and by parochial authorities, small-pox, typhus, and the cholera would disappear, as the black-plague has done, and the epidemics which do visit us would be encountered with calm and vigorous intelligence, and not as now, with alarmed ignorance and frantic expedients.

Our Postal and Revenue Establishments, considered with a View to Utilising the former for the Receipt and Payment of Revenue Moneys, &c. By a CIVIL SERVANT. Pitman : 1866.

Several successive Chancellors of the Exchequer have expressed their dissatisfaction with the present mode of collecting the taxes, and the Board of Inland Revenue have, from time to time, in their annual reports to the Treasury, strongly condemned the entire system. They have not hesitated to affirm that it is injurious to the Revenue, conducive to fraud, and attended with great annoyance and inconvenience to the public. It might naturally be expected that, after such emphatic condemnation, any Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to induce the Legislature to pass an Act to amend the evils and defects of the present system. Under ordinary circumstances this might be the case; but when we remember the power of *vested interests*, and the influence of the several parties likely to be affected by a change, we are not surprised at the obstacles that have been presented to every attempt to deal satisfactorily with this question. However urgent may be the need, upon public grounds, for an amendment of the law, it is a feat of too herculean a nature for any Government to attempt, unsustained by a strongly expressed public opinion. This was proved in 1864, when Mr. Gladstone attempted to carry a measure for the improved collection of the taxes. Little public interest was awakened, and hardly any sympathy shown with his earnest effort to mitigate some of the evils of the present system. On the 9th of February last he spoke thus:—
'In my opinion the present system is most defective, and I really wish that gentlemen would be disposed, if they could find time, to examine this subject for themselves, because, though not likely to become one of party or political importance, it is one which greatly affects a number of local communities as well as individuals, and I think there will soon be a general desire to change the present system.'

The book now before us is a valuable contribution towards such a consideration of the subject. It discusses the entire question in a fearless and comprehensive manner, and seems to demonstrate the feasibility of most material and advantageous changes. The scheme suggested by the author is an entire amalgamation of the Customs, Inland Revenue, and Postal Services in one great office, with responsible heads to each department. This office would have its branches in all parts of the country, managed in connection with our present Postal arrangements. Both economy and general public convenience would be largely promoted by the proposed scheme. The possibility of such combination is established by the author upon evidence beyond exception. For the purpose of proving his various positions, he systematically refers to the evidence taken before a Committee of the House of Commons in 1862 and 1863; and to enable his readers to verify his references, he has reprinted in the Appendix all the more important portions of that evidence, the official document itself being now out of

print. As an illustration of the practicability of at least some of the suggestions contained in the book, it may be stated that already, within a few weeks of the publication of the work, one of the changes urged in it has actually been effected. Several of the chief officials had positively affirmed the impracticability of constituting the revenue collectors generally, stamp distributors also. This has, however, at last been accomplished, and has been officially acknowledged to be advantageous both to the public and the revenue. This fact alone justifies us in claiming for the author an attentive hearing. We believe that the present costly system of distinct establishments, each with its multifarious ramifications, extended all over the country, is little understood by the general public. The whole subject urgently needs investigation, and we trust that the publication of this work will help to draw increased attention to it. We earnestly recommend its careful perusal.

POETRY, FICTION, AND BELLES LETTRES.

The Vision of Hell. By DANTE ALIGHIERI. Translated by H. F. Cary. Illustrated with the designs of M. Gustave Doré. New Edition. London: Cassell, Petter & Co.

M. Doré's fame as an illustrator of the principal classics in European literature, has rapidly culminated. In popular, and perhaps in artistic, estimation, he has, just now, scarcely a second. He shrinks from no undertaking, however, daring and however colossal. He boldly submits his artistic imagination to comparison with the creations of a Shakspeare, Milton, Dante, and even the old Hebrew historians and prophets. He pours out his illustrations, moreover, with a fertility and rapidity that, despite the proverbial affluence of genius, is inevitably productive of a large percentage of failures. Great genius, however, M. Doré unquestionably possesses; but of a lurid, fantastic, and sensational kind. Its instinct generally guides him to themes eminently congruous. Perhaps his *chef d'œuvre* as yet, his more ambitious attempts notwithstanding, is 'The Wandering Jew.' In the 'Inferno' of Dante, however, he has found a congenial subject, but with this drawback, that it is a perpetual temptation to the exaggeration of a tendency which needs restraint, rather than impulse. The apocalyptic character of Dante's great poem is to M. Doré's sobriety what the 'Destruction of Jerusalem,' or the 'Last Judgment,' was to Martin's, and it must be confessed that M. Doré has often fallen before the temptation. Grandly imaginative, and suggestive as some of these illustrations are, the series, as a whole, is too uniformly lurid and sensational to be pleasing. It is as if the whole of the Turner Gallery were in his latest style of misty or grotesque grandeur.

It would be difficult to suggest a more remarkable contrast in art than between the Dante illustrations of Flaxman, and those of Doré; the one cold as a cartoon, the other sensuous as the scene of a melodrama. Flaxman pure, sculpturesque, dealing chiefly with the human figure, and relying upon his perfect drawing; Doré scenic and vague, dealing chiefly with landscape, and relying upon magical *chiar' oscuro* effects: precisely where Flaxman is strongest Doré is weakest. Nothing can surpass the grandeur of his half-delineated, half-suggested horrors. In one sense the artist, in this, resembles the poet. Half of Dante's effects are produced by the indefinite suggestiveness of his mystic and pregnant words.

Every sentence has depths, from which cursory readers utterly fail to draw. Hence the difficulties of any artist's task. The lines of a drawing pencil cannot be made as suggestive as the thought and words of a poem. They have this disadvantage too, that the suggestions of the artist's pencil must be chiefly material; those of the poet's words may be intellectual or moral. Perhaps M. Doré deserves to have it said, that, so far as pictorial art can suggest more than it embodies, he is in harmony with his author. The poem and the illustrations together fill up a more perfect picture than either could do alone. Sometimes words fail, and the idea is filled up by the artist; sometimes it is impossible to attempt the realization of what the poet's words suggest. Nothing, perhaps, that art can achieve in the realms of weird and lurid imagination is left unattempted by M. Doré. We have the mysterious suggestions of fantastic crags, and gnarled trees, and piled up clouds, and awful chasms, and boiling seas, and all the nondescript natural symbolism that so enthralled us in 'The Wandering Jew.' Only by such frequent repetition one gets a little too familiar with the trick of the art. Dante, however, suggests a hell much more spiritual and inward than M. Doré; the predominant, if not the only features of his illustrations are of physical torture, which is represented with an elaborate and fertile ingenuity worthy of a grand inquisitor. We shrink and shudder, and, it may be, shut the book, more than satiated with having 'supped on horrors.' This has ever been the failure of pictorial art. The 'Hell' and the 'Purgatory' of Orgagna, in the Campo Santo of Florence, simply make us laugh.

These illustrations vary very greatly—from conceptions and performances that are really sublime, to others more akin to theatrical diorama; frequent instances of bad drawing, especially of the human figure, greatly mar pictures upon which we should otherwise look with very great satisfaction.

The English version of Dante which forms the text of this superb volume is that of Cary. The illustrations are very effectively reproduced. Every accessory of type, paper and binding, which can make a *livre de luxe* is carefully supplied. The volume is one which deserves to take a high place among the productions of modern art. To Dantopholites it will be another and a most acceptable wreath placed upon the great master's brow.

Master and Scholar, &c. &c. By E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
London: Alexander Strahan.

This volume of poems, dedicated to the memory of Keble, is characterised by many of the excellencies, and some of the weaknesses of that great master of the poetry of Christian sentiment. It breathes, in slow and measured, and almost monotonous cadence, much hallowed and refreshing thought, which falls on ear and heart like the melody of distant chimes ringing from some antique spire. The rich and varied culture of the writer is rather too apparent, while the delicate nicety of his references to place, and time, and personage, show his poetry to have been his toil, as well as his recreation. He wanders back into the cloister of St. Ebbe's, Oxford, in the 13th century, and, with skill and tenderness, gives an old-world picture of the Friar Bacon. This almost forgotten herald of modern physical science is the 'master' whose conflicts with the prejudice and ignorance of his time form the subject of the first and most considerable poem. Nor does our author

fail to show with more than ordinary care, the insufficiency of mere natural science to soothe or satisfy the deepest questionings of the human spirit. The 'Scholar,' who started with a passionate love for Roger Bacon, to lay the supposed magician's *magnum opus* at the feet of the Pope, returns after ten years of wandering to light up his master's dying ear with the new-found light of spiritual freedom and hope. The exceedingly able article in the 'Contemporary Review' for July 1866, by the same author, on Friar Bacon, should be read as a commentary and introduction to this poem. It will then be seen how much of the story is founded on fact. With exquisite delicacy, Mr. Plumptre pours forth once more the pitiful wail of poor Eloisa's broken heart over the idol of her passion. More of her story and of that of Abelard is introduced than we find in the well-known lines of Pope, and the lessons which her agony teaches to all generations are not concealed. Our author also takes us back into the family of Bethany, and weaves the traditions of the Magdalen into a charming poem. Why he should translate the familiar names of Mary, Lazarus, and John, into Miriam, Eleazar, and Jochanan, we do not see. The same kind of modified conceit is conspicuous elsewhere, though it can hardly be said to mar the excellence of the volume as a whole. Though the author is fond of the distant and the past—and there is a dreamy if not drowsy tone about these placid and pure recitatives—he does not fail to show the bearing of the themes, which he has versified so tenderly, on the sorrows and anxieties of this generation. Translations from the Hebrew Psalms, from the Persian pietists, and from Clemens Alexandrinus, and Prudentius, show how wide his sympathies have carried him; and though German, Mediæval, Oriental, and Latin themes have chiefly engaged his muse, yet he has so sweetly reproduced Scriptural scenes and thought, that we are convinced the volume will add to the author's reputation, so highly distinguished in other departments.

London Poems. By ROBERT BUCHANAN, author of 'Idylls and 'Legends of Inverburn,' 'Undertones,' &c. London & New York: Alexander Strahan.

A strong dramatic faculty manifesting itself in poetry has become very rare. What there is of it has for the most part taken up its habitation in prose novels. Here is a young poet, however, who unquestionably possesses it, though he writes tales in verse, and not plays. In 'Willie Baird,' 'Poet Andrew,' and others of the 'Idylls and Legends of Inverburn'—as now in the present volume—Mr. Buchanan presents us with a series of life-like character-pictures. We have Jane Lewson, the flaccid-natured affectionate woman, in subjection to the rigid iron-grey piety of her old maid sisters; Nan and Liz, deep-hearted and true, however faulty, frail, and unromantic to the superficial or conventional observer—types of how many women in our great cities, reared in and begirt with circumstances unideal enough! 'the little milliner,' with her childlike spirit, unharmed by the evil around her, as the poet with exquisite felicity expresses it:—

'Fear, nor sin, nor shame, hath she,
But, like a sea-bird on the sea,
Floating hither, thither, day and night:
The great black waters cannot harm her,
Because she is so weak and light.'

Then we have the two rough but big-hearted sailors (no land lubbers these in nautical attire!), and poor, erring Kifle, in that noble poem 'The Scaith o' Barth'; and the neer-do-well father, tutored and moralised over by his prim and respectable (?) son, Attorney Sneak, 'sharp like a tyrant, timid like a slave.' In this last poem, and the Starling, Mr. Buchanan shows a grim Scotch humour. Mr. Buchanan tells his stories in the person of one of the characters concerned; and the characters he has chosen to depict are never (like those of Mrs. Browning) subtly intellectual analysts of themselves or others, nor are they persons likely to look at events in a romantic or poetic aspect. This imposes peculiar difficulties on the poet. And there may be an instance or two where the character represented speaks too much like a poet; but, on the whole, the dramatic propriety of each narration is, to us, the strongest test and proof of the rare calibre of Mr. Buchanan's dramatic faculty. The simplicity of the natures he has chosen to portray, and of the incidents in which he has involved them, is calculated to make the poems generally interesting, because generally intelligible. It is in this region that the lights and shadows of human nature are disposed in broad grand masses, little broken up and weakened; and out of such materials the most imperishable of poetry has been built up. He likewise chooses his heroes and heroines chiefly from low and unartificial life; and there is no doubt that such life is by far the most picturesque. However refined, his personages are never offensive, prosaic, or commonplace at the moment when he allows us to see them, whatever they may be at other times. Simple and few as may be his incidents, the poet generally selects them so that they shall be such as to extract for us the very essence and aroma of the characters brought into play; the tragic, pathetic, loveable, or pitiable elements lying down at the root of the simplest and most ordinary natures. And in the person of one whose perception is rendered sensitive and delicate by deep sympathy or interest, he brings out all the subtler features and *nuances* of the situation with care and fineness of touch. On this account, in Mr. Buchanan, the metre, the poetic form, has generally a '*raison d'être*,' which we do not always feel in Crabbe—of whom Mr. Buchanan in some degree reminds us, nor even in Wordsworth. One more remark we must make, that the moral atmosphere of this book seems to us thoroughly healthy, though there is no preaching in it; and the morality is not pharisaic or merely conventional. But we rise from the perusal of it with larger, kindlier, less artificial, and more hopeful views of our common nature, because we have been looking at it through the eyes of one who sees deep and truly.

Our admiration is not indiscriminate. We think it a mistake to have written a poem like 'The Gift of Eos,' inviting comparison with the 'Tithonus' of Tennyson; for that enshrines all the aerial, exquisitely subtle graces of the elder poet's elaborately-finished style. Mr. Buchanan's distinct original faculty comes out chiefly in the homelier subjects he has treated; yet of the vigorous, clear, vivid execution of the 'Death of Roland,' we cannot speak too highly; this, too, is realistic in its way; and here the poet again achieves a triumph. We can make no extracts in so short a space, but must conclude our notice by asserting that we feel sure no genuine lover of poetry can read the lively little poems, 'Langley Lane,' and 'The Blind Linnet,' or the grand and touching ones 'Nell' and 'Liz,' without feeling stirred to the depths of his soul; and we record our conviction that if Mr. Buchanan writes no more, he will have permanently enriched English literature by much that he has already accomplished.

