R. Bell

R-13
QUQU
601/A/149/1K
NATIONAL LIBRARY
CANADA
BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE

VOL. IV No. 3

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

PAGE.
I. THE WORK OF THE MINNESINGERS. LOIS SAUNDERS 161
II. REQUIEM. ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON 180
III. BALFOUR'S "FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF." JOHN WATSON 181
IV. CARMEN. T. R. GLOVER 189
V. THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF CLASSICAL AND POPULAR LATIN. A. B. NICHOLSON 190
VI. LAUDATRICES TEMPORIS ACTI. JOHN MACNAUGHTON 201
VII. CRITICISM AND DEUTERONOMY. JOHN BURTON 203
VIII. THE STRUCTURE OF MAN—AN INDEX OF HIS PAST HISTORY. A. P. KNIGHT 209
IX. GREEK COMMERCE AND TRADE ROUTES. T. R. GLOVER 218
X. BOOK REVIEWS 230
XI. CURRENT EVENTS 233

JANUARY, 1897

PUBLISHED FOR THE COMMITTEE BY
THE KINGSTON NEWS
KINGSTON, CANADA

SINGLE COPIES, 30c. PER ANNUM, $1.00

APPLETON'S

POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY.

Edited by WILLIAM JAY YOUMANS.

The POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY is without a competitor.

It is not a technical magazine.

It stands alone as an educator, and is the best periodical for people who think.

All its articles are by writers of long practical acquaintance with their subjects, and are written in such a manner as to be readily understood.

It deals particularly with those general and practical subjects which are of the greatest interest and importance to the people at large.

It keeps its readers fully informed of all that is being done in the broad field of science.

Illustrations, from drawings or photographs, are freely used in all cases in which the text may be thereby elucidated.

Examination of any recent number will more than confirm the foregoing.

$5.00 per annum; single copy, 50 cents.

D. APPLETON & CO., 72 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

Canadian Agency: G. N. MORANG, Manager, 63 Yonge St., Toronto.

Write for Special Premium Offer.

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

VOL. IV. JANUARY, 1897. NO. 3.

All articles intended for publication, books for review, exchanges,—and all correspondence relating thereto—should be addressed to the editors, Box A, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.

THE WORK OF THE MINNESINGERS.

THERE are certain places which seem destined to become again and again the scene of movements materially affecting the life of a nation and its future development. Germany can boast of, at any rate, one such spot. To the valleys of Thuringia belongs the honour of being the cradle of her early poetic literature, of her religious liberty, and of her later magnificent literary development. We are accustomed to connect the name of Luther with the Wartburg, and of Goethe with Weimar, but it is often forgotten that centuries before their names became famous, the foundation of their work had been laid by the band of knights and poets, whose story we are about to consider.

Two monuments of this time remain to us of special interest. In Weimar the famous Minstrel Hall is still standing, now restored to something of its former splendour, and not many miles away, in the palace of the Wartburg, the ancient residence of the Landgraves of Thuringia, visitors are still shewn the Banqueting Hall of the Minnesingers, the scene of many poetic contests, and especially of the famous Wartburg Krieg, where under Landgrave Hermann, hundreds of poets assembled to challenge each other in a poetic tournament. These two buildings stand as mementoes of a movement which had its rise in Thuringia, and which quickly spread through Suabia, Bavaria and Austria, on the banks of the Rhine and the Danube, changing to a great extent the face of German civilization and introducing a new era into its literature. The twelfth century was full of such changes.

Already in Provence and Northern France the new instinct of poetic feeling had given birth to love songs and romances, which were to take root and blossom among the people of Germany. The new impulse spread and grew; it was everywhere fostered and encouraged by the German nobility, and before long almost every court was a centre for the cultivation of the poetic art, where the wandering Minnesinger was sure of encouragement and support. Hence we find that many of the most famous poets of this time were attached to the court of their prince, fighting under him in time of war, and treated as honoured guests in time of peace. The great imperial festival at Mainz in 1184, under Frederick Barbarossa, where nearly seventy thousand French and German knights were assembled, gave additional force to the new movement.

By this time the Minnesingers were a recognized body. They were, for the most part, knights, attached, as has been said, to the household of some prince, but often wandering from place to place in search of adventure. Unlike their predecessors, the wandering minstrels, or gleemen (*Spielmann*) of the ninth century, they were generally of noble birth, and often renowned for feats of arms. Their central theme was Love, and with this was closely connected the worship of woman. In the heroic poems and epics of the preceding centuries, war was the leading motive; the later renaissance of German poetry in the eighteenth century, received its inspiration in great measure from a fuller interpretation and comprehension of nature; but the poetry of the Minnesingers, as the name implies, was emphatically the poetry of Love. In the early epic poems the chief interest lies in the enmities and battles of the different nations, and the fate of the principal characters is closely connected with the result of battles and sieges. Love grows up in the midst of war and bloodshed, and has something of their lurid and savage character. With the Minnesingers this is all changed. It is love in its bright and smiling aspect that meets us. The Minnesang reflects the splendour and gaiety of the court, it is full of the delight of May, of the songs of birds, and the scent of flowers. It has lost the intenseness of the preceding age. But the Minnesingers too had their serious side, and the results of their work in literature, music and civilization have been more important than at first appear.

Five names are specially to be noted among the countless poets of this period, differing considerably among themselves, and together presenting what was best in the works of the Minnesingers. These names are Heinrich von Veldeke, Hartmann von der Aue, Gottfried von Strassburg, Walther von der Vogelweide, and Wolfram von Eschenbach.

