

Probably the most interesting part of Lord Coleridge's paper is his reference to Arnold's religious writings. His treatment of this subject shows that the engrossing duties of his high office have not caused him to be inattentive to the momentous course of religious thought and inquiry. He quotes "that tremendous passage" in Cardinal Newman's "Apologia:" "The sight of the world is nothing else than the prophet's scroll, full of 'lamentations, and mourning, and woe.' To consider the world in its length and breadth, its various history, the many races of man, their starts, their fortunes, their mutual alienation, their conflicts; and then their ways, habits, governments, forms of worship; their enterprises, aimless courses, their random achievements and acquirements, the impotent conclusion of long-standing facts, the tokens so faint and broken of a superintending design, the blind evolution of what turn out to be great powers or truths, the progress of things, as if from unreasoning elements, not towards final causes, the greatness and littleness of man, his far-reaching aims, his short duration, the curtain hung over his futurity, the disappointments of life, the defeat of good, the success of evil, physical pain, mental anguish, the prevalence and intensity of sin, the pervading idolatries, the corruptions, the dreary hopeless irreligion, that condition of the whole race, so fearfully yet exactly described in the Apostle's words, 'having no hope and without God in the world'—all this is a vision to dizzy and appal; and inflicts upon the mind the sense of a profound mystery which is absolutely beyond human solution." He compares with this St. Paul's words, "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now;" and then comes this remarkable passage from the pen of the Chief Justice himself: "The great apostle and the great living writer both for themselves solved the awful mystery in the same way and almost in the same words; but it is not to every one that 'faith's transcendent dower' has been vouchsafed in such abundant measure; and any fair man will probably not deny that the mode in which it is customary to present religion now from the

pulpit and the platform does not solve the mystery, does not recognize the facts, does not give rest or satisfaction to reverent and intelligent men not seeking doubts, but whom doubts have reached, to whom inquiry seems a duty and proof a need, and who have accepted, not only as self-evident truth, but as a principle of conduct, the great saying that things are what they are and not other things; why, therefore, should we desire to be deceived? Surely the travesty of Christianity which surrounds us, the severance of doctrine from practice, of creed from conduct, the substitution even in precept of outward ceremony for softening of the temper and purifying of the heart, the divorce probably never before so complete between good works and definite belief, the reproduction with curious fidelity of the state of things in which it was 'an agreed point amongst all people of discernment that Christianity is at length discovered to be fictitious;' the blindness of the clergy and of religious men to the fact that the edifice which is so fair and seems so strong is undetermined in all directions; the awful consequences which would follow from an open revolt against religion which the bigotry of Churchmen is but too likely to bring about,—thoughts of these things might well lead a man of lofty character and keen mind to try to point out to his contemporaries what was the Christian verity which in his judgment fable and superstition had joined together to conceal, and piercing through, or tearing off, the human incrustations of so many centuries, to display once more the divine kernel of unspeakably precious truth which lies hid beneath them." The Chief Justice when he penned these sentences was doubtless prepared for adverse criticism, for on a previous page he writes: "On these (theological and religious) subjects few men can write what their readers differ from without creating irritation and offence. The subjects are too important, the interests too deep, the connection with the inner and the higher life too close, for men to accept what they dislike with even so much equanimity, and that is little enough, as they can extend to politics. Prejudices are not necessarily bad, but religion with almost every man is