Dramatic Studies: By AUGUSTA WEBSTER. *The Prometheus Bound of Æschylus*, literally translated into English verse. By AUGUSTA WEBSTER. London and Cambridge: Macmillan. www.libtool.com.cn

To use the 'young language' of her publisher's University, Mrs. Webster deserves to be *Kudized*. In her original poems there is unquestionable power. They are for the most part 'dramatic monologues,' after Mrs. Browning; and it may, perhaps, be considered refreshing that any minor minstrel has discovered that there is somebody besides Mr. Tennyson worth imitating. Mrs. Webster has chosen—it is the indolent habit of the day—blank verse as her vehicle: apparently the easiest, it is really the most difficult of rhythms; and the poet would be wise who resolutely refrained from writing blank verse until he had reached the age of forty. Mrs. Webster's blank verse has none of the sustained music, the organic rhythm, which is necessary to make blank verse endurable. 'A Preacher,' and 'By the Looking Glass,' are the poems which we prefer. In the former the soliloquist, being of weak material, preaches one doctrine, holding another.

'Then here again, *'the pleasures of the world
That tempt the youngest members of my flock.'*
Now I think really that they've not enough
Of these same pleasures. Grey and joyless lives
A many of them have, whom I would see
Sharing the natural gaieties of youth.
I wish they'd more temptations of the kind.'

Mrs. Webster's 'Preacher' is rather dull: and the heroine of her 'Looking Glass' is rather ugly. The latter soliloquizes in a lyrical metre, whose fluency shows that the authoress has versifying powers. This also, appears more satisfactorily, in her rendering of the 'Prometheus Bound,' a version which is both accurate and poetical. We quote a well-known passage, which is admirably translated.

'Oh marvellous sky, and swiftly winging winds,
And streams, and myriad laughter of sea-waves,
And universal mother earth. I call ye
And the all-seeing sun to look on me,
What I, a god, endure from other gods.
Yea, see racked with what tormentings
I must wrestle through time told by thousands of years,
For the new king of gods has contrived for me,
Bondage thus shameful.
Woe, woe! for the pain that is on me now.
I groan, and I groan for the coming pain—
When will the end of this evil break
Like the dawn of a star in heaven?'

Mrs. Webster need not fear the comparison with Dean Milman, which shall conclude our notice: *πρὸς τὰς ἐν' ἐμοί. Place aux dames.*

'Now let the forked whorls of fire be driven
Against me, and let the air be convulsed
With thunder and rage of boisterous winds,
Let the blast sway the earth to her lowest base,

To the very roots, let it heap the sea wave
 In lashing surge on the path of heaven's stars,
 Let it, whirling me high in resistless wrath,
 Dash my body down to deep Tartarus—
 He stays me not, do what he will.'

Thus the Dean of St. Paul's:—

'Aye on that head the lightnings hurl,
 In sharp-edged flakes that blaze and curl,
 With thunders rend the shivering heaven,
 And blasts in frantic eddies driven!
 The earth to its foundations bare,
 Up from its roots let whirlwinds tear!
 Confound wild ocean in its wrath
 Even with heaven's stars in their empyreal path:
 And let him hurl amid the storm,
 Deep, deep to Tartarus, my form;
 Plunged in the gulf of dark Necessity;
 Yet never, never can he make me die.'

Mrs. Webster is, we think, the more *Æschylean*: but in neither version is the last line satisfactory.

The Prince's Progress; and other Poems. By CHRISTINA ROSETTI.
 London: Macmillan & Co.

No one can read Miss Rosetti's volume without the conviction that whatever the comparative rank to which she may be entitled, she takes an undisputed place among true poets. Whatever may be the indefinable criteria of poetical genius as distinguished from clever verse-making, they are unmistakeable. Whatever the distinctive qualities of her muse, Miss Rosetti has every right to sing, that Wordsworth and Tennyson can claim; no one can imagine that her thoughts would be better said than sung. Her thought is not so profound as Wordsworth's; her form is not so perfect as Tennyson's; her passion is not so intense as Byron's; her descriptive power is inferior to that of Thomson; she has not the humour and pathos of Hood; nor does she equal any of these great masters in musical rhythm or constructive power; yet is she beyond all question a genuine poet. Her conceptions are fresh and beautiful, and are inspired by the recognition of underlying meanings and subtle harmonies. Her feeling is deep and tender, although its sadness is too predominant; and her verse is artistic and musical. She sings as a bird sings, because she must. If the thought of an audience is present to her at all, the consciousness of it is wonderfully concealed. A sadly meditative and introspective spirit, finds quaint and melodious expression for itself, and establishes an involuntary sympathy with all who have any appreciation of its moods. It expresses itself, moreover, not in metaphysical speculations or analyses, but in concrete embodiments of the imagination. It seeks palpable images and analogies, clothes itself with form and feature, and becomes vivid and human, so that we have companionship with it. In this respect Miss Rosetti resembles Shelley more than Wordsworth. Miss Rosetti also possesses the power of reticence and restraint, which is the faculty of a true poet. She is content to suggest her thought, and so far as she presents it, she is severely modest in her delineations, neither caricature nor exaggeration disfigures it.

Miss Rosetti looks upon human life mournfully, as if she had suffered much in it. It is to her a temptation or a trial in which men have evil to resist and sorrow to endure, rarely a sunshine or rest, which may be heartily enjoyed. www.libtool.com.cn

The first and principal poem in the volume, and which gives to it its name, is a sustained allegory, representing the seduction of human passion and the weak yielding of the human will. The progress of the prince to his bride is delayed by every wayside attraction, and he arrives only to see her carried out dead, her heart broken by his apparent infidelity. The poem is a gallery of beautiful pictures of the scenes through which he passed, and evinces the writer's peculiar power of exhibiting external nature in connexion with the working of human passion. The smaller poems are exquisitely finished; some of them are already familiar to readers of serial literature.

To all who love true and beautiful poetry, the volume will be very acceptable. Like an hour beneath the shade of green trees on a sultry day, like a quiet church service with the unresting life of the city surging round, it will refresh minds that are weary, and soften hearts that are hard.

The Inner Life. A Poem. By the Rev. W. TIDD MATSON.
London: Elliot Stock.

The verse which Mr. Matson has adopted lends itself very felicitously to serious themes, but it is as yet so identified with its greatest Master that it suggests very perilous comparisons. Mr. Matson uses it with great skill and elegance, his deep religious feeling and earnestness does much to inspire it, and he possesses poetical powers of no mean order. In a series of short cantos he describes the inception, growth, characteristics, and consummation of the inner spiritual life of a religious man. With equal subtlety and sympathy he recognises its various moods, and often gives expression to them in words which will be precious formulæ for many thoughtful and devout souls. His poem appeals to spiritual sentiment, after the manner of the *Christian Year*. It is a tender and beautiful *vade mecum* for earnest hearts. Mr. Matson has modestly printed it in a cheap pamphlet of sixteen pages. We hope that he will forthwith put it into a form more portable and elegant, so as to fit it for the dressing-table and the pocket.

The following may be taken as a specimen of the earnestness of Mr. Matson's feeling, and of the felicity of his verse:—

‘Lord, I was blind, I could not see
In thy marred visage any grace;
But now the beauty of thy face,
In radiant vision, dawns on me.

Lord, I was deaf, I could not hear
The thrilling music of thy voice;
But now I hear thee, and rejoice,
And all thine uttered words are dear.

Lord, I was dumb, I could not speak
The grace and glory of thy name;
But now, as touched with living flame,
My lips Thine eager praises wake.

Lord, I was dead, I could not stir
 My lifeless soul to come to Thee;
 But now, since thou hast quickened me,
 I rise from sin's dark sepulchre.

For Thou hast made the blind to see,
 The deaf to hear, the dumb to speak,
 The dead to live,—and lo! I break
 The chains of my captivity.

Our Hymns: their Authors and Origin, being Biographical Sketches of nearly Two Hundred of the Principal Psalm and Hymn Writers, with Notes of their Psalms and Hymns. A Companion to New Congregational Hymn-book. By JOSEPH MILLER, M.A. London: Jackson, Walford, & Hodder.

We have received Mr. Miller's volume too late for more than a cursory examination. The true worth of such a compilation can be appraised only after minute and manifold tests. We have, however, submitted it to such an opportunity as has enabled, and with very satisfactory results. Mr. Miller has arranged his notices in chronological order, and, keeping steadily before him the object of his work, has furnished such biographical and critical material as may be supposed of interest to hymnologists. The biographical information is succinctly and skilfully given; such points are selected as throw light upon each author's compositions; and thus a beautiful and instructive significance is often given to a hymn that otherwise would be a hymn and nothing more. And as some of the most eminent divines and servants of the Church are numbered amongst hymn writers, the volume is virtually a very valuable and interesting biographical dictionary. The most interesting question in such a volume concerns the real authorship of obscure or anonymous hymns, and bibliographical or biographical information concerning hymns of indisputable authorship. To this department of hymnology Mr. Miller has made some valuable contributions. His research has been most extensive and unwearied, and he has probably determined indubitably the authorship of many hymns not hitherto identified. When the 'New Congregational Hymn-book' was compiled eight or nine years ago, but little had been done in that way. It was almost the first hymn-book that pretended to any historical or critical research; immense labour was expended upon it, and much was done by a comparison of original editions of hymn-books, examination of collected works and religious magazines, and inquiries through 'Notes and Queries,' and other channels of information. The information kindly afforded by Mr. Daniel Sedgwick—that dictionary in breeches, for all recent hymn-book compilers, was especially valuable. Since then much has been done by Sir Roundell Palmer, and others. Articles on hymnology have appeared in reviews and magazines, and almost every month hymnological queries in 'Notes and Queries.' Even our Episcopalian friends have been almost shamed out of their inveterate and unworthy habit—happily, almost peculiar to themselves—of concealing in their hymn-books the Nonconformist sources to which they are so largely indebted. Mr. Miller has had the advantage of these eight or nine years of almost

continuous research; and, as the result, he has supplemented many of the bibliographical defects of the 'New Congregational Hymn-book,' and has corrected some of its errors. We have noted several of these in looking through the volume, and by-and-by when his statements have been sufficiently tested, it may be well for the Committee of the Congregational Union to revise the list of authors. The authorship of some of the hymns published in the 'New Congregational' as anonymous, was, however, known to its compilers, but, for various reasons, the names were withheld; in most cases the condition was insisted upon by the writers themselves. The authors of several of the anonymous hymns have been ascertained since the hymn-book was stereotyped. In other cases such as the wrong attribution of Mr. Anstice's two hymns, Nos. 354 and 593, from the 'Child's Christian Year' to Keble, and many others, Mr. Miller has rendered good service by his corrections. On the other hand, Mr. Miller has not only left something to be done by investigators who may come after him, and, as we trust, in future editions of his own book, but he has fallen into some mistakes. For instance, the author of the hymns bearing the name of Shrubsole, one of which Mr. Miller has erroneously attributed to Matthew Wilks, was not the Rev. Wm. Shrubsole, of Sheerness, as Mr. Miller supposes, but Mr. William Shrubsole of the Bank of England, his son, 'one of the 'Fathers and Founders' of the London Missionary Society, father of the late Mrs. Cunliffe, who kindly submitted the original MSS. to one of the compilers of the 'New Congregational Hymn-book.' If we mistake not, his hymns are appended to Mrs. Cunliffe's memoir of her father in Dr. Morison's volume, entitled as above.

For Mr. Miller's information, however, we may say that the hymn No. 376, 'Lo, on the inglorious tree,' is a translation of an old Latin hymn by the Rev. W. J. Blew ('Church Hymn and Tune Book') revised by one of the compilers of the 'New Congregational Hymn-book.' We will only say, concerning Mr. Miller's criticisms on omissions and readings, that the editorial functions required of compilers of a hymn-book for use in public worship, are essentially different from those of the editor of a work like Sir Roundell Palmer's. When hymns extend to twelve, eighteen, or twenty-four verses, omission becomes imperative, and many considerations besides intrinsic excellency, such as unity, progress, or fitness of sentiment, must determine what verses are to be omitted. An abbreviated hymn may be a congruous whole, or but a heap of *disjecta membra*. As to readings—when, as Sir Roundell Palmer justly remarks, 'a hymn is easily spoiled by a single falsetto note,' verbal alteration becomes imperative, if some of the richest devotional compositions of our literature are not to be altogether discarded. For instance, ask a congregation to sing the first line of Charles Wesley's Nativity Hymn as he wrote it, 'Hark! how all the welkin rings,' and the archaism would set everybody in a titter. The justification of an editor in such alterations is to be found, not in any theories about alterations, but in the practical result. The compilers of the 'New Congregational Hymn-book' wisely proceeded on the principle of making no alteration when such did not seem, for worshipping purposes essentially necessary. The taste or even refinement of one age may be the burlesque or coarseness of another. Such verbal adaptations have been found imperative by every compiler of hymns for public worship.

But we must not permit Mr. Miller's book to tempt further remark. As a work of very great research, of skilful composition, of valuable information, and of exceeding biographical and religious interest, we

heartily commend it to every household, as the inseparable companion of the hymn-book which it illustrates. The latest contribution to the literature of our hymnology, it is, out of sight, the best.

Letters of Eugénie de Guérin. Edited by G. S. TREBUTIEN.
London: Simpkin & Marshall. 1866.

This is a companion volume to the charming journal of Madlle. de Guérin, which has recently taken the heart of Christian and Protestant Europe by storm. It is difficult to say in what the charm of these letters consists, yet it is equally difficult to resist their fascination. The incidents which they relate are of the simplest and homeliest description; the correspondents to whom they are addressed, are with few exceptions, unknown to fame; yet the writer throws around them a certain glamour which makes us quite sympathetic in the varied changes of their lot. There is much that is gushing and even sentimental in the extravagant terms in which Eugénie de Guérin's loving heart pours forth its cataracts of affection on a multitude of objects. Her thoughts dwell more on the shady than on the sunny side of human life, but though she has the secret of manufacturing sorrows, she knows how to put away the sackcloth and gird her with gladness. She seems to live ever beneath the shadow of the wing of the Angel of Death, yet he is not to her the grim spectre which Holbein represents him, but rather the Janitor of Paradise, and as the door closes behind one after another of her friends, gleams from the light within fall, and rest upon her soul. Her whole spirit was interfused with that peculiar form of religious life which can grow up only under the influence of Roman Catholicism. Her estimate of the world, of holy places, persons, days, and things, her hagiology, her reverence for and dependence on sacraments, crucifixes, and Holy Mother Church, evince a degree of superstition which at times is little better than fetichism; yet withal it is refreshing to trace the evidence of the buoyant and practical power of her faith, of her obvious love to God, her delight in prayer, and her Christian charity. She rejoiced in Church festivals, and loved to attend on services and ceremonials, yet she clearly regarded them only as means to an end, that end being to bring her into closer communion with God and heaven. In her allusions to death and departed friends, we trace only slight hints of her belief in purgatory; she hopes that those who have departed hence are at once in heaven with God. These volumes as a whole suggest to us the perpetual flow of some exquisite waterfall; the jets and eddies of strong affection dart in various directions, and aim at unseen objects; sunbeams, 'motions of moonlight,' weave their iris on her falling tears; and while the glad outbursts of her heart refresh the spirits of others, she is still embowered in the mountain fastness, guarded by the beauties of nature, and singing her everlasting song. These letters lose much by being clothed in an English dress. In almost every page we find expressions which, in their original form, are extremely touching and graceful, but in our matter-of-fact tongue convey an impression of extreme sensibility, verging at times on absurdity. Some of the expressions are foreign to the genius of our language, and could scarcely be adequately rendered in English; but in many instances the translator has failed to do justice to Madlle. de Guérin's beautifully-expressed thoughts and feelings.