The fame of Heinrich von Veldeke is to some extent that of a pioneer. He was looked on as the father of chivalrous poetry in Germany, and his successors were unanimous in according him the honour of having laid the foundation of their art. He was the first to introduce pure rhyme in his poems: rhyme, until his day, having been mere assonance. Though he wrote many lyrics and poems, his fame principally rests on his version of the Eneid. Dull and monotonous as it appears to the readers of the present day, this poem gained immense popularity in its time, and quite eclipsed the French romances of Flor and Blancheflur, of Tristan and Isolde, which had previously been translated into German. We scarcely recognize the pious Eneas as the hero of Lavinia's protracted love affairs, and Virgil's extremely condensed account of the episode leaves us unprepared for the fulness of detail found in Veldeke's poem, which has expanded into fourteen hundred lines. No doubt the mediæval love for Virgil, who rivalled King Arthur in popularity, contributed to the success of the poem. The metre is the rhymed couplet, but the lines are irregular and uneven. A few lines may serve as a specimen.

Thus Lavinia was crowned
As a queen by all around ;
Thus her love, long sought,
Was to a fair end brought
Without mishap at all.
Great the feast and rich the array,
Wide the couches where they lay.
Joy shone in every face.
The king first took his place,
With princes fair to see,
Each man in his degree,
Richly and nobly clad ;
And every heart was glad.

For each right nobly fared,
The food being nowise spared.
Now, if one should seek to tell
Duly and rightly what befel,
And the truthful history,
Too long a tale 't would be.
I will therefore shortly say
That all too much was given that day
Of drink and dainty dish;
Everything that heart could wish,
Or man desire in his thought,
It was straightway to him brought.

There is something delightful in the naive allusions to the plentiful fare, but it must be confessed that the literary merit of this passage is not very high.

The instrument, rough and uncouth in its first forms, was rapidly perfected on all sides. In a long poem, entitled Moriz von Craon, written soon after Veldeke's Eneid, there is a distinct advance in melody, fluency, and spontaneity. Already one of the most characteristic notes of the Minnesingers is heard,—their childlike delight in nature. Some lines recall our own Chaucer.

It was the merry time
That bringeth on the prime,
Sang the birds in wood and sky,
Loud and high,
With many voices clear;
The rose and broom appear,
And blossom everywhere.
It was the merry time when care
And sorrow are hateful to the heart,
Richly adorned was every part
Of the forest in lovely dress,
For the summer's joyfulness.
Fresh young leaves and grass below,
Did a fair green carpet shew,
Full of flowers of every kind.
All this brings a gladsome mind,
When one thinks of it again,
And calls to mind the birds' sweet strain,

The poem, which is very characteristic of the time, is the story of a noble lady, who, by her repeated cruelty and scorn, has alienated her lover's affection. Deserted by him, she is filled with repentance, and retires to her castle, where she laments her fate. The whole poem is fresh and original, but as in the Eneid of Veldeke the metre is irregular, and the rhyme often halting. The poet loudly laments the limitations of the German language

Cease I now my theme to teach
Beggar poor the German speech,
When a man therein would sing,
That his verse may smoothly ring,
He his words must split,
Or two together knit.
Would I had power to make my thought,
Better and more finely wrought.

Meanwhile in Thuringia, a regular school of poetry was springing up, which was soon followed by others in the neighbouring provinces. In Suabia, Hartmann von Aue was writing his romances of Erec and Iwein, both formed on the Arthur romances, which by this time had found their way into Germany and which provided the subjects of most of the longer poems. Von Aue, at first closely followed in Veldeke's footsteps, but his work has far greater interest and poetic value than anything that Veldeke has written. One of Hartmann's poems has become more familiar to English readers than perhaps any other work of the time, through Longfellow's Golden Legend. The original, which bears the name of Der Arme Heinrich, has been faithfully translated by Rosetti. In the main, Longfellow has followed the old poem, though the simplicity and quaintness of the latter have vanished, and most of the tragic details have been sacrificed.

Hartmann von Aue was probably a Suabian by birth. He appears at any rate, to have been attached to one of the lords of Suabia, and was happy in his early life. His prosperity vanished with the death of his patron, and he says himself, 'Whatever happiness I possessed in my early life has been more than paid for by a double sorrow, namely, by the death of my master, and by the cruelty of my beloved.' His lord's death was a tangible trouble, but too much importance must not be attached to the second complaint. A lady love, cruel if possible, was a necessity for the mediæval poet. It was part of his stock in trade, and her existence in his poems does not at all imply that he was not a happy and prosperous husband and father. For the times, Hartmann von Aue seems to have been well educated, he could read and write, as he frequently tells us, and had also learned French. The fact that he was called by his contemporaries, The Wise Hartmann, seems to point to unusual learning. In Gottfried von Strassburg's poem of Tristan Hartmann is mentioned with enthusiastic praise. Gottfried praises the 'crystal clearness' of his words, the vividness and beauty of his stories, 'his speech sucks the very heart out of an adventure.' This gift of narrative is very strong in the two great chivalric romances of Erec and Iwein. Erec was the first of the kind to appear in Germany, and although not equal to Iwein in conciseness and beauty of language, is full of interest. The French influence is clearly perceptible, but Hartmann's own individuality continually shows itself, especially in his later work. No poet thought out his story more carefully than Hartmann.

