

compatibility with modern civilization, pretensions against the State, jealousy of the use and circulation of Holy Scripture, the *de facto* alienation of the educated mind, detrimental effects on the comparative strength and morality of the States in which it has sway, and its tendency to sap veracity in the individual mind. As between the Historical and Evangelical Schools, Mr. Gladstone evidently inclines, as he has always done, to the former; yet he does no injustice to the Evangelicals. He is even coldly tolerant of the Theists, although he has "quitted the zone" in which he can alone feel comfortable; and when he comes to the Negatives, he feels like a negro transplanted from Tanganyika to the Pole. Mr. Arthur Arnold's paper on Persia has been referred to elsewhere. It is exceedingly interesting as a picture of Mohammedan savagery and decrepitude. The description of the Shah's palace, with its globe with literally emerald seas, its diamond England, India of amethysts, and Africa of rubies, and all the wealth in pearls and gold distributed elsewhere, ends in the anti-climax, that to "prevent rain or snow entering this and other halls of His Majesty's palace, cotton sheets are hung, covering the sides open to the weather. Outside all is darkness, extortion, cruelty, oppression, misery in every shape."

Mr. Pollock's paper on "The Drama" is a long but most valuable paper on the subject. It is in the main historical, giving a very lucid account of the English, Spanish, and French drama, the last especially interesting because it contains a detailed account of the plays of Dumas, Alfred de Musset, Victor Hugo, Dancourt, and Octave Feuillet. Sir John Lubbock, in a paper on "Elementary Education," pleads the claims of physical science to a place in the curriculum, and ridicules grammar and history, the latter in trenchant style. Prof. Lewis Campbell gives another instalment of his essay on New Testament revision, in which he descends into minutiae. He is generally a conservative on the subject, loath to sanction alteration where a decent apology can be offered for the *laissez faire* policy. Not that he is rigidly orthodox by any means, as he shows in more places than one. As when (p. 95) he calls the theory of verbal inspiration "a superstitious feeling;" or where (p. 96) he objects to the "poor and shuffling policy" of levelling just up to the spirit of the age. On this he remarks: "The Biblical critic ought, of all other men, to be most aware that what was once great in his subject has become small, and that what is now whispered in the ear in closets will ere long be proclaimed upon the house-tops." These are bold, true words. Then again, treating of the chapter-headings in The Song of Solomon, and also in Psalms xciii. and cix., he inquires, "How long must a strain of interpretation which no clergyman

would now venture to adopt in preaching to an educated congregation be allowed to impress the minds of simple folk who read the Bible for themselves?" Finally, in speaking of the marginal dates, Prof. Campbell observes: "The first impression on the eye of the child in reading Scripture is not easily shaken off, and the 4004 at the beginning of our Bibles may have had an incalculable effect in fostering the long quarrel between science and revelation. Do we really mean, in the present state of knowledge, to base chronology on the lives of the antediluvian patriarchs?" We wonder if Prof. Campbell ever subscribed his name to the Confession of Faith?

Miss Swanwick's paper on "Evolution and the Religion of the Future" is thoughtful and moderate, its writer ranking herself outside all Mr. Gladstone's five schools, and as belonging to the Free Christian churches. She is no mere Theist, for she believes in Jesus and in Scripture; but like Mr. Clodd, whom she quotes, there seems to her a common progressive movement in all religions. The great principle underlying the doctrine of Evolution, she observes, "is that throughout the universe there has been a continual unfolding;" in short, each link in the vast chain of human development is connected with every antecedent link, and would have no significance if we could suppose the continuity to be broken. The mental and spiritual development of the individual is only the progress of the race *in petto*. This is illustrated by a brief sketch of the Greek, Buddhist, Parsee, Hindoo, and Hebrew religions. The writer, finally, while rejecting most orthodox dogmas, especially the "fiercest"—"the eternity of hell-fire"—finds in the teaching of Jesus the fundamental truths of religion. The second part of Mr. Fairbairn's monogram on Strauss commences with an account of the desperate conflict precipitated by the publication of the *Leben Jesu*. Strauss had the combative instinct strong within him, and he was not very particular in his choice of the weapons he employed—the Damascus blade or the Irish shillelagh came alike to him. But, in fact, a man can hardly be expected to be picked in his words when he is compared with Judas; "like the devil, without conscience;" "without a heart, or had one like Leviathan;" "as firm as a stone and hard as a piece of the nether millstone," &c. His defence, however, was, in the main, a softening of his original—in short, he was apologetic in both senses of the word. He published a third edition of the *Life*, in which he retracted so much as to undermine the mythical theory and set about attempting a reconciliation. In consequence he was invited to a professorship of theology at Zurich, but was compelled to resign summarily, through clerical hostility. Then all his concessions were thrown to the winds, and he launched upon the unknown sea, drift-