Arne. A Sketch of Norwegian Country Life. By BJÖRNSTJERNE BJÖRNSON. Translated from the Norwegian by Augusta Plesner and S. Rugeley-Powers. London: Alexander Strahan. www.libtool.com.cn

The countrymen of Björnson have acknowledged him as a writer of fresh, beautiful, and original genius, the destined creator of a modern national literature; and there can be no doubt that, if his life be spared and his promise fulfilled, he will take an honourable place in the literature of Europe. For a long time the national individuality of Norway was overpowered by that of Denmark, to which she was united; and since she became free, she has produced no writer who has won for himself a name.

Björnstjerne Björnson, whose very name is redolent of old Norse tales, is the son of a clergyman, and was a rough, muscular, unlettered boy, full of play, and paying but little attention to the studies of the University. He was, however, a diligent student of the pages of nature—those ‘manuscripts of God.’ He became a contributor to periodical literature, travelled to Copenhagen and Hamburg, and about nine years ago, published in a little provincial town in the north of Norway a book called ‘Synnove Solbakken,’ awoke up one morning, and found himself famous. Björnson’s genius is purely original, as felicitous in its conceits as that of Jean Paul, only less fierce and passionate; as homely and humorous as that of Charles Lamb, as ethereal and musical as that of Ariel. His stories are old Norse Sagas modernized and humanized; they blend the charm of a fairy tale with the sympathies of common life. This is the first of his works that has been translated into English, and the translators merit the thanks of all readers who are in quest of something pure, fresh, and entertaining. In the original it has achieved a very wide popularity. It carries us into quite new scenes, amongst quite new people, who, while distinctly localized as Norwegian peasants, are drawn with the fine traits of loving and suffering humanity, which make men of all nations akin. The tale progresses by incidents, without long narrative or laboured description, and occasionally a whole pathetic episode is told in a single line. A fanciful parable of life, under the figure of a cliff, clothed with verdure and grace, whether it wishes it or not, opens and closes the story, and runs like a golden thread through its homely warp and weft, now wrought into exquisite posies of verse, now doubled and twisted into quaint knots of metaphor.

Björnson is essentially a poet. His stories are interspersed with verses which, even in their translated form, are full of beauty and grace. *Arne*, the hero of this volume, could always sing more than he could say, and when he got his first glimpse of spring and love, he sung this song to somebody, until it nearly took her breath away:—

‘The Tree’s early leaf-buds were bursting their crown:

“Shall I take them away?” said the Frost, sweeping down.

“No; leave them alone,

Till the blossoms have grown,”

Prayed the Tree, while he trembled from rootlet to crown.

‘The Tree bore his blossoms, and all the birds sung:

“Shall I take them away?” said the Wind, as he swung.

“No; leave them alone,

Till the berries have grown.”

Said the Tree, while his leaflets quivering hung.

'The Tree bore his fruit in the Midsummer glow :
 Said the girl, " May I gather thy berries, or no ?"
 " Yes ; all thou canst see,
 Take them ; all are for thee,"
 Said the Tree, while he bent down his laden boughs low.'

Views and Opinions : By MATTHEW BROWNE. London : Alexander Strahan. 1866.

The Gentle Philosopher ; or, Home Thoughts for Home Thinkers.
 London : James Blackwood & Co. 1866.

We ought to be a wise and understanding people. We receive, between the four Seas, some twenty thousand sermons weekly, and few days elapse without many well-meaning, and some highly-gifted men lavishing upon us good advice. Everybody seems bent on making others find light in their light, see evil in their curse, and discover beauty and excellence in their choice, their moods, or their ideals. The two volumes before us are very much akin with the quiet, though rather exhausted spirit of the Country Parson. At all events, they seek to give permanence to some of the fleeting but savory meditations which have amused our leisure, or arrested our attention, when they casually appeared in the journals of the day. They do not profess to go very deeply into any subject, or to give much information, or to guide to new sources of intellectual wealth ; but they strike chords and sound key-notes of excellent fantasias, and at times play through overtures to unwritten but yet possible dramas which excite curiosity and provoke admiration. Matthew Browne cares little for criticism, and seldom goes out of his way to avoid it. He chats and coos and nods confidentially at his reader, at times wearing a very heart of hearts upon his sleeve, and satisfied that the public will be profoundly interested in his ways and moods and fancies ; and at other times he garrulously runs on, implying that he has not time to cross the room in order to rectify a quotation or justify an epithet, and that his '*view*' and his '*opinion*,' as such, unrectified and unjustified, or not defended, are for the nonce worth our pondering. Perhaps they are ; we have been beguiled into reading the volume through, and shall probably repeat the experiment more than once. There is a very encyclopædia of fancy, crotchet, anecdote, quotation in the author's soul that makes one envy those 'friends round St. Paul's, who are held by him in sweet remembrance.' A man who can trace recurring ideas through Tennyson with patient care, and prove that he has studied him as old divines studied their Bible, who can nevertheless go utterly mad about the '*colour of love*,' (!) and then defend street preaching, the ballet dance, the sanctity of Sunday, and nervous agitation, and, moreover, can say new and 'rich' things about every topic he touches, may be pardoned some of his impertinence and extravagance and oddity. There is a high tone and thorough novelty about this '*viewy book*,' which gives it a charm and fascination even to jaded critics.

'The Gentle Philosopher' moves in a humbler region and more beaten track ; and though some of his brief essays appear to us essentially weak and prosaic, many of them are noble and well meant, and an hour will be often won amid the hurry of the busy world to listen to the flow and ripple of the burn, beside which the '*Gentle Philosopher*' has guided our steps.

Days of Yore. By SARAH TYTLER.
Strahan.

'Let the dead past bury its dead' is not the many of whom are smitten with a passionate labour hard at archæology and history to galvanize generations into seeming life. Miss Tytler contribute to such a result. We do not think effort. She has tried her hand on many episodes but the stories strike us as anything but interesting. An elaborate preparation for an insignificant and dramatic incidents are commonplace and will eminently artificial and constrained, and fail to living power the characters and scenes which she Adam Home's repentance appears to us, upon conceived and most interesting of the tales, butness gives it this distinction. This story, ever disfigured by an amount of Gaelic words that unintelligible to an uneducated Southron, and the authoress had appended a glossary.

Lynton Grange. A Novel. By JOHN R. S.
Paternoster-row.

This is a very good novel, especially regarded. It evinces a profound acquaintance with humankind of depicting its several types, in fiction which is not often surpassed. The story is very in which it is told, the incidents which fill it, of scenes into which it carries the reader, interesting. Here are some of the most graphic scenery and phenomena, and of London life, have read. The book, besides, breathes truth and reality which we do not always find in the popular writers. But, above all, it is morally pure and without parading religious opinions or sentimental spirit. The author has 'endeavoured,' as he 'to indicate, beneath the interest and amusement, 'a lesson of human experience,—that evil, if forced, becomes an ennobling and purifying agent; but 'utter darkness.' It is high praise, but it is not of the author, to say that he has succeeded, and may be as useful as it is interesting.

Wealth and Welfare. By JEREMIAH GOTTE
Alexander Strahan.

A simple tale of Swiss life, intended to illustrate by its title-page; the representatives of which well-to-do Bernese farmers. There is but little but its interest is sustained by the light and customs, ideas, and feelings of Swiss life. To the world of which they know but little—it is a little tale, but it has about it the charm of most

our own. The story is told in an interesting manner—the preaching and the moralizing a little too prominent and prolix, perhaps—but otherwise, lightly, gracefully, and skilfully; the religious feeling is throughout excellent: the book is admirable for family reading.

THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY, AND PHILOLOGY.

The Tripartite Nature of Man, Spirit, Soul, and Body. By the Rev. J. B. HEARD, M.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

The subject of the present volume, though long ago fully discussed in Germany by philosophers and physiologists, by moralists and theologians, has not hitherto been systematically handled in this country. English readers have had to depend for their knowledge of it upon scattered hints found in sermons, hasty notices in critical and theological reviews, and disconnected remarks in such commentaries as those of Olshausen, Alford, and Ellicott; all of which are necessarily imperfect, and many of them decidedly incorrect. We heartily rejoice, therefore, at the appearance of a goodly volume devoted to the systematic treatment of such an important subject. Taking into consideration the novelty to many of our readers, of the topic discussed and the speculative nature of many of the details, we think that the best service we can render is to present as full and as faithful a statement as our space allows, both of the subjects treated and of the author's method of treatment. The Bible, as a revelation of man to himself, must not only issue the command of duty, it must also furnish us with a key to self-knowledge. It must tell us of our inner nature, that it is made in the image of God, as well as indicate the duties which such a God-like nature has to perform. The former belongs to Christian psychology, the latter to Christian ethics. The mistake of Christian psychologists has consisted in attempting to amalgamate the psychologies of Plato and Paul. In consequence of which they have either fallen into the heresies of Apollinaris and Origen, or, following the lead of Augustine and Jerome, they have rejected the distinction between *Psyche* and *Pneuma*, a feature which characterised the theology of the West. But Plato cannot be harmonised with Paul, for, of the *pneuma* of the apostle the divine Plato is totally ignorant; and his false spiritualism has proved more detrimental to Christian truth than the pure intellectualism of his most renowned pupil and rival. The psychology of Aristotle, too, though more correct than that of his master, lacks all knowledge of the *pneuma*, the distinctive feature of Biblical psychology. Science, as well as the schools, has treated copiously of the relation and distinction between soul and body; but with regard to the spirit or *pneuma*, it, too, is mute. But where science and the schools are silent, the Bible is vocal; and while it tacitly assumes the relation of soul and body, it is distinct in its utterances with regard to the relation of soul and spirit. We are not, however, to look for an explicit statement of the true trichotomy in the Old Testament. Just as under the old dispensation, the personality and operations of the Holy Spirit were not distinct, so the distinction between soul and spirit was also latent; the *ruach* and *nephesh* of the Hebrews are only distinguished from each other as the *pneuma* and *psyche* of the Greeks, and the *animus* and *anima* of the Latins; they are used only to distinguish the animal from the intellectual, and not the intellectual from the spiritual or pneumatical. Their *nephesh* referred to what we should now call body, and

back to what we call soul. But, with the development of the Divine nature, that of the human keeps pace; therefore with the approach of the dispensation of the Spirit, the nature of the human spirit, as the sphere of its operation, became more clearly defined. Hence, in the utterance of Christ, though the distinction between soul and body, as the first step towards a complete trichotomy, is emphatic and distinct, the pneuma has not yet emerged out of the Old Testament obscurity. His teaching forms a transition period in the history of Biblical psychology. With the descent of the Divine Pneuma, the trichotomy is completed. In the teaching of the apostles we find the pneuma not merely in its contrast with soma, but also with psyche. It is to the writings of the apostle, then, that we are to look for the essentials of Christian psychology in their developed form. In these documents we find it explicitly stated, that man consists of body, or sense-consciousness; psyche, or self-consciousness; and pneuma, or God-consciousness. By this, we are to understand, not the union of three separable and distinct natures, but so many separate manifestations of one and the same nature. These parts are ideally distinguishable, but not actually separable. The will or personality has these three forms of consciousness, but the personality is ever the same, whether it acts through the body, soul, or spirit. In the Trinity there are three persons in one nature or substance, in man there are three natures in one person.

As regards their origin, the soul and body are the *work* of the Divine Creator, but the spirit or pneuma is an *emanation* from Him, and co-substantial with Him. The pneuma is the organ of divine knowledge and fellowship. It is the true presence-chamber of the Almighty. Rational intuition can tell us *about* God, but it is by the pneuma alone that we *know* God. The soul is the nexus between body and spirit. In the soul of man the animal and spirit so combine, that their separate existence is destroyed. It is probable that neither soul nor spirit is, by itself, capable of a separate entity, but that they can combine, and thus form spiritual life and spiritual consciousness, as soul and body do to form animal life and animal consciousness. Adam was probably created an adult physically and psychically, but pneumatically or spiritually an infant. He was in a state of *actual* innocence, and of *possible* spirituality and immortality, by the native powers of his own pneuma. By the fall, not only was his innocency lost, but the pneuma lost its hold of God. The reign of anarchy began. The soul rebelled against the spirit, and the body against the soul. All these were seriously injured; sense-consciousness became depraved, self-consciousness darkened, and God-consciousness dormant. The pneuma, after the fall, though not absolutely destroyed, became dead to all the higher exercises of faith, hope, charity: as conscience, however, it still disapproves and condemns, but has not the power to control. Adam, when he fell, lost not only the pneumatical for himself, but also the power of transmitting it to his posterity. He lost the power of propagating a spiritual progeny, *ex traduce*, and handed down to all his offspring injured somatical and psychical powers, and a ruined pneuma capable only of discharging its lowest functions. Man was henceforth born into a state of anarchy, and a harmonious unaided development of his nature became impossible. Since the fall, the psyche is the governing faculty in unregenerate man. The work of God's Spirit, in regenerating man, therefore, is to quicken the pneumatical, purify the intellectual and moral (psychical), and to control the animal. Henceforth the spiritual must come to man from his spiritual head by the instrumentality of the

Spirit, as the psychical comes from his psychical head. With the loss, by the fall, of the God-likeness, man lost also the immortality contingent upon its possession. Death ensued. Now death in its entire form must have involved not merely the separation of soul and body, but a dissolution of the link which binds the three together. This process of dissolution was prevented by the mediatorial work of Christ, and through him death has become a kind of suspended animation.