Gottfried von Strassburg, in his poem of Tristan, breaks off from his subject to mention five of his brother poets with words of generous praise, while one, who is in many respects the most remarkable poet of the Minnesingers, is referred to in terms of strong disapproval. The reason of Gottfried's dislike to Wolfram von Eschenbach, will be evident when we come to consider the poetry of the latter. Besides Veldeke and von Aue, Gottfried singles out for praise Bliker von Steinach, of whose poems hardly anything remains, Reinmar von Hagenau, and the greatest lyric poet Germany saw before Goethe, Walther von der Vogelweide.

Gottfried's own poetry was distinguished by the qualities which afterwards characterized his school, fluency, polish, and artificiality. His long poem of Tristan was left unfinished and completed by other hands. Among these early poets it is rare to find one like Reinmar von Hagenau, who rather despises the influences of the outer world.

I have one grief above all other sorrow,
It is not that the summer has an end,
What matter if the green hedge fade to-morrrow?

Of troubles such as these there is no end.
I will not on such trifles waste my sighing,
I mourn for other griefs than flowers a-dying.

Other poets meanwhile had sprung up and were carrying their joyful songs and tales of love and chivalry throughout Germany. Two poets, however, stand far above the rest of the Minnesingers, two, who, though friends, were very unlike in character and in the work they produced, and who together represent all that was best and noblest in the poetry of their day. These were Walther von der Vogelweide and Wolfram von Eschenbach.

Walther von der Vogelweide was par excellence, the lyric poet of the Minnesingers, and the worthy forerunner of Goethe. His work was indeed purely lyrical. He never attempted any of the longer and more sustained efforts, which were then so common. But his range was a wide one, and included almost every subject, love, politics, religion, patriotism, the beauties of spring, of woman, and of the world of nature. He is moved by all, and finds inspiration in all. Walther has much of Chaucer's genial nature, his sense of humour and his keen though kindly eye for human weakness. He was intensely patriotic and his poems are loud in praise of his own people, and his own country. We scarcely look for Luther's predecessor among the Minnesingers, and yet many of Walther's poems have the same sturdy note of defiance against the Pope's encroachments on German liberty. One of the boldest of these poems is directed in scorn against Innocent III, whose interference in the German succession Walther bitterly resented, and whose institution of hollow staves for the collection of money for the Crusades had given great offence.

Ah! in what Christian wise the Pope laughs now at Rome, no doubt
When he says to all his people "See what I have brought about:"
The thing he says 'twere better it never had been thought.
"Two Germans underneath one crown together have I brought
Now they shall ruin and lay waste the kingdom at my will,
But none the less will we our coffers fill,
They pay their tribute to my stave, and all their wealth is mine,
Their German silver shall be poured out at my holy shrine.
Eat their fowls, my priests, come eat and drink their wine,
And let the Germans..............................fast."

The spirit of determined opposition to papal oppression did not, we see, begin in the sixteenth century.

This poem belongs to the more serious class of Walther's poems, commonly called Sprüche (*Sayings* or *Proverbs*). To this class also belongs a remarkable elegy, written probably after the frequent disputes over the German succession and the struggles with the Pope had brought much distress to Germany. The melody and metre are flowing and easy, and the poem impresses the reader as more modern than most of the poetry of the time.

Alas! and where has vanished so many and many a year,
Was all my life but dreaming? Did I never yet see clear?
All that once seemed so real, was it but a fleeting play?
Long, long have I been dreaming, and time has passed away,
Now at last have I awaked, Alas! I cannot understand
What was once as clear and plain in my sight as is this hand.
The friends, the fields, I long ago gazed on with childish eyes,
Are now as strange as though 'twere naught but vanity and lies.
Those who were once my playmates now are old and grey,
The field is ploughed, the wood cut down, and all is passed away,
Only the water flows as it flowed in days gone by.
Ah! surely I am made the playfellow of misery,
Many greet me coldly who knew and loved me well before,
Alas! God's grace has passed away from the earth for evermore;
Sadly I remember many days of gladness and delight,
But like a stroke upon the sea, they have vanished from my sight,
Alas! for evermore.

Alas! how heavy a mind bows down the youthful heart:
Who once in joy and gladness lived their merry part,
Now they know of naught but sorrow, Alas! why is it so?
Where'er I look, I find no heart with happiness aglow;
The dance, the song, have all by care been driven far away,
Never in Christian land was seen so sorrowful a day,
And cruel letters have been brought of late to us from Rome,
We are allowed to grieve, but joy has left the German home.
Now I am full of grief, as once I lived right joyfully,
For smiles of happiness are turned to tears and misery,
The birds in the air above are mourning for our pain,
What wonder when even to death I grieve and weep in vain;
Poor fool, why should I speak such useless speech as this,

He who would seek for pleasure here, shall fail of Heaven's bliss,
Alas! for evermore.

Alas! how have they sought upon us sweetness to bestow,
I see the bitter in the cup, amid the honey show.
The world without is lovely, white and green and red,
But within are blacker colours, the darkness of the dead.
And whom the world has led astray, let him pardon seek and peace,
For small the penance needed to bring his soul release.
Then think on this, O Knight, for to you pertains this thing,
You wear the helm and armour with many an iron ring,
The mighty shield is yours also and consecrated sword.
Would God that I were worthy to battle for my Lord,
Then should I, poor sinner, a noble prize obtain,
Not house, or land or prince's gold the pay that I would gain,
I seek to wear a heavenly crown, even with the angel host,
A soldier's spear might win it, fighting bravely at his post.
Ah, to take the Holy Journey, and beyond the waters pass,
Then Glory should I always sing, and never more, Alas!

