

it existed under Baur. With regard to the *Leben Jesu*, Mr. Fairbairn remarks that "the work was fundamentally vitiated, falsified in character and method, by its starting-point and end. It professed to be critical, but was throughout dogmatic. Its critical theories had been created, its exegetical method was applied, to work out a foregone conclusion. Certain narratives, which were regarded as historical, were incompatible with a given speculative doctrine, and blocked the way to a speculative end. So a critical historical theory was invented to pulverize the narratives and dissolve the facts." Mr. James Fergusson attacks vigorously the theory of Dr. Currey, in the Speaker's Commentary, on the plan and dimensions of the Temple at Jerusalem. As an architect, he has no mercy upon the theologian.

The *Fortnightly Review* opens with an article by Mr. Chamberlain on a very important subject—"The Right Method with the Publicans." The standpoint of the writer may be judged by a sentence: "Is it altogether impossible to find some means of preventing the abuse of strong drink without arbitrary interference with individual liberty, and without palpable injustice to those who have embarked their fortunes in the trade?" In Mr. Chamberlain's opinion all past legislation has been ineffectual, and "restriction, in the forms which it has hitherto assumed, of shorter hours, more stringent regulations of licensed houses, and magisterial control of licenses, has been a conspicuous failure." It appears that, in England, the license, though nominally granted year by year, becomes, when once granted, "a lease, with perpetual renewal, subject only to the payment of the license duty, and moderately good conduct." To the Permissive Bill, which is substantially our Dunkin Act, the writer objects, first because it is an intolerable interference with individual liberty, and secondly because it makes no provision for compensating those whose existing means of livelihood it proposes to destroy. The proposed "Free Trade in Drink" is equally distasteful to Mr. Chamberlain, and in lieu of any of these remedies and others, which he examines in detail, he proposes the Swedish or Gottenburg system of buying up the business *en bloc*, and conducting it in the interests of sobriety and general morality. He certainly appears to demonstrate that in Gottenburg it has diminished drunkenness by nearly one-half, and he calls the objection that all the ratepayers would thus become parties "a sentimental one," because they are already responsible for it.

Sir Rutherford Alcock's paper on "China and its Foreign Relations" describes the traditional and actual policy of that Empire, and points out that it is drawing near to Russia, and conceding to that Power trade and

diplomatic privileges it denies to others. Professor Stanley Jevons treats of "Cruelty to Animals" as a study in Sociology. He is opposed entirely to the movement against vivisection, and thinks he controverts the reasoning of its friends by showing that the English people are inconsistent in their view of various kinds of cruelty—making fanciful distinctions where there is actually no difference. A reasoner who can see no distinction between the extermination of wild dogs by poison, in a pastoral country like Queensland, and the torture of an offending dog by strychnine, before a gaping theatre of students in London, is a dealer in fallacies. Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth's review of the results of the English Education Act is instructive. He is, of course, in favour of voluntary, in opposition to Board schools, and takes every pains to show that the shutting up of the former means an immense increase in the local rates.

Mr. G. H. Lewes completes his essay on "Spiritualism and Materialism" by an examination of the latter. His objection to it is simply that it is "unphysiological," not because it contradicts our aspirations, nor because it is instinctively repudiated. He is, in short, a materialist who does not pin his faith to molecular motion in the brain, but in the human organization as a whole. On the other hand, he considers the spiritual interpretation as illusory. Mr. Walter Bagehot's second paper on "The Postulates of English Political Economy" is valuable in more respects than one, but his arguments and illustrations cannot be condensed here. It must suffice to say that, as in the first paper he dealt of the migration of labour from employment to employment, so here he treats of the conditions under which capital is transferred, including the whole subject of values, exchangeable and international. Mr. Morley's review of recent books of travel contains much food for reflection. Of course, he does not lose the opportunity of having a fling at missions, or at "the narrow and ignorant Protestantism" of the middle classes, or that "certain holy contempt" they have for the heathen. Mr. Morison's "Madame de Maintenon" is finished. It throws new light upon the life of the wife of Louis XIV. The account of St. Cyr and the King's childish interest in it is admirable, and Madame's real character may be summed up in a brief extract from a letter to her brother:—"We shall meet again, if it please God. Think of Him, in order to be always ready to die, and for the rest, let us keep ourselves jolly." As Mr. Morison adds—"Security as regards income, and security as regards salvation, are the two points she never leaves out." Mr. Bryce devotes a few pages to Lord Salisbury's Oxford University Bill, which, on the whole, he is disposed to favour.