Of the soul, or self-consciousness, we cannot predicate mortality or immortality. Life is not an essential property of mind any more than of matter. Since the soul can exist only through its union with spirit or God-consciousness, the proofs of its immortality must rest, not on the nature, the psyche, but on the gift of eternal life to the pneuma, when quickened and revived in the image of God. The immortality of men and of angels seems to depend upon their possessing and continuing in the Divine likeness. Whether the devil and his angels are immortal, and whether unregenerate men are immortal, are questions which lie beyond the horizon to which Scripture bounds our view. The second death may mean not life in death, but the 'death of death and hell's destruction.' It may be only one awful means of destroying death. All observation of the connexion between soul and body is in favour of the psycho-pannuchist theory of the entire unconsciousness of the intermediate state; all Scripture intimations are against it. But since, according to our theory, two of the forms of consciousness can exist without the third, we can easily perceive how the psycho-pneumatic life may be one not merely of consciousness, but of far higher form than when united to sense. This may be a means not simply of perfecting and completing the sanctification of the psycho-pneumatical, but also one of God's ways of quickening the dead, by making it a state of probation to the psychical. As the death of Christ was destined to repair the losses of the fall with regard to the entire nature of man, the redemption through Him cannot be complete until the body is reunited with the soul and spirit. With regard to the resurrection of the body, there are two extreme views,—the Egyptian, which was also handed down by the schoolmen, that the same *sarx* would be raised again; and the Greek theory of the resurrection of the disembodied spirit; neither of which accords with the statements of Paul. One makes too much of the body, the other too little. At the resurrection there will be the transformation of the natural into a spiritual body, which will be the final one in the history of man. Then will disappear the *sarx* with all its influences, and a new *soma* or organism will be given him adapted to the wants of a nature altogether spiritual and God-like.

Such, are the principal topics discussed in this volume. We have given their outline in our own order, but, as far as we could, in the author's expressions. Our aim is not now to criticise the work, but to call attention to the subject, to state the writer's opinion, rather than express our own. The subject is one of immense importance to the right understanding of Scripture, and the author is a most learned sincere Christian man. The book manifests a vast amount of theological and philosophical reading, of historical and critical research. All sources of information have been consulted, and an earnest spirit pervades the whole. The volume is distinguished from the German works upon the same subject by carrying out Biblical psychology into all its applied metaphysical details; while the Germans have generally confined themselves to pure psychology. We cannot help believing that the work will be of great service to the truth, and we therefore strongly recommend to our readers a careful perusal of its contents.

Biblical Commentary on the Books of Samuel. By C. F. KIEL, D.D., and F. DELITZSCH, D.D. Translated from the German by Rev. JAMES MARTIN, B.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1866.

www.libtool.com.cn

Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job. By F. DELITZSCH, D.D. Translated from the German by Rev. FRANCIS BOLTON, B.A. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1866.

We have before us two valuable volumes, which add greatly to our indebtedness to Messrs. T. and T. Clark. The first embraces a most important transition period in the history of the Jewish people. As Exodus contains an account of the deliverance of the chosen race from Egyptian bondage, so here we have recorded the means of their deliverance from the power of the Philistines. Samuel completes what was commenced by Samson, and, by spiritual power and prayer, brings back the children of Israel from dead idols to the worship of the true God. Politically, also, they passed from the government of the judges to that of the kings. These books, on the ground of their extreme purity of diction, are assigned to the golden age of Hebrew literature. In prose, they hold a corresponding position to that which Isaiah and Joel hold in poetic or prophetic compositions, and in this respect form a striking contrast to the Chronicles and Kings. The introduction to this volume is exceedingly meagre, owing, we believe, to the existence in Germany of such works upon the subject, as those of Zunz, Ewald, Hävernick, De Wette, Bleek, and Stähelin.

Unlike the Greek histories, the historical books of the Old Testament, with the exception of Nehemiah, made no mention in the text of the name of the author. Hence the names the books bear furnish no clue to their authorship. It is clear that several portions of these books could not have been written by Samuel. Josephus and the Mishna are silent with regard to the author. The Babylonian Gemara is the first to attribute them to the author whose name they bear. This statement, standing as it does, alone, and made 1,550 years after his death, is not worthy of credit. Abarbanel (followed by Grotius) thought it was written by Jeremiah. Horne, in his introduction, thinks the first twenty-four chapters were written by Samuel, the rest by Nathan and Gad. This opinion had no better foundation than the testimony of the Talmudists. Drs. Keil and Delitzsch say, 'The author is himself quite unknown, but, judging from the spirit of his writings, he was a prophet of the kingdom.' By the 'spirit of his writings, we suppose they mean the prominence given in the narrative to prophets as compared with priests and Levites, the latter being mentioned only twice in the whole books of Samuel. With regard to the time of their composition, these authors say, 'That all that can be maintained with certainty is, that they were not written until after the division of the kingdom under Solomon's successor.' This opinion is based upon 1 Samuel xxvii. 6. We think, however, that there are several circumstances in favour of an early date after the secession, and justify us in fixing a period, after which they could not have been written; e.g., we find no allusion to the decay of the kingdoms, the captivity, or the religious reforms introduced by the pious Josiah. We hold it, therefore, pretty clear that they must have been written before those national events, i.e., between 975 B.C. and 622 B.C. We also dispute the reference to, and the rendering of 1 Chron. xxix. 29, as establish-

ing the fact that the author had before him written documents. There are several other points in the introduction which are either very briefly or unsatisfactorily handled. With regard to the Commentary, it is highly condensed in most places, severely critical, replete with references to other works for further elucidation, abounds in the excellencies of German handbooks of exegesis, and is marked, also, with some of their unavoidable defects.

In the second volume before us, we have another commentary added to the numerous excellent works already existing upon the fine old book of Job. The theme of the poem—the problem of human destiny and Divine dealings—invests it with undying interest, and we therefore find the learned and the thoughtful constantly recurring to the task of expounding it. It is the most difficult of Hebrew compositions. Many of the words and expressions are peculiar to Job, and many of the thoughts are not found elsewhere in the Bible. In order to convince oneself of its difficulty, it is necessary only to look at the endless number of words inserted in italics by our translators, the host of renderings which everywhere crowd the margin, and the imperfect and often unintelligible paraphrase of the Seventy. The richness of its mythical and physical allusions, the wide observation of oriental customs and scenery, rendered it impossible for the translators fully to apprehend the meaning. There is much in the nature of the book that required for its interpretation the fuller light of the 19th century. The present commentator has brought to the elucidation of his author the ripest results of modern scholarship, all the aid furnished by historical and mythical research, by Western discoveries, and by oriental traditions. The spirit of the Book of Job is admitted by all to be strangely un-Jewish, or extra-Jewish, and in many respects runs counter to the current beliefs of the genuine orthodox Jew. In order to account for this, Delitzsch classifies the Book of Job with the writings of the Israelitish Chokma (or wisdom,) which may be characterised as an attempt to reconcile Revelation and Providence. These writings are the productions of the universalistic, humanistic, philosophic tendency of a certain portion and period of Jewish thought, which, tired of the exclusiveness and narrowness of the popular creed, turned its attention to the contemplation of problems relating to our common humanity. To the literature of the Chokma period belong also several of the Psalms, Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes. In accordance with this opinion, Delitzsch assigns the date of the Book of Job to the Solomonic period, and regards the arguments for the pre- and post-Solomonic dates as ‘resting on invalid grounds, false observation, and deceptive conclusions.’ He makes this unequalled poem, therefore, coincident with the highest summit of magnificence attained by the kingdom of Israel. He endeavours to establish this date by the affinity of its contents with other canonical writings, and by the favourable internal and external condition of the nation. He does not regard the Satanology as at all unfavourable to this date, for he maintains that the ideas of the evil spirit are derived from the serpent, and not from Egyptian or Persian sources. The author, according to Delitzsch, though himself an Israelite, studiously selected a hero from extra-Israelitish tradition, handed down among the Arab tribes belonging to the east of Palestine. Although he does not disavow his Jewish stand-point he carefully avoids the introduction of strictly Jewish topics. With most of the recent commentators, he regards the prologue and epilogue as essential parts of the book, but he admits a difficulty

with regard to the six chapters containing Elihu's speeches, i.e., Ch. xxxii. to xxxvii.

The theme of the book, according to Delitzsch, furnishes an answer to the question, Why do afflictions befall the righteous? The answer is twofold, viz., that they are on the one hand the workings of God's love and the means of discipline and purification; and on the other the means of the testing and manifestation of the righteousness of the afflicted. There is, however, in his estimation, a more radical answer underlying the whole. Many of his opinions are built on an exceedingly uncertain foundation, as will be seen by reference to any of the expositors who differ from him. The introduction is, however, very comprehensive and complete in its treatment, and will amply repay a careful perusal. The commentary is, in our opinion, one of the best of this excellent series. It contains the condensed results of the ripest lexical and grammatical knowledge, manifests a thorough mastery of all sources and subjects helpful in the elucidation of the author, and an accurate acquaintance with the latest physical, geographical, and chronological discoveries, and with such historical and anthropological traces as tend to throw light upon any portion of this book. Although the work is primarily and chiefly critical, yet it never fails to mark the bearing of each passage on the highest interests of man, and to unfold the great principles of the ethical and theological truth which it contains for his guidance and comfort. We hope to recur to a critical examination of the work when the second volume appears.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus.

With a New Translation. By J. G. MURPHY, LL.D.
T.C.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

This volume, both as to subject and treatment, forms a befitting sequel to that on Genesis, by the same author. The writer regards the stupendous events of the nation's infancy, recorded in the second book of the Pentateuch, as embodying broad and deathless principles, deserving the attention, not simply of the theologian, but also of the student of national and social economy. 'The Pentateuch,' he says, 'is the light of revelation, shedding its salubrious beams on those questionings of the spirit of man, those themes which have been darkened and confused by the entrance of sin. And when men come to acknowledge the Divine authority and penetrate into the true meaning of the second portion of it, this book of moral resolvings, and teachings, and doings, they will find in it a safe guide to new and sound views of ethical, political, and educational science.' The scope of Dr. Murphy's work is, therefore, wide and exhaustive. The plan is the same as that of his commentary of Genesis. First comes the general arrangement and division of the topics; next a few prominent Hebrew words, placed at the head of the section for the benefit of Hebrew scholars, accompanied with a brief explanation and exposition; then a revised rendering; and lastly, a commentary, which is the complement of the translation. The commentary is critical and exegetical, chiefly the latter. As instances of its criticisms, see iii. 14. This phrase has been variously rendered; by the Authorised Version, "I am that (= that which) I am;" by the Seventy, *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*; by Aquila and Theodotion, *ἐσομαι ὅς ἐσομαι*; by the Vulgate, "Sum qui sum;" by others, "ero qui ero" and "ero qui fui;" by Dr. Murphy, "I am for I am;" a rendering long ago given by Abarbanel, and adopted by

Dr. Boothroyd, but the reason assigned for it here is different. Dr. Murphy rejects the A. V., because it conveys no new truth respecting God, does not express the meaning of *EHJEH*, and does not comport as well as his own does, with the Seventy and the Vulgate. The explanation he gives of *EHJEH*, is that it denotes an incipient stage of an action or an event, and means, therefore, *I go to be*, I am on the point of proving myself to be by a noticeable action. Hitherto, God had mainly promised, but now he is going to perform. He consequently takes the name *JEHOVAH*, to denote the self-existing and self-manifesting agent; *EHJEH*, the prophetic *JEHOVAH*, or he who is about to manifest himself; *JAH*, the historical *JEHOVAH*, or he who has manifested himself. We confess ourselves unable to understand why he should not render it, "I shall be for I shall be:" nor how his own rendering removes the tautology he objects to in the Authorised Version, nor how it harmonises with his own explanation. In the same manner he explains vi. 3, "*by my name Jehovah was I not known to them*," as signifying that as the performer of promises and the giver of existence to that purpose which he had expressed, He was not known, personally and practically to them. He was not known to them as Jehovah the agent, but only as El Shaddai the potent. Are we then to understand that Jehovah is identical in meaning with Ehjeh? We confess, that whatever be the right interpretation of these passages, in our opinion that of Dr. Murphy seems inconsistent and unsatisfactory. Another instance will be found in xvi. 14, where, in his explanation of Manna, he rejects the marginal rendering for reasons similar to those above, and we think equally unsatisfactory. There is evidently some blunder in the sentence on page 145, which has escaped the attention of the author. But Dr. Murphy is obviously the exegete rather than the critic, the theologian rather than the grammarian: and here we have much less fault to find, although there are some points which he has discussed somewhat hurriedly and unsatisfactorily, e.g., the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh, the miracles of the magicians, &c. As an exegetical work, however, this surpasses all that we are acquainted with upon the same subject. It embodies much searching and painstaking investigation without bewildering us with an undue parade of the processes by which the author has arrived at his conclusions. In this respect he has exercised a great amount of self-denial. The style is terse, graphic, perspicuous; the treatment of the subjects original, suggestive, striking, e.g., the pleas of Moses, the plagues and their meaning, the law and its divisions, &c. The author has glossed over no real perplexity by a wordy superficiality. We doubt not that by some he will be regarded as too prone to detect the symbols of Christian truths and principles in the events of the Exodus, yet even in this they will find that his remarks are not a string of fancies, but fruitful suggestions, pointing out instructive analogies if nothing more. We very strongly commend this work to the attention of all theological readers, both lay and clerical, feeling assured that it will invest many portions of this old book with a new and attractive meaning.

Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. 3rd Edition. Edited by W. L. ALEXANDER, D.D. Vol. III. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black.

This Herculean task has just been completed. The third volume has been expanded to 1175 pages, and sustains fully the magnificent promise of the earlier volumes. The maps and woodcuts are most excel-

lent, leaving nothing to be desired. A considerable element of bibliographical and biographical learning is comprised in this work, which, being omitted in other current dictionaries of the Bible, give a peculiar character to this. The numerous articles by the present editor are a great and valuable feature of the work, revealing astonishing comprehensiveness and great power of condensation. We refer particularly to those on Phœnicia, Shemitic languages, &c., &c. Dr. Ginsburg has greatly enriched the volume by the ample stores of his Rabbinical and Hebrew learning. His article on the 'Song of Songs' is full of deep and startling interest, and Dr. Mansell's article on 'Chaldean and Greek Philosophy' is well worthy of his great reputation. We hope, before long, to give some detailed examination of this noble contribution to biblical science, and meanwhile congratulate the learned and laborious editor on the successful termination of his great undertaking.

A Cyclopædia of Biblical Geography, Biography, Natural History, and General Knowledge. Div. III., IV., V. Edinburgh: Fullarton & Co.

This new competitor in the now crowded arena which it has entered holds on its way very vigorously. The arrangement, and the general quality of the articles, entitle it to an honourable place. Had not Dr. Smith and Dr. Alexander anticipated it, it would have found an instant and indispensable place in every theological library. It is worthy of note that of the four great Bible cyclopædias just now given to the public, Scotland produces three, viz., Dr. Alexander's, Dr. Fairbairn's, and the one before us.