But by far the larger part of Walther's poetry consists of Minnesangs, poems on the love of woman, of praise of her beauty, her constancy and sweetness. They are full of the freshness of spring and out-door life. There are constant comparisons between the charms of his lady love, and the beauties of Nature, always in favour of the former. Here is one called Spring and Women.

When the flowers in the grass are springing,
Smiling up as if to greet the dawn,
Early in the morn in time of May.
And the merry birds are gaily singing,
In their sweetest wise, what joy is born
For the world, to speed its happy day!
Man half deems that Heaven's realm he shares.
Would you know what greatest likeness bears
To this joy? I straightway shall make known
What, so often as it greets my eyes,
Calls to mind this thing and this alone.

Yes, methinks a maiden fair and splendid,
Richly clad and with bright blossoms crowned,
Passing like a queen among the throng,

Stately she, by all her train attended,
Casting many a gracious glance around,
Like the sun she seems the stars among.
May, with all her favours to bestow,
Nothing half so wonderful can show,
As her lovely form so full of grace.
All the other flowers we let go by,
Gazing only on one beauteous face.

Look now if proof must justify my praising,
Come forth into the joyous realm of May,
Which lies in all its fulness in your sight.
Gaze here, and then on woman's beauty gazing,
Say which must yield and own the other's sway,
See if my choice be not well judged and right.
Yes, if of twain I needs must choose,
And the one for the other lose,
Sir May! December thou should'st be,
Ere I would give my love for thee.

Pfeiffer, who has so ably edited and annotated the works of the Minnesingers, has said that it is impossible to translate Middle High German into Modern German in a manner that is even endurable. The best part of its bloom and melody is destroyed thereby, he says, with a ruthless hand. It must then be even more daring to attempt its reproduction in English. But it may be urged in excuse, as has already been done by Karl Pannier, who has rendered all Walther's poetry into modern German, that a translation brings the poem within the reach of many who cannot avail themselves of the original. This argument is even more valid for English than for German renderings of the early German poems, and hence these inadequate translations have been, with some hesitation, inserted. Every variety of rhythm and metre was used. In many cases the result was artificial and stilted, but Walther's songs are uniformly flowing and natural, even when, as in the following Winter Song, he is somewhat fettered by the exigencies of the rhyme.

Winter, thou bringest us gloom everywhere,
Forest and meadow are leafless and bare,
Many sweet sounds floated once on the air,
Tossing their balls I have seen maidens fair,
And the music of many a song-bird was there.

Oh could I sleep all the winter away,
As oft as I wake my grief finds its way,
That his realm is so wide, and so mighty his sway.
But courage! he yields in the conflict with May,
And flowers I gather, where once the snow lay.

One of the favourite forms of Minnesang was the Dance Song, many specimens of which are found. The one given below is apparently a dream, in which the poet has met his lady love, whose image is afterwards continually before him.

"Lady! this garland take,"
So spake I to a maiden wondrous fair,
"And you the dance shall make
More lovely by the lovely flowers you bear,
Had I great store of gems and gold,
All should belong to you.
Trust me my words are true,
Steadfast the purpose which I hold.

Love! for your grace to me,
Gladly a garland do I wind for you,
As fair as well may be,
For many flowers are here, red, white and blue.
In yonder hedge I know where they do hide,
There they are gaily springing,
The birds above them singing,
Together we will break them side by side."

My gift she did not spurn,
But took it as a child from friendly hands,
A rosy flush did burn
Upon her cheek, as the rose mid lilies stands.
Shamefaced her blue eyes looked on me,
A gracious answering greeting,
Came to me from my sweeting,
And soon I had what I ne'er looked to see.

I think not that again,
Such joy will come as then possessed my breast,
The blossoms fell like rain
From the trees above, and in the grass did rest.
I was so glad I laughed for happiness.
But as the dream sped on,

Which all this joy had won,
The morning dawned and I awoke from bliss.

But hence it doth arise
That summer long when lovely maids I meet,
I gaze into their eyes,
If I perchance may see her—Oh! how sweet,
If at this joyful dance my love I see,
Have pity, maids, be kind,
Oh, bear it in your mind,
Would I beneath our wreath my love might see.

We know more of the life of Walther von der Vogelweide than of most of the Minnesingers, and his life may probably be considered a typical one. He was born about 1168, it is supposed in the neighbourhood of Bötzen, in the Tyrol. He was of noble birth, but belonged to one of the poorer and less important ranks of knighthood. About his twentieth year, he left his father's home and attached himself to the court of Duke Friedrich at Vienna. Singers and poets were sure of a gracious reception at this court, and here Walther probably spent the happiest part of his life. Here began his friendship with Reinmar von Hagenau, who encouraged him in the practice of his art, and here some of his finest lyrics were written. But Friedrich died in 1198, and Walther's wandering life then began. He was attached in turn to the courts of Philip of Suabia, Otto IV, and Friedrich II, the last named presenting him with a small fief in the neighbourhood of Würzberg, to the great joy of the homeless poet, who had met with many privations in the course of his wandering life, and who was filled with happiness to possess at last a settled dwelling place. He had been a constant wanderer, and had travelled with his inseparable companion, his fiddle, through every part of Germany. As he himself says he had seen " many lands, from the Elbe to the Rhine, travelling even so far as to Hungary," he had studied the ways of men " from the Seine to the Mur, from the Po to the Trave." Walther's last journey was taken to the Holy Land in the company of Friedrich II in 1228. Soon after his return he died about 1230, and was buried in the Lorenz garten at Würzberg, before the door of the new minster. His tombstone was still in existence in the last century with the following inscription :

[*]Pascua qui volucrum vivus, Walthere, fuisti,
Qui flos eloquii, qui Palladis os obiisti!
Ergo quod aureolam probitas tua possit habere
Qui legit hoc dicat, Deus istius miserere.