It is not for us to question the expediency of the contemporaneous publication of so many Cyclopædias. If publishers find their account in it, the market is open, and we cannot have too many works of this class. It is a serious defect in this work that no editor's name appears on the title-page, and that no names of contributors are given. In works so multifarious and big, responsibility must necessarily be divided; not even upon an editor can the whole be fairly imposed. If anything like competence and independence are to be preserved, the name of each writer is a necessary instruction to the reader. The articles, however, so far as we can judge, are carefully done, and are fairly comprehensive and scholarly. Some of them would be improved if they were purged from the somewhat numerous Scotticisms that disfigure them. Some of the articles are expanded into elaborate treatises, and many great Biblical questions receive a full and argumentative treatment. Of these, the chief instance is the article on the Exodus, or, as the writer designates it, 'The alternative view of the Exode,' which occupies one hundred and thirty-eight pages. It is written with great ingenuity, and with a perfect mastery of the extensive literature of the subject; but it is a polemic for the maintenance of a theory rather than such a judicial statement of information as one expects in a cyclopædia. All the principal theories of the course and encampments of the Israelites are examined; the ordinary peninsular route is rejected, as not justified by the history, and as giving pertinence and power to the cavils of Colenso, whose speculations are brought into great prominence throughout the article. The theory maintained by the writer is substantially that put forth in 1834 by Dr. Beke in his 'Origines Biblicæ,' and adopted by a writer in 'The Journal of Sacred Literature,' for April, 1860. The

present writer amplifies and illustrates the statements of these writers, by a great mass of new facts and arguments, drawn from the records of modern travellers. The conclusions affirmed are, that the Exodus is a riddle which till now has remained unsolved; the 'Red Sea' of Scripture is not ~~the Gulf of Suez but the~~ Gulf of Akabah; which, therefore, was the true scene of the passage of the Israelites.—In harmony with this, the Egypt of Scripture was not the country of the Nile, but a country more to the East, through which a sweet water channel ran, connecting the Mediterranean with the Gulf of Suez, which channel was the river of Egypt upon which Moses was exposed; Goshen was the elevated region known as Mount Casion, on the boundary between Mizraim and Palestine; Horeb was the ridge of the Tih, and Sinai the Jebel-el-Amjah, a limestone ridge north of the Tih, on the plateau of the desert of the wanderings. The Israelites journeyed much farther to the east, and crossed the Jordan much farther to the north than is generally supposed.

It is impossible for us to examine in detail the statements and arguments which are adduced in support of these positions, and with which the article is literally crammed. We can only say that we have read the whole with great care—in the light of such intelligence as recent travel through the greater part of the district described gives us—and that the writer has utterly failed to convince us. He has, we think, greatly magnified the difficulties of the peninsular route, and has greatly understated the far greater difficulties of the route that he advocates. If he will concede to the former the suppositions by which he relieves the latter, they will wholly disappear. Whether the numerical test be that of the ordinary 'thousands' of our version, or that of 'armies' for which the writer contends, the difficulties which on the one supposition are only great, on the other are simply insuperable. There is really no difficulty in the peninsular route that has not recurred a thousand times to subsequent hordes of Bedouins. From Suez to Sinai there is not a physical obstacle to oppose the march of a multitude, while the present natural provision for sustenance is a hundredfold more than in the Tih range, which is utterly destitute of both vegetation and water, whereas both are plentifully found in the palm groves of Feiran and in the valleys of Sinai.

The writer is obliged to assume the former existence of both forest and river, in the region of the Tih, both of which are utterly incomprehensible to a traveller on the spot. The Tih is simply the precipitous limestone wall of the vast plateau of the desert, 4,000 feet high, and stretches in a rude semicircle right across the peninsula; the plateau having a uniform slope northwards to the Mediterranean. It is furrowed with deep water-courses, which form the system of the El Ariah, —a main trunk with extensive branches: these are the means of carrying off to the Mediterranean the volumes of water which fall in the down pour of the rainy season; the rest of the year they are dry. How a river could rise on the edge of a limestone precipice, or a forest be found there, is as incomprehensible as the supposition of such on the edge of Shakspeare's cliff at Dover.

If a change in productiveness is to be assumed, it is much easier to suppose it in the peninsula than in the El Tih. In recently traversing this region, from Suez to Sinai, and across the Desert to Palestine, with a keen interest in the questions connected with the Exodus, our difficulties, instead of being increased, were almost removed, allowance being made for even a minimum of such miraculous interference as the history

records. They would be removed entirely were we to avail ourselves of the interpretations and suppositions which the writer of this article brings to the support of his theory. There is an over-ingenuity in the arguments of the article which excites suspicion, and there are an assumption and a far-fetchedness in his interpretations, especially of the miraculous incidents of the history, which we cannot admit. The whole becomes a special pleading from which the judicial interpreter of history recoils. The article, however, is a very remarkable one, and is worthy the attention of all students of the Exodus.

Sure Standards of the Faith. By the Rev. W. M. STATHAM.
London: Cassell, Petter, & Galpin.

In a simple popular way, and with great conciseness and completeness, Mr. Statham puts the great arguments for Christianity, so as to furnish a manual for those who may not have access to larger works, or time for their perusal, and who may yet be perplexed by the questionings of modern scepticism. Various aspects of Christianity are discussed in seven lectures. The Characteristics of Christ's life, and the arguments for Christianity deducible therefrom, in the first; the Characteristics of the Church, in the second; of the New Testament writings, in the third; of the new life of Christian men, in the fourth, and so on. Mr. Statham's lectures make no pretensions to the scientific or elaborate treatment of those of Luthardt, Naville, or Auberlen; they are popular Sunday discourses, but they put the great points of each argument in a clear, telling way, so that the least intelligent may understand and appreciate them. If it be possible for a child to put questions which a philosopher cannot answer, it is also possible for the humblest Christian to put arguments, to which all the labour and learning of infidelity cannot reply. Such arguments for the use of the unlearned Mr. Statham has here brought together and put into popular form. His little book deserves our very warmest word of commendation.

Essays on the Irish Church. By Clergymen of the Established Church in Ireland. Oxford and London: James Parker and Co.

The Alleged Conversion of the Irish Bishops to the Reformed Religion at the Accession of Queen Elizabeth; and the Assumed Descent of the present Established Hierarchy in Ireland from the Ancient Irish Church Disproved. By W. MAGIERE BRADY, D.D. London: Longman and Co.

Hardly can we imagine a more desperate advocacy than that which would vindicate the Episcopal Establishment in Ireland. All the facts are against it; and its apologists are reduced to even a more hopeless predicament, than the theorising philosopher who consoled himself by the assurance that it was all the worse for the facts: reason, righteousness, and experience, are all against the maintenance of a church, which, having for three hundred years wielded all the appliances of a wealthy establishment, is—where the Irish Church is just now; and the argument is only the more fatal, if, Dr. Brady's demonstration notwithstanding, it be maintained, as is done by the writers in this volume, that

the Protestantism of Ireland dates from primitive Christian times. One of two things must be admitted—either that the Protestantism itself is wrong, or that the methods of maintaining it have been wrong. It contradicts every conception and experience of religious truth, to conceive of it as purely maintained, and wisely advocated, and yet for centuries on the losing side. The writers of the present volume are compelled to give up the argument from success, and to argue that a church exists for other reasons than to succeed. 'It is of course true, and has been fully acknowledged in the preceding pages that, owing to various adverse circumstances, the Church of this country, when accepting the Reformation, failed in drawing with her the mass of the population; and that she has consequently been, and still is, in a very decided numerical minority.' 'While the Church of Ireland and her ministers clearly recognise the duty of our endeavouring, by every lawful and hopeful means, to draw within her pale those who are without it, they do not recognise this as their first, chief, and paramount obligation, by their success or failure in which they are to stand or fall.' Mr. Edwards thinks that it is a sufficient justification of the continuance of the Irish Establishment that it should take care of those who do belong to it, and 'let its light shine before men.' The whole blame is thrown upon 'adverse circumstances,'—always the argument of the weak; scarcely to be admitted, however, in presence of the early progress of Christianity, and of the modern progress of Protestant Nonconformity; these succeeded, in spite of ten times the 'adverse circumstances,' that the Church in Ireland has had to endure. 'As to Roman Catholics,' argues Mr. Edwards, 'it is notorious that they are not, for the most part, open to conviction.' Surely a somewhat gratuitous aspersion; or true in only the sense in which Nonconformists might allege the same of Established Churchmen, who refuse to be convinced even by facts—the facts of their own comparative failure, and of the success of the churches opposed to them.

The fact is, that the writers of these Essays, able and candid as they are, fall into the common error of churchmen, and, first, identify spiritual religion with the visible church; next, the visible church with episcopacy; and finally, episcopacy with a national establishment. They claim for the whole of these conditions the prerogatives of each one; which makes it very difficult to argue with them. They refuse to admit that church organization is but the social form in which spiritual life embodies itself, and that, therefore, spiritual life may embody itself in various forms equally valid and Scriptural—thanks to the Divine wisdom which has left so much in church organization unlegislated for. They argue also as if national Establishments were of Divine obligation—whereas, neither on Scriptural, traditional, nor rational grounds, can they be regarded as other than mere expediences. Some would contend that on Scriptural grounds, having respect to all precedent, to the liberties of the spiritual life, and to the prerogatives of the great spiritual Head of the Church, they are essentially unlawful. Some of the wisest and most faithful adherents of the Church of England have regarded Establishments as mere expediences, and have pronounced against the Established Church of Ireland a sentence of condemnation as utter and severe as any that Nonconformists could pronounce. We need refer only to the Parliamentary debates and to the publications of the last fifty years, by men of all parties. The fact is, that Established Churchmen feel pretty much as Roman Catholics in England felt in the time of Henry VIII., and as Roman Catholics in Italy feel, in prospect of the

fall of the temporal power of the Pope;—they cling to their possessions with shrieking anathemas against all who would touch them. Every act in the history of the Protestant Establishment—however just to Roman Catholics, or to Protestant Nonconformists—by which the domination of the alien Church was ~~attempted~~, its usurpations curtailed, or its exactions limited, is regarded in these Essays as spoliation. Possession, however acquired, and, whoever else it may wrong, is right for the holder. These writers have only one conception of righteousness—that which is beneficial to the church established; no matter whether it is equitable to Nonconformists or not: *their* duty is plain; let them renounce their Nonconformity, and they will remove the inequality: they will then need no Maynooth; no exaction will wound their conscience; and there will be no incongruity in large revenues, and a numerous and princely episcopate. In their argument from possession, moreover, these writers confound the property which a nation intrusts to a corporation with the private possessions of individuals. The property appropriated by the nation to the church, in whatever form, is only trust property, intrusted for certain uses, which, at the time of intrustment, seemed desirable; but it does not follow that the intrustment is to be perpetually continued, despite of failure and of changing circumstances. The legislators of Henry VIII's time could not make unalterable laws, even for the Church, so as to preclude after generations from changing or abrogating them. The world cannot thus be delivered over to the wisdom of past centuries. Every prerogative of altering or making laws, of granting and directing the use of endowments that previous generations possessed, belongs to this. In secular charities, indeed, it is continually exercised; endowments for one purpose are, not indeed confiscated, but diverted to some other analogous and more practicable purpose. And there is nothing in the religious character of the Church to hinder a similar treatment of its endowments, or even a withdrawal altogether of such as have been intrusted to it by the nation, if such should seem desirable in the interests of religion. Of course equity demands that existing individual interests should be preserved unimpaired, as they are in all such cases; but, beyond this, a church organization has no claim, even in equity, upon the continuance of endowments that have so palpably failed in their purpose, or that are inequitable to others. It surely cannot be a matter of Divine right that one particular church organization, as such, shall, in all perpetuity possess endowments, whatever its position relative to other churches, or its failure in the use of them. Every argument by which Episcopalians justify the supercession of the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, or the supercession of the Pope's temporal power in Italy now, will justify the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church in Ireland. Of its kind, it is the greatest anomaly and scandal in Christendom.

But although we think the argument of the writers of these Essays utterly untenable, and their position desperate, we gladly bear testimony to the great ability, intelligence, and candour they display. They are remarkably free from the vituperation, aspersion of others, and unfair argument, which are often so painful in similar works. Nothing indeed can surpass the excellent temper and general fairness of the volume. The arguments of the writers are bad, but they are temperately urged, and they make the most of them. All that can be said for the Irish Church is here said in the best possible way. The introductory Essay, on the general question of Establishments, is very *doctrinaire*, and leads to lame and impotent conclusions; but it is very able, candid, and

generous. It even goes so far as to recommend the endowment of Nonconforming churches, while the Episcopal Church is maintained in its supremacy as an establishment. Its admissions indeed are very remarkable; so also are its assumptions; and equally so its assertion of the failure of the voluntary principle—the voluntarism of the Irish Roman Catholics—the Scottish Presbyterians—the Nonconforming churches of England and Wales notwithstanding. It is, for instance, a somewhat venturesome objection to voluntarism, in the present doctrinal state of the English Church to say, that 'It secures 'neither universality nor permanence of religious influence, and it 'exposes those influences to a deterioration of their quality;' and it is oddly oblivious of the fact that England has had an Established Church for three centuries, to urge, as an objection to voluntarism, the irreligious condition of large masses of the population of great towns. 'Voluntarism,' says Mr. Byrne, 'fails by virtue of its essential principle, in providing a universality of religious influences for the country.' Indeed, in the light of the present facts of the religious world, within and without Established churches, this argument against voluntarism is, in many ways, one of the most remarkable and piquant that we have seen. 'The Irish Roman Catholic Church,' it is oddly urged, 'is a 'striking example of all the evils incident to the voluntary system.' If Mr. Byrne's knowledge of voluntarism goes no further than this, we cease to wonder at this argument. Notwithstanding all this, we commend this volume to our readers as a careful and temperate putting of the case of the Irish Church. The writers have said for it all that can be said. Assuredly, therefore, Nonconformists may feel very complacent in both their principles and the speedy triumph thereof.

Dr. Brady, himself an Irish clergyman and chaplain to three successive Lords-Lieutenant, inflicts another heavy and unkind blow at upholders of the Irish Establishment. If the Evangelical authors of the 'Essays on 'the Irish Church' are deprived of the argument from utility, the High Anglican party are deprived by Dr. Brady of the argument from uninterrupted succession. It has ever been their boast that the present Episcopal Church in Ireland stands in the true succession of the ancient Irish Church, and traces an unbroken genealogy from St. Patrick. This is the position taken by Mr. Edwards in his 'Historical Sketch of the Church 'of Ireland.' 'Notwithstanding, therefore,' he remarks, 'the cavils of a 'few objectors, the general verdict of impartial writers attests the regularity and canonical authority of the Irish Reformation. . . . The 'prelates who had derived their authority and succession from the 'primitive bishops of the Church of Ireland were themselves the agents 'and instruments of her reformation. Of the entire hierarchy, consisting 'of four archbishops and twenty-two bishops, two only refused their 'consent, while all the rest continued in their sees, and from time to 'time, as vacancies occurred, consecrated others to fill them; so that 'every Irish bishop and clergyman in our own day can clearly trace his 'spiritual authority and ecclesiastical descent from the ancient Church 'of St. Patrick.' ('Essays on the Irish Church,' p. 99.) Dr. Brady, by what appears to us to be indisputable facts and arguments, proves diametrically the opposite, viz., that the present Irish Church derives its descent, not from the Church of St. Patrick, but from the English church of Bishop Bonner. Dr. Brady affirms that there is positive evidence to prove that the great majority of the Irish bishops refused to conform, and that there is not a particle of evidence to prove that any one of them conformed—the strong presumption being to the contrary—

except Hugh Curwin, Archbishop of Dublin; who was not an Irishman nor of Irish consecration, but was an Englishman, and consecrated in England by Bonner and other English bishops. This effectually cuts off the present Irish Episcopate from the pre-Reformation Church; first, because all its members are episcopally descended from Curwin, who received his ordination in England; and next, because if Curwin stood alone and ordained alone, his ordinations are invalid, inasmuch as canonically one bishop alone is incompetent to ordain another.

It is very curious that, as in England only one diocesan bishop took the oath of supremacy to Elizabeth, while the rest were deprived, and the archbishopric of Canterbury was filled in a very doubtful manner; so it was in Ireland. The High Church dependence upon succession, therefore, hangs in each country upon a link of very dubious metal. Matthew Parker's consecration is a very anxious question for the high churchmen of England, and Hugh Curwin's for those of Ireland. We wish them comfort in their historical faith, and in Dr. Brady's conclusion, that the present Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland really stands in the succession of St. Patrick. We need scarcely say that the decision of the question, either way, in no way concerns us, or affects our estimate of the Irish Establishment. Every faithful minister of Christ, in our judgment, stands in the true apostolic succession; if he is doing faithful work, we gladly bid him God speed; but it is a serious matter for those, the validity of whose church hangs upon a theory of episcopal ordination.

Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism. A Word about Intercommunion between the English and the Orthodox Churches. By J. J. OVERBECK, D.D. London: N. Trubner & Co.

Dr. Overbeck dates his preface from Reading, professes to be a member of the Orthodox (Russian) Church, and avows his object to be the establishment of a Western orthodox Catholic Church,—‘a reunion annihilating ‘schism and heresy, Romanism and Protestantism, unbounded tyranny ‘and unbounded liberty.’ How he purposes to accomplish this does not appear, unless it be by a *tour de force*, for he is unmeasured in his lofty denunciation of every Church but his own, and imperiously summons it to implicit submission. He has but little mercy for Rome, the schism of the West; he has still less for the English Episcopal Church, which ‘stands insulated without any recognised Catholic sister-Church, dis- ‘owned by the whole Catholic Church.’ ‘The English Church is not, ‘and never was recognised by any Catholic Church.’ As to the Anglo-Catholic section of it, its members ‘are so incredibly short-sighted as ‘to identify the English Church with their own limited party in the ‘Church.’ Dr. Overbeck ruthlessly denies the validity of the orders and sacraments of the English Church, quoting against those who maintain them, Hooker and other Anglican authorities, and reminding them that the Romish Church insists upon the reordination of their clergy. He denies the unity of the Church, dwelling with cruel unction upon its divisions; the Episcopal Church is ‘a queer medley of quarrelling parties; an ‘instructive pattern-card of heresiology.’ He taunts it with its obsequious seeking of communion with the Eastern Church, and plainly tells it—even more haughtily than Rome tells Dr. Pusey—that compromise is impossible; inasmuch as it is essentially a Protestant and heretical

Church, it must abjure all Church pretensions, and unconditionally submit.

Dr. Overbeck writes somewhat wildly and spasmodically, but he hits very hard. Evangelicals, Broad-churchmen, and Ritualists all come in for a share of his blows; the latter are the most to be pitied, as they receive them kneeling. Surely the scorn poured upon them by both the Roman and the Eastern Church will teach them the folly of their mimic hierarchy and spurious sacerdotalism.

www.libtool.com.cn

The Conflict of Christ in His Church with Spiritual Wickedness in High Places. Sermons preached during the season of Lent, 1866, in Oxford, with a Preface by SAMUEL, Lord Bishop of Oxford. Oxford and London : James Parker & Co.

The Oxford Lent Sermons have become an annual contribution to sermon literature, and generally of considerable value. They deal with a higher range of subjects than ordinary pulpit addresses, and they are preached by picked men. Some of the volumes have long occupied an honoured place upon our shelves. Of course they are decidedly Anglican in ecclesiastical feeling; but they are no less decidedly spiritual, evangelical, and devout. They maintain uncompromisingly the great doctrines of salvation which are so vital and so precious, and so far as practical sermons can, they opportunely maintain Evangelical views of the great facts connected with the character and work of our Lord, which rationalistic teachers assail. We do not think the present volume equal in ability, or calculated for the usefulness of some of its predecessors. The preachers are able men, such as the Bishop of Oxford, Professor Mansel, Mr. Woodford, the Dean of Canterbury, and Dr. Pusey; but either their inspiration has somewhat failed, or the subject of the course has not been favourable to effective discourse. In the first five or six sermons there is considerable sameness, the topics being too closely allied for treatment by separate preachers. The same preacher would have avoided repetition, but different preachers almost inevitably traverse the same lines of thought. There is, too, a certain vagueness, a want of articulation, precision, point, and power in many of the discourses, producing the feeling of talk *about* matters, the heart of which is not penetrated. This is especially the case, strange to say, with Professor Mansel's sermon on 'The Conflict and Defeat in Eden,' of which the narrative as such is utterly ignored. Most of the sermons indeed are meditations rather than discussions. This is a characteristic of modern Church of England preaching, which distinguishes it from that of its earlier periods, and also from the preaching of Nonconformists—not, we think, to its advantage. It wants grip and thoroughness. One feels as if listening to a vague lulling sound, rather than to a vigorous, instructive, and decisive discussion. This makes the assumptions of the preachers all the more unwarrantable; such, for instance, as the surreptitious adjective employed by Mr. Carter, 'On these momentous words ["ye are 'come unto Mount Sion," &c.] rests the belief of the guardian angels of baptized souls.' Why 'baptized' rather than redeemed or regenerated souls? Surely, a sacramentarian theory should not be introduced in this contraband way. Cool and flagrant assumptions of this kind are, however, after the manner of our Anglican friends. Making due allowance for these, we commend this volume for thoughtful, devotional reading.

Studies for Sunday Evening. By LORD KINLOCH. Edinburgh : Edmonston & Douglas.

Lord Kinloch does not think that the devotional feelings which Sunday evening readings should produce are nurtured best by mere musings of inactive thought, or by mere excitements of sentimental feelings. He refuses to follow where so many now lead, and insists upon vigorous, suggestive, and accurate thought, as the noblest handmaid of the devotional soul. In right and worthy thoughts of God lie the seeds of all healthy feeling and true religiousness. In this respect his admirable little volume of verse, 'Time's Treasures' was greatly superior to the sentimentalisms of 'The Christian Year.' So this little volume of short essays is worth a thousand rhapsodical and sentimental spiritualisings; vigorous thought, felicitous expressions, and a tender and devout feeling are its characteristics; not only are we instructed as well as moved, we are moved by being instructed. We gladly give it our strongest commendation.

Discourses delivered in Christ Church, New-road, Brighton. By the Rev. ROBERT AINSLIE. London : Longmans.

It was a matter of sincere regret to us when the gifted author of these Discourses terminated, or at least greatly modified his relation with Evangelical Congregationalism, by becoming the minister of Christ Church, Brighton; but it is gratifying to discern, throughout this volume a generous, liberal, and even affectionate recognition of the great teachers of catholic Christianity. It would be difficult to gather from these discourses the doctrinal changes, which Mr. Ainslie's theology has undergone. He makes the trite repudiation of ecclesiastical or scholastic systems of theology, and puts forth the claim urged by all sections of Christian thinkers to the possession of the simplest primitive Christianity of the New Testament. The discourses are grouped into four series, each consisting of eight sermons. The perfections and attributes of God, the religious life, and an expository treatment of 1 Cor. xiii., are the topics of the first three series. The remaining section contains miscellaneous sermons. The whole of these discourses are characterised by clearness and force of style, by masculine common sense and sound ethical wisdom. There is no bombast, no pretence, no straining after effect. We find on every page classical repose, and self-restraint, and may we add coldness? at least the passion and fire are well under control. There is more of the spirit of the Ecclesiastes than of the Gospel of John; there is much practical advice concerning duty, but there is no grappling with the mysteries of life or salvation. A busy man, a statesman whose religious principles were settled, a quiet mind that never felt a theological difficulty, and had suffered no intense agony over sin, might be made more vigorous, more loving, and more useful too by the perusal of some of these discourses, but we do not think that a broken heart, or a bewildered intellect would find the balm or guidance which we are satisfied the author wishes to supply. With the larger portion of the volume we cordially agree, though we are conscious of moving into a completely different region of thought the moment we pass from that of Hooker, Baxter, Hall, or Bunyan, whom the author so reverently quotes, into that which is created by himself. There is unstinted praise of the moral teaching and sublime example of Jesus Christ; the words of Christ, and the portrait of Christ as given in the Gospel, are accepted without reserve; there is profound reverence for the mighty working of the Holy Spirit of God; but the

thing which Christ did for us to inspire our love and obedience is now where clearly announced. There is little left to worship in the Divinity of Jesus, and no supernatural or mysterious operation, nothing, beyond what is simply natural, to be discerned in conversion to God. In the tone of these discourses there is nothing harsh or offensive towards old friends, and herein the volume widely differs from some others on which we have been occasionally called to comment. We therefore cordially invite to it the attention of those of our readers who are anxious to see what may be made of Christianity when it is deprived of much that we esteem to be essential to it, and when its exposition is abundantly characterised by culture, intelligence, and candour.

Essays for the Times on Ecclesiastical and Social Subjects. By JAMES H. RIGG, D.D., Author of 'Modern Anglican Theology.' London: Elliot Stock.

These essays have, with one or two exceptions, appeared as contributions to 'The London Quarterly Review.' Dr. Rigg does not contribute much to the permanent philosophy or theology of the Church; his strength lies chiefly in criticism of passing phases of thought, and his essays have chiefly a polemical value. They are essentially 'Essays for the Times.' Dr. Rigg 'catches the manners living as they rise.' The papers in this volume discuss such matters as 'The Vocation and Training of the Clergy,' 'The Established Church, Defects and Remedies,' 'The Puritan Ancestors and High Church Parents of the Wesleys,' 'Kingsley and Newman,' 'Pusey's Eirenicon,' 'Archbishop Manning and Dr. Pusey,' &c. Dr. Rigg wields a trenchant pen—he is keen, sagacious, and merciless in discriminating truth and in exposing error; his thinking is robust, and his temperament somewhat hard, a 'sharp threshing instrument having teeth.' In some things, perhaps, he would have greater insight and more power were his sensibilities somewhat more refined; but he is a redoubtable *malleus hereticorum*, and does valiant battle for the truth.

Dr. Rigg prefixes to his essays an Introduction, on 'The Relations of Wesleyan Methodism to the Established Church; a matter not easy for outsiders to understand, and yet which, if understood, would be a key to Dr. Rigg's stand-point, more satisfactory in giving a notion of his book than a detailed examination of his essays. The truth is, that the Wesleys themselves have scarcely determined this question. There is a young Wesleyanism and an old Wesleyanism; and the one, we presume, would not be content to accept the exposition of the other. Even Dr. Rigg is not very consistent with himself. In one place he tells us, 'The Wesleyan Methodists, indeed, have always and rightly objected to be called Dissenters. Their organisation did not originate in dissent; dissent from the Church of England had nothing whatever to do with any part of their peculiar and essential economy as Methodists. Methodism went forth from the tents of the mother-church because it was, in fact, driven forth. The Church of England counted Methodism as a Hagar, and thrust her out into the wilderness with her sons.' A strange statement for a man with Dr. Rigg's historical knowledge and keen acumen to make, if, as it obviously is, intended to intimate a difference between the origin of Methodism and the origin of 'Dissent,' popularly so called. In every sense, speaking generally, in which the first Nonconformists were dissenters from the Established Church, the first Methodists were. Even Dr. Owen

was not an Anti-state churchman, scarcely any of the early Nonconformists were. Their separation from the church, like that of the Methodists, was on practical and not on theoretic grounds. They 'went forth from the tents of the mother-church, because they were, in fact, driven forth.' As with the Methodists and the Free Church of Scotland, their practical action preceded their formulated principles of Anti-state-churchism. The only difference is that Congregationalists are a few generations older than Methodists, just as Methodists are older than Free Church Presbyterians. The voluntary principles of Congregationalists have grown to maturity; those of our Wesleyan brethren are making all the progress that the most ardent voluntary could desire. Dr. Rigg himself is far in advance of Dr. Bunting. The Wesleyans may object to be called Dissenters—we do not insist upon the designation; but Dissenters in fact they are, and have been, in every sense in which we are Dissenters, from the day that the first Wesleyan society administered the sacraments and ordained a minister. It is unworthy of a man like Dr. Rigg, and unworthy of our Wesleyan brethren to persist in a thing, and to repudiate the vernacular designation of it.