The first line probably contains an allusion to the old legend, afterwards recorded by Longfellow, which declared that Walther, when dying, left directions that the birds should be supplied with corn and water on his tombstone. When this charity was stopped, through the avarice of the monks, the spirit of Walther, we are told, was troubled and could not rest in his grave. "Se non é vero, é ben trovato," there is certainly in the story something of the spirit of the old Minnesinger, the lover of forest and water, the sweet singer of birds and flowers.

It is impossible to study the poems of this time without perceiving that the position occupied by woman, is very different to anything previously accorded to her. One of the most important results of the introduction of chivalry everywhere, had been the alteration of woman's social standing, and in Germany this alteration was effected in no small degree by the Minnesingers. It might indeed be said that apart from their influence on German literature the most permanent result of their work is to be found in the subsequent condition of woman. Although the devotion and reverence with which the latter was regarded became at length both strained and ridiculous, and helped to bring chivalry itself into contempt, yet the principle underlying mediæval woman worship is still the basis of the modern attitude towards woman, the attitude of protection and consideration of the strong towards the weak, for the loss of which no advanced privileges could atone to her sex. It needs but a glance over the earlier epics to see how vast was the difference between her past position, and the one she acquired in the 12th and 13th centuries.

Among primitive, or barbaric races woman was of little importance. She was valued more as a chattel, which might be interchanged for beasts, armour, or gold. Homer indeed, generally speaks of his women with respect, and there are few scenes of modern courtesy more beautiful than Helen's reception by the

---

[*] This epitaph may be freely rendered thus:—
Thou who wert once, O Walther, the giver of food to the birds, the flower of eloquence, the mouth of Minerva, that the crown may be given thee for thy life of virtue, let each man that reads now say, The Lord have mercy upon him.

Trojan chiefs at the Scaean gate. But there is no attempt made to distinguish the characters of the women : their physical charms are mentioned, and it is for these that they are valued. In the German epics preceding the times of the Minnesingers, there is advance in many ways, and some attempt is made to characterize. In some of the earliest poems, there are at any rate two types of woman, the gentle, loving and weak, and the passionate, strong and often cruel type. As we approach nearer the 12th century, the heroines of the various poems assume more individuality, some care is given to the working out of character, and far more importance is attached to their influence. They are no longer like Helen of Troy, the almost passive cause of war, they are like Chriemhild and Brünhild, the authors and instigators of strife, or like Hilde, the peacemaker between hostile familes. The moral standard is not very high, but faults and virtues stand out in bold relief. Already too, at a very early date we see the germs of the fundamental law of chivalry, that the strong must protect and serve the weak, in the laws which required twice as much blood money for the murder of a woman as of a man, in the heavy penalties enforced for the rough treatment of young girls (even the rude loosening of the braids of her hair being punished as severely as the poisoning of a freedman), and in the laws for protecting the property of widows and children. But in spite of these indications of a change of feeling, the revolution wrought in woman's position in the 12th century was a radical one. With the raising of her social position there was a corresponding elevation of the moral standard. The noble woman must have noble qualities, truth, constancy, tenderness, sweetness. There is a little poem by Walther von der Vogelweide where he contrasts beauty of form and goodness of heart, and chooses the last as the one essential. Yet Walther was a little disposed to undervalue external beauty.

Hast thou truth and constancy?
Then my heart from care is free,
Lest thou ever willingly,
Wilt cause grief or pain to me.
Hast thou not these two, 'tis vain,
I shall never call thee mine, though my heart
break with the pain.

Hartmann von Aue esteems goodness of heart and womanly sweetness above all beauties of person. The maiden who offers herself for Prince Heinrich's life, bears "hidden deep within her breast, a heart of such goodness, as never yet God bestowed upon a maiden." It is true that this ideal exists side by side with the gay, frivolous and worldly type that was also the result of chivalry and its customs, but it is significant that it was the former and not the latter which was held up as the standard for womanly excellence.

Though Walther von der Vogelweide was unsurpassed on his own ground, yet Wolfram von Eschenbach is in many respects the more important figure. He is the most powerful and thoughtful of all the mediæval poets, with the exception of Dante, to whom he may be compared. Like Dante he treats of the gravest questions that can occupy man. His Parzival is a psychological epic, and deals with the inner development of man. As in Goethe's Faust, he treats of man's temptation, his fall and his restoration. The story of Parzival and the mysterious search for the Holy Grail has always been attractive to poets, and to Wolfram's poem is added the interest which comes from the attempts of a powerful, original and self-taught intellect to work out problems of unchanging interest. It is in this connection that Wolfram has much affinity with Dante, though the similarity is modified by the difference which must exist between a man of poor education and one steeped in all the literary, theological, and scientific learning of his time. Wolfram was probably the last great poet who had no literary education. That a certain amount was obtainable in his day we know by the acquirements of other poets, but he does not appear to have availed himself of the cloister schools, or any other sources of learning then open. Yet he was by no means ignorant. Though he never learned to read or write, he taught himself natural history, astronomy, national history and tradition, and French, which he understood when spoken or read out. He was a constant wanderer, and himself says that a wandering life is necessary for a knight. "He who will exercise the office of a shield-bearer must travel through many lands." He was certainly the most original of the Minnesingers, and his intellect far the most keen and powerful among them. This is probably in great part owing to his manner of life and self-education. It is not difficult to understand why Gottfried von Strassburg should have disapproved of Eschenbach's work, for they were the opposites of each other in almost every point. The merit of Gottfried's poetry lies in its smoothness, polish and delicacy, and he could see no beauty where these did not exist. But Gottfried is often artificial and rhetorical, and his long, minute descriptions are extremely tedious. Wolfram's defects are just such as would offend Gottfried, his lapses into obscurity and heaviness, his indifference to polish, and his comparative illiterateness. But Wolfram had a force and imagination, a depth and freedom which were far beyond the Suabian poet, and which stamp Wolfram's poetry as unique in his time. His chief strength lay in epic poetry, lyrics he seldom attempted, only eight being still in existence, and of these only three are love songs. Parzival, Willehalm, Titurel, are his three great works. Titurel is so called from Titurel the sovereign of the Grail, and the grandfather of Sigune and Schionatulander, the story of whose loves is told in this poem. The metre was of Wolfram's own invention, and has been preserved in the translation. It is a modification of the Gudrun strophe, and consists of four lines, three of which contain a cæsura in the middle of the line. The first part of Titurel, which is given below, tells of the childish love of the two children. The boys and girls of those days must have early learned the language and ways of lovers, and we have here a charming picture of the children, of the dawning of unconscious love, and of their imitation of the talk of their elders. "It is silly sooth, and dallies with the innocence of love."

Ye who have sung of love   and pains of love have tasted,
Hark to the tale of maiden's love   and youth in sorrow wasted,
Such a tale am I now declaring
To all who love's desire   and the fire of love are sharing.

The sweet young Schionatu   lander felt love burning
For his little playmate's beauty   his sad heart was yearning,
He spoke 'Sigune of all the fairest,
Help, sweet maiden, let thy hand   bring help, if for my grief thou carest.

'Lady of Katelangen   deny me not thy treasure,
Men say thou comest of a race   who take a gracious pleasure,
With love's reward the friend to honour,
Who feels love's need, and O wilt thou   the ancient use dishonour?'

'Doux ami, now speak   dear friend, what is this thou declarest?
Let me know of a truth   if this mind towards me thou bearest.
If so to thy grief I must listen kindly,
But art thou not sure thereof   thou dost wrong to speak thus
blindly.'

'Man must seek for favour   where alone she dwelleth,
Lady, I seek thy favour   thy grace all other gift excelleth.
Friendship well beseems children's pleasure,
But who shall comfort longing   if favour never yields her treasure?'

She spoke 'If thou need healing   thou should'st make known thy
sorrow
To those more powerful than I,   thus should'st thou comfort
borrow.
Why ask that I should heal thy grieving?
I am an orphan, friends and lands   far, far behind me leaving.'

'Right well I know fair lands are thine,   and as a queen men hold
thee;
I seek not these at all, let but   thy heart through thine eyes behold
me,
So that thou take pity on my sadness,
Help, lest the torrent of thy love   sweep from out my heart all
gladness.'

'Is Love a He? Can'st thou not   Love's likeness be telling?
Is it a She? and if she comes   shall I with her make my dwelling?
Shall I keep it with the rest of my treasure?
Will she fly upon my hand? is she wild?   can I lure her at my
pleasure?'

'Lady, from man and maid alike   have I oft heard the story
How Love can draw his bow full well   on the young and the
hoary,
With deadly aim he sends his thoughts winging,
Nor ever fails bring down his game   running, creeping, flying,
springing.

Sweet Maid! till now I only knew of Love by song and fable,
Love dwells within the thought, now to tell his strength I am able,
A changeless love fills my heart with madness.
Love like a thief from out my breast has stolen away all gladness.'

'Schionatulander! to me thoughts come thronging,
When thou leavest me I feel in my heart so strange a longing,
Till once again mine eyes perceive thee,
All week I grieve, not once or twice the longing will not leave me.'

'Ask of Love no more, sweet maid, for by thy showing,
Full well thou hast learned already of Love's coming and his going,
See how Love may compass Joy's undoing,
Give Love his right, and pleasures lost our hearts will ne'er be ruing.'

She spoke, 'And can Love steal into all hearts softly creeping?
Can neither man nor maid escape by speed or strict watch keeping?
And will none avenge Love's dealing
On those who for his fault such cruel pangs are feeling?'

'Yes, Love is mighty over young and old he hath strange power,
No man on earth can declare what he doeth hour by hour,
Let us together seek his help forever
By changeless friendship, then shall Love by change destroy us never.'

'Alas, has Love no other help, no other way to shield me?
But I must give myself to thee and all my young life yield thee?
Thy youth was never to my service given,
Ere thou win me, know, with sword and shield thou must have bravely striven.'

'Lady, when I grow strong and bear arms, to do thy pleasure
By labour hard or light alike will I strive to win thy treasure,
Perchance for my guerdon thou'lt befriend me,
I need thy help, O grant it that success may attend me.'

So with tender words had love his first awaking,
In the days when Pompeius to Baldag his way was taking
With his strong men, swift in arms and plunder,
And Ipomedon the mighty, many new spears broke in sunder.