We are glad to say, however, that Dr. Rigg has better moods than this. In his Introduction, he protests vigorously against any supposition of the identification or approximation of the Wesleyan churches to the Established Church. 'There has been a wide-spread impression that Wesleyan Methodists are barely separated from the Established Church of England; that, so far as they are separated, such separation is in violation of their own original principles, and that they might, without any great violence or difficulty, be reunited with the Established Church. It is high time that such delusions on these points as have prevailed should be dissipated. I have no hesitation in saying that there is not the remotest possibility of the Wesleyan Methodist church ever being absorbed in the Church of England. And I doubt whether out of the many hundreds of Wesleyan ministers, and of the hundreds of thousands of Wesleyan communicants, there are altogether a score of persons who would not smile with supreme amusement if such a proposal were presented to them.' Then, after citing Mr. Wesley himself as a declared Nonconformist, 'It is well,' adds Dr. Rigg, 'that it should be known that, speaking generally, neither ministers nor people now acknowledge any allegiance, or anything like a filial relation to the Church of England. We are as independent of the Church of England as those who call themselves Dissenters, or as we are of the Dissenters themselves.' 'Speaking generally, the repugnance of Wesleyan Methodists to join the Church of England is stronger than that of Dissenters.' This, at any rate, is unequivocal. We must leave Dr. Rigg to reconcile it with such sentences as we first quoted, with the unquestionable repudiation of the very idea of dissent by the Wesleyans themselves, and with the equally unquestionable fact that no class of persons have supplied more clergymen to the Established Church than the more respectable Wesleyans, and especially Wesleyan ministers. We quite believe that the growing feeling of Methodism is as Dr. Rigg states. We trust, therefore, that we have heard for the last time invidious comparisons between the semi-affiliation to the Established Church of Wesleyan Methodism, and of the naughty repudiation of her maternity and control by Puritan and Congregational Dissenters.

One of these 'Essays' was delivered in Exeter Hall as a lecture,

before the Young Men's Christian Association. It is somewhat grandiloquent and superficial. It abounds in platitudes and sweeping assertions, which are not worthy of Dr. Rigg's powers, and hardly may pass muster in a professed treatise on the 'Influence of the Bible on the progress of civilization, science, and art.' The ground traversed is too vast, and the argument is often most insecure.

The Papal Drama. A Historical Essay. By THOMAS H. GILL.
London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1866.

Should any sound Protestant be conscious of having his eyes dazzled by the pyrotechny of Rome, or his spirit discomposed by the assumptions of Manning, Wiseman, or Montalembert, let him read some calm, judicial record of the History of the Papacy. A volume or two of Milman's admirable History of Latin Christianity, will prove a powerful disenchantment. A few facts are worth libraries of vapid declamation. The work before us is a careful and elaborate portraiture of the rise, triumph, decline, and agony of the Popedom. It reviews the part taken by Italy, France, and Austria, as actors in the Papal drama, estimates the past and present relations of this country with the Roman Church, and predicts the catastrophe of the utter fall and ultimate ruin of the latter. Learning and research are apparent throughout, and some poetic inspiration has guided the pen of the author in arranging the scenes of his prose drama, the changing tableaux of his terrible *épopée*. We think he writes too vehemently, too obviously in the spirit of a partizan, and a determined enemy of the Papacy, to produce the salutary effect achieved by the perusal of either Milman or Ranke, nevertheless, we hail the work as timely and valuable. We are not so sanguine of the approaching fall of 'Babylon the Great' as our author appears to be, but we are not unthankful for his burning words.

The New Testament for English Readers, containing the Authorised Version, with a Revised English Text; Marginal References; and a Critical and Explanatory Commentary: by HENRY ALFORD, D.D. Vol. II. Part II. London: Rivingtons. 1866.

This great work is now completed, and forms a very admirable contribution to theological and biblical science. Dean Alford has presented to the English reader much more than an abridgment of his valuable Commentary on the Greek Testament. The notes, and introductions, and general prolegomena appear to be given entire. Quotations from foreign commentators, and from Greek and Latin fathers are translated. The text which Dean Alford has finally decided upon as the best provisional text of the entire New Testament is carefully translated, and arranged in parallel columns with the authorised version. In the *notes* will be found a more literal translation than that which is presented above, and thus the English reader will have ample material for consideration. We do not here criticise either the text, translation, or notes. Whatever may be the faults or defects characterising so vast an undertaking, we owe the greatest obligation to the author of a work which has done so much to popularize Biblical criticism and hermeneutics, and to bring the stores of German philology and exegesis within the compass and reach of the English student.

The words with which the author concludes his prolegomena are so striking and noble, that we venture to reproduce them. 'I complete my

'work with humble thankfulness, but with a sense of utter weakness before the power of God's word, and inability to sound the depths even of its simplest sentence. May He spare the hand which has been put forward to touch His ark: may He, for Christ's sake, forgive all rashness, all perverseness, all uncharitableness, which may be found in this book, and sanctify it to the use of His church; its truth, if any, for teaching; its manifold defects for warning. My prayer is and shall be, that in the stir and labour of men over His word, to which these volumes have been one humble contribution, others may arise to teach, whose labours shall be so far better than mine, that this book and its writer may ere long be utterly forgotten. Come, Lord Jesus.'

The Critical English Testament: being an Adaptation of Bengel's Gnomon. With numerous Notes, showing the precise results of Modern Criticism and Exegesis. Edited by Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A., and Rev. JAMES HOWES, M.A. Vols. I. and II. London: Alexander Strahan.

It is enough to say concerning this work, that it is a new and complete translation of Bengel's 'Gnomon,' annotated by two competent scholars, and enriched with references to the most recent critical writers. It is a critical New Testament, containing the latest contributions of modern scholarship to New Testament exegesis, for the use of those unacquainted with the Greek language. Concerning Bengel's 'Gnomon,' first published in 1742, Archdeacon Hare justly said, 'He condenses more matter into a line than can be extracted from pages of other writers.' Notwithstanding the rich contributions of the past century to New Testament exegesis, the 'Gnomon' still stands *facile princeps*; it needs supplementing, but it has not been superseded. Such supplement the editors have supplied by incorporating, in brackets, the most important results of modern textual criticism, such as are contained in the works of Tischendorf, Alford, Ellicott, and others. A more valuable hand-book for the minister's table could not have been supplied.

The First Epistle of John, expounded in a Series of Lectures. By ROBERT S. CANDLISH, D.D. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black.

The Son of Thunder was also the Apostle of Love; and one of the most acute and learned theologians of Scotland, whose sword has seldom rested in its scabbard, has left the region of controversy and presented us with a noble volume of expository lectures on his First Epistle. There is the same subtle thought and close theologic analysis that characterised Dr. Candlish's former productions, but the theme of this volume is Christian life and experience in its higher walks and most exalted aspirations.

Dr. Candlish divides the Epistle into three groups of considerations; the first, fellowship with God in light; the second, fellowship with God in righteousness and righteous love; the third, this fellowship with God triumphant over the world and its Prince. This broad analysis of the Apostle's thought is carefully sustained in the succession of discourses arranged under each of these headings. Every sermon is complete in itself, and exhibits that concentration of thought upon each successive topic for which Dr. Candlish is so remarkable, indeed, one might imagine each truth as it comes into his grasp, to be the one solitary, infinite

reality which he had given his whole energy to expound ; but, notwithstanding this, there are obvious links of connection present to his mind, and with much brilliance he draws forth from the Divine casket chains of jewels which beautify and illumine one another. These lectures are more fit for private meditation than for critical dissection, and we are too thankful to the author for his heart-searching words, to submit them to any detailed analysis. It may be observed that he has made wise use of all modern researches into the text, and handles with great skill the *loci verati* of the Epistle, here as elsewhere showing the results of ripe scholarship. www.libtool.com.cn

The Complete Works of Thomas Brooks. Edited, with Memoir, by the Rev. ALEXANDER BALLOCK GROSART, Liverpool. Vols. I., II., and III. Edinburgh : James Nichol.

Mr. Nichol has begun nobly his new series of the later English Puritans with the complete works of Thomas Brooks, the Independent pastor of St. Mary Magdalen ; the first three volumes of which are before us. Brooks is but little known save by his 'Precious Remedies,' his 'Mute Christian,' and his 'Unsearchable Riches of Christ,' and yet he was, perhaps, the very greatest of the later Puritans. A contemporary of Thomas Fuller and of John Milton,—born, indeed, in the same year as the great Puritan poet, he was a noticeable man, even side by side with such compeers.

With infinite painstaking and genial garrulousness, Mr. Grosart has compiled an excellent memoir of him, carefully gathering together all scraps of information concerning him that can now be found. What is more, Mr. Grosart has for the first time given us a careful and conscientious text, scrupulously free from the licentious emendations and finikin modernisings of Mr. Bradley, the Tract Society editors, the editor of Ward's Standard Library, and most others. Mr. Grosart is punctilious to a comma, for which he deserves the hearty thanks of all lovers of pure literature. Even as contributions to our knowledge of Commonwealth literature, these reprints are of very great value. The religious value of their subject matter is above all price.

A Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews. Being the substance of Thirty Years' Wednesday's Lectures at Blackfriars, London. By that holy and learned divine, WILLIAM GOUGE, D.D., and late Pastor there. Before which is prefixed a Narrative of his Life and Death. Vol. I. (Puritan Commentaries.) Edinburgh : James Nichol.

The new volume of the 'Commentaries,' by the learned Rector, for forty-five years, of St. Ann's, Blackfriars, and member of the Assembly of Divines, is especially valuable, both from its great rareness, and its great excellence and learning. No editor's prefix, no preface, nor note of information is given, but we presume the Comment has been printed from the text of the folio of 1655. The editors have retained the short, but succinct and interesting biographical narrative prefixed to that edition, and they could not have done better. Except Owen on the Hebrews, no such critical and learned commentary on this important book is to be found in English theology. This reprint will be a great boon to students. We could have desired concerning the man, a little of the biographical gossip of which Mr. Grosart is so great a master.

INDEX

To the Forty-fourth Volume of "The British Quarterly Review."

- Ainslie, Rev. Robert, Discourses, 575.
 Alford, Henry, D.D., New Testament for English Readers, 578.
 Allies, T. W., Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church, 269.
 Angus, Joseph, M.A., D.D., Handbook of Specimens of English Literature, 254.
 Anstie, Francis Edmund, M.D., Notes on Epidemics, 545.
Atonement, Moral View of the, 410.—Recent origin of this opinion, *ib.*; Teachings of the Fathers, 411; and of later Theologians, 413; Moral view wanting in power and not to be preached, 415; Moral sense of man asks for an expiation, 418; So does the moral government of God, 419; Is there such a thing as Divine forgiveness, 422; Or is sin only a moral disease, 425; Moral view compared with the teachings of Scripture, 426; Character of Bushnell's book, 429; Was the death or the suffering the Atonement, 431; Texts brought forward by Bushnell, 438; The idea of expiation present in the Jewish sacrifices, 441; Importance of the subject, 450.
 Baker, S.W., Albert N'yanza, 230; Various discoverers in Africa, 231; Author's characteristics as a traveller, *ib.*; Relation of his discoveries to those of Speke and Grant, 232.
 Baur, Dr. F. C., Vorlesungen über die Christliche Dogmengeschichte, 297.
 Baxter, R. Dudley, the New Reform Bill. See Reform.
 Beychlag, Prof. Dr., Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments, 295.
 Biblical Cyclopædia, 567; Article on the Exodus; New route suggested, 568.
Biran, Maine de, 301.—Hardly known in England, *ib.*; not generally in France, 302; Opinions of Naville, Royer-Collard, and Cousin regarding him, *ib.*; His place among French philosophers, 303; Peculiar connection with this century, 304; A psychologist, not a metaphysician, *ib.*; A savant, 305; First a stoic in religion, but at last a Christian, *ib.*; De Biran's birth and history, 306; unharmed by the Revolution, 307; His essay crowned, *ib.*; His marriage, 309; Abandons sensationalism, 312; His great work now lately published, 313; Goes to Paris and mixes in public affairs, *ib.*; Made a councillor of state, 314; Embraces Christianity, 315; His views on consciousness, 316; Duality of human nature, 320; Four 'systems' in man, 321; Criticism of Descartes and other philosophers, 324; M. Jouffroy's doctrine regarding consciousness, 326; Defects in De Biran's system of psychology, 330; religious sentiments, 341.
 Björnson, Björnstjerne, Arne, a sketch of Norwegian life, 557.
 Blackley and Howes' Critical English Testament, 579.
 Bois, C., Valeur religieuse du Surnaturel, 291.
 Bonifas, P., Unité de l'enseignement Apostolique, 290.
Boole, Professor, 141.—Birth and parentage, 142; Early life, 143; Choice of profession, 144; First mathematical essays, 145; Correspondence

- with Mr. Gregory, 147; Life at Lincoln, 151; Effects of study of mathematics, 152; Right use of leisure, 153; First paper for the Royal Society, 155; Mathematical analysis of logic, 157; Professorship at Cork, 158; Lecture on the claims of science, 159; Philosophy of the ancients, 161; Theory of probabilities, 163; University honours, *ib.*; Social aspect of intellectual culture, address on, 164; Marriage, 165; Admission into the Royal Society, 167; Literary distinctions, 168; Treatise on differential equations, 169; Kind-heartedness, 170; Love for children; sincere piety, 171; Mathematical researches, value of, 172; Mathematical and logical writings, 173; Calculus of deductive reasoning, 177; Laws of thought, 178; De Morgan and Jevons on Boole's system, 179.
- Bouvier, Auguste, Affirmation et Indépendance, 291.
- Brady, W. Maziere on the Irish Church, 569.
- Brooks, Thomas, complete Works, Edited by Grosart, 583.
- Brown, James Baldwin, The Home Life, 277.
- Browne, Matthew, Views and Opinions, 558.
- Brusson, Ch., Les Psaumes, traduits de l'Hébreu, 289.
- Buchanan, Robert, London Poems, 549.
- Bushnell, Horace, The Vicarious Sacrifice, 410.
- Buzacott's Mission Life in the Islands of the Pacific, 540.
- Byrne, Mrs. Wm. Pitt, Cosas de España, 541.
- Camille, par l'Auteur des Horizons Prochains, 294.
- Candlish on the First Epistle of John, 579.
- Carpenter, Mary, Last Days of the Rajah Rammohun Roy, 542.
- Chevalier, Michel, L'Armée Prussienne. See Germanic Empire.
- Christian's Mistake. See John Halifax, Author of.
- Chrysostom, St. John, on the Priesthood, Translated by B. Harris Cowper, 280.
- Clemency Franklyn, 259.
- Collette, C. H., Dr. Newman and his Religious Opinions, 269.
- Comte Auguste, *Life and Works*, 58.—His various disciples, *ib.*; Their eclectic spirit, 60; Man must worship, 62; Mr. Mill's criticism, 63; Birth and childhood, 65; Friendship with St. Simon, 66; Marriage, 67; Mental disease, 68; Positive philosophy, 70; Precursors of positive philosophy, 71; Classification of the sciences, 72; Law of the three stages, 73; Mr. Herbert Spencer, 74; Social science, 75; Insufficiency of mere human science, 76; Positivist calendar, 77; Comte's revolutionary tendencies, 78; Litigation with his publisher, 79; Transcendent self-importance, 80; Pecuniary need, domestic distress, 81; Attachment to Madame de Vaux, 82; Change of method, 83; *Système de Politique positive*, 84; Positivist society founded, 85; generosity of his friends, 86; Last will and testament, 87; Wide influence of positivism, 88; Future of positivism, 89.
- Conder, R., Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, 284.
- Congregationalism, *English and American*, 90; Spiritual Life, its origin and power, *ib.*; Liberty of conscience, its first claimants, 91; Conduct of the first Christians, 92; Reign of Constantine, *ib.*; Freedom of Conscience, how lost and regained, 93; Churches of the Reformation, *ib.*; Court Clergy and Puritan Clergy, struggles between them, 94; First Independent Church, 95; Scrooby, *ib.*; John Robinson, 96; The Early Separatists and their sufferings, 97; Early Congregationalists, their principles, 98, 99; New Plymouth Colony of Pilgrims, 100; New England Union of Church and State, 101; Faction of Lyford and Oldham; 102; Troubles in Massachusetts, Roger Williams, 103; Antinomian Controversy, 105; The Quakers, 107; Progress of Religious Liberty, 109; Rise of Unitarianism in the United States, 111; Writings of Dr. Belsham, 113; Parallel between the Arian Defections in England and America, *ib.*; Great defects in American Congregationalism, 115; What English Congregationalism has been, 115—119; Comparative view of English and American Congregationalism, 119; Councils of Churches, 120; Ordination, the Pastorate, usages with respect to, 122.