There is in the Minnesingers, taken as a body, a more serious vein running through their poetry, than is to be found among their brethren in Provence. As we have seen, much of Eschenbach's poetry has a strong tendency to turn to the deeper and more spiritual side of life, and Vogelweide, who has left us the most perfect and spontaneous love songs and lyrics of all the Minnesingers, was also the author of many thoughtful and religious poems. This tendency, noticeable even in the early days of the Minnesingers, increased and strengthened in the time of their decadence, and gave the direction to the next development of the poetic art, when religious poems contemning the world and worldly love, took the place of the joyful songs of the Minnesingers, the mendicant orders replaced the knights of chivalry, and the beautiful free life of the twelfth century gave way before the flood of ascetic and monastic rule. With the next movement and with the didactic poetry which accompanied it we have here nothing to do. It sprang up side by side with the later efforts of Minnesang and gathered strength as the latter decayed. But the work accomplished by the Minnesingers was no trifling one. Their poetry, with many defects of artificiality, tedious detail, and heaviness to be found at times, has yet done immense work in forwarding the formation of national literature, and besides forms in itself an addition to that literature of which Germans may well be proud, in spite of Lowell's severe and sweeping criticism "that it is impossible to find anything more tediously artificial than Provençal literature, except its reproduction by the Minnesingers." That artificiality and unreality are there it would be useless to deny; that they are the chief characteristics of the representative Minnesingers, no one who knows them will be inclined to admit. And even in the days of their decline the true note is often heard. Walther himself has nothing sweeter or more natural than this stanza by Ulrich von Lichtenstein, one of the most extravagant and unreal of the later poets.

In the forest, sweetest songs
  Little birds are singing,
'Neath May sunshine in the hedge
  Fairest flowers are springing.

So my courage wakes again
  When it thinks of thee, confessing
Thou hast filled my life with blessing,
  As dreams bring the poor man gain.

It is impossible here to do more than refer to the relation of the Minnesingers to music, but it must not be forgotten how much they did for its spread and development. Their songs were all intended to be sung, and almost every poet was a musician, and did his share towards implanting and cultivating that love of music, which has become the heritage of the German race.

The poetry of the Minnesingers had been inspired by what was then the highest chivalrous ideal. It had confirmed and strengthened the virtues which it was the aim of chivalry to develop, honour, loyalty, generosity and fidelity. Its general tendency then was decidedly for good, and the work of the Minnesingers has strong claims to be considered as one of the most important factors in the history of Germany.

LOIS SAUNDERS.

REQUIEM.

UNDER the wide and starry sky,
  Dig the grave and let me lie.
Glad did I live and gladly die,
  And I laid me down with a will.

This be the verse you grave for me:
Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from sea,
  And the hunter home from the hill.

—*Robert Louis Stevenson.*

BALFOUR'S "FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF."

(CONCLUDED.)

HAVING convinced himself that we must postulate a Creator and Preserver of the world of phenomena, Mr. Balfour next affirms that we must further assume a "preferential exercise of Divine power." We cannot "think of evolution in a God-created world without attributing to its Author the notion of purpose slowly worked out."

Now, it is of course obvious that, if there is a God, the world must realize an end, and that that end must include goodness; indeed the two ideas are at bottom identical. But the question is whether Mr. Balfour has said anything to establish either idea, and whether his conception of a "preferential exercise of Divine power" is satisfactory. These two points are really two aspects of the same problem. Now, Mr. Balfour's mechanical conception of the relation of God to the world seems to make any satisfactory conception of "purpose" impossible. The world is affirmed to be constructed, or brought into existence by God, and so far it is not supposed to involve any purpose, or at least any purpose which "makes for righteousness." The world exists and is due to Divine power, but whether it shall lead to righteousness will depend upon the direction which is given to it. We have therefore to assume that what has been brought into existence is not allowed to lead to evil, as it naturally would do if left to itself, but is in some way turned away from evil and given a direction towards good. Mr. Balfour therefore assumes that the world which he supposes to have been created by God, *might* have developed into evil. Nay, I think we are entitled to say, that it *would have* developed into evil, were it not for the "preferential exercise of Divine power." Now, this view is evidently based upon a Manichaean conception of the original evil of created "matter," an evil which requires the interposition of Divine power to counteract it and turn it towards good. This whole conception seems to me radically false. Just as the notion of a primitive "matter" created by God is unmeaning, so the notion of a "preferential exercise of Divine power" is equally unmeaning. Does Mr. Balfour seriously mean that particular forms of existence operate of themselves independently of Divine power, and operate only in the way of evil? If not, what does he mean by the "preferential exercise of Divine power?" Does he mean that all human actions, for example, are evil—that man is in his whole nature evil, and that when he does any good actions, these proceed entirely from the "preferential exercise of Divine power?" If so, man is a devil, but a devil kept within bounds by God. His own volitions are purely evil, and all good volitions proceed from God. Thus, he cannot but sin, as St. Augustine said. What, then, becomes of that freedom, for which Mr. Balfour is so much concerned? Is there any meaning in speaking of a being as free, who cannot but will evil?

In making these objections, I do not for a moment mean to deny that what Mr. Balfour calls the "preferential action of Divine power" corresponds to a truth; my point is, that he endorses the mechanical conception of the relation of God and his creatures, the inadequacy of which has so often been proved. What, then, it may be asked, is the truth which Mr. Balfour is seeking to enforce, when it is stripped of its artificial garb? The truth seems to me to be, that the world is essentially divine—not partly devilish and partly divine. There is no external and mechanical action of God upon it; the Spirit of God permeates it down to its minutest fibre. Nothing can prevent the realization of good, because the principle of goodness is the essence of all forms of existence. On the other hand, the realization of goodness is possible only by a process: for goodness is not something which immediately exists, but something which must be won by pain and travail. Evil is therefore not an accident in the world. If we admit that only through the consciousness of evil can man realize the depths as well as the heights of his own nature, without the consciousness of evil he could not attain to the consciousness of goodness. But, because his deepest nature is to live and will the good, the triumph of goodness is assured. Pessimism is contradicted by pessimists; for what ultimately gives force to pessimism is the conviction that the true nature of man is goodness. In this sense, then, that the whole process of evolution is the growing consciousness of the Divine as that which is present in evil not less than in goodness, but in evil only as the necessary step to goodness, we may admit Mr. Balfour's claim for a "preferential exercise," I should not say of Divine "power," but of the Divine "Spirit," as revealed in and to man. In other words, we must view the whole universe as working together towards the realization of goodness. It requires no mechanical action of Divine "power," because it is from first to last the embodiment of the Divine "Spirit."