Coquerel, M., fils, *Les premières transformations historiques du Christianisme*, 290.

Cousin, *Œuvres Philosophiques de M. de Biran*, edited by, *see* Biran.

Cox, Samuel, *The Secret of Life*, 284.

Crump on Bank Currency and the Exchanges, 543.

Daguerre, L. J. M., *History and Practice of Photogenic Drawing*. *See* Photography.

Dante, *The Vision of Hell*, illustrated by M. Gustave Doré, 547.

Dasent, G. W., *Story of Giall, the outlaw, from the Icelandic*, 255.

Delitzsch, F., *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Job*, 563.

Dexter, Henry M., on Congregationalism. *See* Congregationalism.

Disderi, *L'Art de la Photographie*. *See* Photography.

Döllinger, John Ignatius, *The First Age of Christianity and the Church*, 273.

Dove in the Eagle's Nest, *The*, 253

Eliot, George, *Felix Holt, the Radical*, 260.

Ellis, Mrs., *The Beautiful in Nature and Art*, 251.

Ewald, Heinrich, *Allgemeines über die Hebräische Dichtung und über das Psalmenbuch*, 296.

Felt, Joseph, *Ecclesiastical History of New England*, *see* Congregationalism.

ianism. *See* Ireland.

Financial Panic, Recent, 125; *Failure of the Bank Act, complaint against it*, 126; *Financial Crises, causes of*, 126; *Financial Influence of Railway Bills*, 127; *Third Failure of the Bank Act*, 133; *Bullion Reserve, Reasons in favour of*, 134; *Allegations in defence of present System*, 135; *Remedies required*, 137.

First Independent Church in England, 95.

Fischer, Kuno, *Geschichte der Neuern Philosophie*, 299.

George, H. B., *The Oberland and its Glaciers*, 537.

Germanic Empire, The New, 503; *Rapid growth of Prussia and Sardinia*, *ib.*; *Points of similarity in their fortunes*, 504; *Moral differences*, 505; *Unscrupulous conduct of Prussia, with regard to Poland, and*

to Schl
and pr
506; 1
pulsory
ib.; On
tary on
mauds
Austri
the los
ib.; R
herself
513; 1
ib.; T
ance
blunde
advant
520; 1
by Pr
annexi
sition
Prussia
where
ing he
Parliar
tria, 5
Europe
this in
France
recent
should
effects
and of

Gill, T. I
Gladston
but rec
224-22
Gordon,
462-46
Gotthelf,
fare, 5
Gouge, V
Whole
Grant, H
283.
Guérin,
Guizot, M
la Reli

Hamilton
Haringto
559.

Harvey,
and o
Head of
Halifa
Heard,
Natur
Held, P
296.

- Herschel, Sir J. F. W., Works on Photography, 346.
 Hester's Sacrifice, 261.
 Hollard, Roger, *Essai sur le Caractère de Jésus Christ*, 291.
 Howells, Wm. D., *Venetian Life*, 540.
 Howitt, Margaret, Twelve Months with Fredrika Bremer, 239.
 Hugo, Victor, *Les Travailleurs de la Mer*, 286.
 Hunt, Robert, Researches on Light in its Chemical Relations. *See* Photography.
 Ireland, 1; Conspiracy against Queen's Government, *ib.*; State Trials, 2; Fenianism, 3; Causes of it, 4; Penal Code, 7; Conquest, Conflicting Creeds, Commercial Restraints, 9; state in the last Century, 11; policy of Pitt, 12; policy of his successors, 13; state of things in 1853, 15; Sir Robert Peel's policy, 16; great Famine and its results, 18; moral and material state of Ireland since 1846, 20; what should be our Irish policy, 22; case of the Establishment, 24, 28; reform of the landed system, 29; supplemental measures, 31.
 Irish Church, Essays on, 569.
 Jamaica, 452; outbreak of the mutiny, its origin, 453; attack on the Whites in the Court-house, 454; account of atrocities not verified, *ib.*; Hordley House sacked, 455; prompt measures taken, and not resisted, *ib.*; real intentions of the rebels, 456; the conspiracy at an end, 458; court-martials and indiscriminate slaughter, 460; opinions formed in England, *ib.*; letter from Col. Elkington, 461; character of Gordon, 462; his arrest and execution, 464; conclusion on the whole matter, 465; recall of Governor Eyre, *ib.*; his colleagues left unpunished, *ib.*; Jamaica Committee, 466; Eyre's explanation, *ib.*; What Dr. Underhill did, 467; condition of the people, 468; Unpopularity of Governor Eyre, 469; effects of emancipation on the West Indies, 470; influence of the Baptists and Wesleyans, 472; selection of the new Governor, 474.
 John Halifax, Author of, 32; distinctive characteristics, 33; purity and goodness, *ib.*; influence of writers of fiction, 34; Wilkie Collins and George Macdonald, 35; simplicity of style, 38; The Ogilviea, 40; artistic mistakes, 42; Head of the Family, John Halifax, 43; superiority of John Halifax, 48; Mistress and Maid, 49; Robert Lyon and Hilary Leaf, 53; A Noble Life, 54; Christian's Mistake, 55; secret of the author's strength and weakness, 57.
 Kiel and Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Books of Samuel, 563.
 Kingsley, Rev. C., Hereward the Wake, 256.
 Kingsley, Henry, Leighton Court, 258.
 Kinloch, Lord, Studies for Sunday Evening, 575.
 Kitto's Cyclopædia, edited by W. L. Alexander, D.D., 566.
 Klostermann, A., *Vindiciæ Lucanæ seu de itinerarii in libro Actorum asservati auctore*, 297.
 Leslie, Lieut.-Col. Forbes, The Early Races of Scotland and their Monuments, 249.
 Life for a Life, A, 49.
 Littré, E., *Auguste Comte et La Philosophie Positive*. *See* Comte.
 Lucas, Rev. S., The Biblical Antiquity of Man, 277.
 Lyra Consolationis, 263.
 MacGregor, Sir C. E., Bart., Garibaldi at Home, 239.
 Martin, Frances, The Poet's Hour, 263.
 ———— Spring-time with the Poets, 263.
 Matson, Rev. T., The Inner Life. A Poem, 553.
 Mehring, G., *Die Philosophisch-Kritischen Grundsätze des Selbstvoranssetzung oder die Religions-Philosophie*, 297.
 Miller, Joseph, Our Hymns, Biographical Sketches, 554.
 Mill, John Stuart, *Auguste Comte and Positivism*. *See* Comte.
 Mistress and Maid. *See* John Halifax, Author of.
 M'Neile, Rev. Hugh, Fidelity and Unity, 270.
 Molesworth, Rev. W. N., History of the Reform Bill. *See* Reform.
 Monkhoven, D. V., *Traité Général de Photographie*, 346.
 Monod, M. Jean, *Discours d'Installation*, 291.
 Moorhouse, Rev. J., Four Sermons, 282.

Murphy, J. G., Commentary on the Book of Exodus, 565.

Naville, E., Maine de Biran, Sa Vie et ses Pensées, 301.

Noble Life, A, 54.

Ogilvie, The, 40—42.

Olive, 42.

Overbeck, J. J., Catholic Orthodoxy and Anglo-Catholicism, 573.

Oxenham, H. N., on Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon, 269.

Pain, The Mystery of, 278.

Palfrey, J. G., History of New England, 90.

Parke, Bessie Rayner, Vignettes, 542.

Parr, Harriet, Life and Death of Jeanne D'Arc, 538.

Peto, Sir Morton, Resources and Prospects of America, 252.

Philosopher, The Gentle, 558.

Photography, 346.—Initial facts on which it is based, 347; Schule, *ib.*; Experiments made by Wedgwood and Sir Humphrey Davy, *ib.*; Discovery of Iodine, Bromine, &c., 349; Labours of Niepce and Daguerre, *ib.*; Daguerrotypes and their drawbacks, 353; Talbot's experiments on paper, 354; Rev. J. B. Reade, 356; His use of gallic acid, *ib.*; The fixing process, 357; Discovery and use of collodion, 358; Present practice, and principles on which it is based, 359; Theories of the action of light, 361; Oliver Wendell Holmes' suggestions, 362; Mode of printing, 363, 366; Photo-lithography and photo-engraving, 367; Mr. J. W. Osborne's method of reproducing maps, 368; Portraiture, 371; Cartes de visite, *ib.*; Favourite subjects, 372; Claim of Photography to rank as a fine art, 374; Application to landscapes, 376; Manner of different photographers recognizable, *ib.*; Pictorial capacity of photography, 377; Absence of colour, 378; Use in discovering criminals, 379; Scientific applications of the art, 383; Photographing celestial bodies, *ib.*; eclipses, 384; magnetic and meteorological variations, 385; interior of the Great Pyramid, 386; Universality of photography, 388; Its periodical literature, 389; Number of photographers, *ib.*; Consumption of eggs, paper, and chemical materials, *ib.*

Plumptre, &c., 54
Poems of
Populatio
Postal an
546.

Quinet, F

Reform a
Differen
183; P
Lord
Sir R.
Ingli
Lowe's
perorati
bers, 1
tellectu
Govern
posed in
Treatm
House
returns
the O
classes,
Mr. Du
The £
County
Rating,
Rating,
217; In
Gladsto
221; L
Mr. Gla
225; M
parties,
Renan, Br
by Rog
cessful
the scar
hypocri
the aut
475; S
The as
candou
rection,
ment c
intende
version
garding
Acts, 4
494;
torical
chapters
of the
the Tr
tic ch
whole,
nestne
Research

- Richard, Henry, Letters on Wales, 544.
- Rigg, James H., Essays for the Times on Ecclesiastical and Social Subjects, 576; Relation of Wesleyan Methodism to the Established Church, *ib.*; Repudiation of the idea of Dissent by the Wesleys, 577.
- Robinet, le Docteur, Notice sur l'Œuvre et sur la Vie d'Auguste Comte. *See* Comte.
- Robinson, Wm., Biblical Studies, 275.
- Rogers, Henry, Reason and Faith, with other Essays, 279.
- Rosetti, Christina, The Prince's Progress; and other Poems, 552.
- Royal Academy of Arts, Exhibition of, 240; Landseer, Maclise, Leighton, 243; Moore, Calderon, 244; No great display of passion in this year's Pictures, 245; Scarcity of good Landscape Painting, 247.
- Rue, Warren de la, Total Eclipse of the Sun, 346.
- Ruskin, John, Crown of Wild Olive, 253.
- Schultz, Prof. Dr. F. W., Die Schöpfungsgeschichte nach Natur Wissenschaft und Bibel, 298.
- Scott, A. J., Discourses, 281.
- Sermons preached in Oxford, 574.
- Shipley, Rev. Orby, The Church and the World, Essays edited by, 264; Parties in the English Church sharply defined—Progress of the High Church Party, *ib.*; Its Movement now parallel to Rome rather than directly towards it, 265; Dr. Littledale's view, 266.
- Son of the Soil, A, 255.
- Spencer, Herbert, Classification of the Sciences. *See* Comte.
- Statham, Rev. W. M., Sure Standards of the Faith, 569.
- Steinmeyer, Prof. Dr., Die Wunderthaten des Herrn in Bezug auf die neueste Kritik betrachtet, 294.
- St. Hilaire, E. Rousseau. Jules César, 293.
- Strutt, Hon. J. W., Photography, its History, Position, and Prospects, 347.
- Stuart, Life and Letters of Lady Arabella, 238.
- Talbot, Mr. Fox, Inventor of the Calotype Process in Photography, 354—358.
- Tocqueville, Correspondance d'Alexis de, 293.
- Tölle, W., Die Wissenschaft der Religion, 295.
- Tytler, Sarah, Days of Yore, 559.
- Ullathorne, Bishop, Anglican Theory of Union, 269.
- Ulrici, Dr. H., Gott und der Mensch, 299.
- Vaughan, Robert, D.D., The Way to Rest, 267.
- Vegetable Life, Beauties and Wonders of, 254.
- Waterloo, Notes on the Battle of*, 391; Special interest attaching to this battle; French narrative superior to English, *ib.*; Life and services of General Kennedy, 393; General view of the Campaign, 394; Comparison between Wellington and Napoleon, *ib.*; Was the Position of the Allies faulty? 396; Napoleon's first masterly plan of attack, 397; Why it failed, 398; Criticism of his subsequent Operations, 399; A capital Mistake, 400; How it arose, 402; Plans of Attack and Defence, 403; The Battle itself, 404; Napoleon's mistakes, and the allowances to be made for him, 406; Wellington's masterly conduct, *ib.*; Causes of the Victory, 408.
- Webster, Augusta, Dramatic Studies, 551.
- Webster, Augusta, The Prometheus Bound of Æschylus, translated by, 551.
- Whymper, E., Swiss Pictures, illustrated by, 254.
- Wilberforce, William, his Friends and his Times, 237.
- Willich, Charles M., Results under the last Bank Charter Act of 1844, 543.
- Wilson, Memoir of George, 238.
- Wyndham, Diary of the Right Hon. William, 233.
- Young, John, The Light and the Life of Men, 410.

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn

www.libtool.com.cn