So far it would seem that the world is not only the creation of God, but is guided toward good. Mr. Balfour has next to explain the rise of the religious consciousness. This he does by saying that in every age, country and people, man has been under the "Inspiration" of God. This view we seem compelled to endorse because religious beliefs require "a Cause harmonious with their essential nature." Mr. Balfour, however, does not limit Inspiration to religious beliefs, but he holds that "every addition to knowledge, whether in the individual or the community, whether scientific, ethical or theological, is due to a co-operation between the human soul which assimilates and the Divine power which inspires." Inspiration, in the sense assigned to it by Mr. Balfour, does not allow us to hold that there is any peculiar endowment by which any man has revealed to him a truth which is hidden from others. All men, in Mr. Balfour's view, are inspired, —unless, indeed, we hold that there is any man who is absolutely destitute of even the faintest glimmer of truth.

The definition which Mr. Balfour gives of "Inspiration" is open to the same kind of objection which we have found to beset his conception of the "preferential action of the Divine power." He opposes the activity of man in the production of belief to the activity of God, and figures the result as due to the co-operation of two independent causes. This seems to me an external and mechanical way of conceiving the matter. Let us take the case of the savage belief in the duty of slaying an enemy. If this belief is due to the co-operation of two "causes"—God and man—we are entitled to ask what part of the belief is to be apportioned to each? We may, no doubt, say that this belief contains the true element, that it insists upon the sacrifice of the natural love of life to a public end, while it contains the false element of denying the fundamental identity of all men. Is the false element contrbuted by man, the true element by God? Mr. Balfour is, I think, bound to say so, because he regards this as an instance of the "preferential action of the Divine power." Thus we come back to the difficulty already pointed out, that man is by his very nature capable of originating what is false, but not of originating what is true; whence it follows that so far as he reaches truth, he is the passive instrument of the Divine power. Now, such a conception seems to me fundamentally false. The nature of man, I should say, is such that he is capable at once of truth and falsehood, of good and evil. There is no external action upon him of Divine power, but in man the Divine Spirit is implicit, and reveals itself in the free activity by which he grasps the meaning of the world, of himself and of God. To suppose that God acts externally upon him is to suppose that he is originally indifferent to good or evil, or that he is only evil; whereas, in truth, man is potentially evil and good, but is so constituted that as he learns to recognize what he is, he gradually liberates himself from evil and identifies himself with the true law of his being. Thus, the Spirit of God is ever present in man. "Co-operation," except in the sense of the free identification with what is revealed in him as the divine law of his nature, is unmeaning. If "inspiration" is employed in this sense of the steps by which man gradually learns that his true nature can be realized only by giving himself up to God absolutely and completely, we get rid of the mechanical idea of an external action upon man by God, or a "co-operation" of two beings whose nature is generically different. For "co-operation" we must substitute the free response of the spirit of man to the Spirit of God.

Now, if we take this view, it is obvious that we cannot separate, as Mr. Balfour does, between inspiration as the "cause," and inspiration as the "authority" of belief. On Mr. Balfour's view, God is the "cause" or rather the part cause of all man's beliefs—as if man had an activity of his own, independently of God—but the beliefs so caused are not therefore true. The distinction is really unmeaning. So far as man has attained to beliefs even partially true, he must be stimulated to hold them by God, and therefore, if we are to apply the imperfect idea of efficient cause at all, we must maintain that the beliefs are ultimately referable to God. And the "preferential action of Divine power" is introduced precisely in order to explain how man, with whatever admixture of error, advances to truth. Thus the cause of the beliefs is at the same time the source of the truth they contain. Now, if this is so, there can be no generic distinction between the two senses of "inspiration" which Mr. Balfour distinguishes. If all inspiration is the process by which man is led to truth, we may properly distinguish *degrees* of inspiration, but we cannot distinguish *kinds* of inspiration. What, then, is the criterion by which one degree of inspiration is distinguished from another? It can only be the *degree of truth* which is attained through the inspiration. The test, and the only test, of the degree in which a man is inspired must be the truth by which he is inspired. This, then, is the standard by which religious, like all other inspiration, must be tested. Tried by this standard, there can be no doubt of the degree of inspiration, or, what is the same thing, the degree of truth of the various religions of the world. Christianity is the religion which is in the highest sense inspired, because it is the religion which is in the highest sense true. This, as it seems to me, is the only defence of Christianity which is possible, or which is needed. The development of the religious consciousness culminates in Christianity. Had Mr. Balfour, in seeking to lay down the "foundations of belief" taken due notice of the convincing force of the argument from the development of the religious consciousness, he would not have found it necessary to defend the Christian faith by an appeal *ad misericordiam*; the whole process of inspiration, as he would have seen, culminates in the inspiration of Him in whom and by whom there has been revealed to us the essential nature of God, man and the world.

And this leads us to consider Mr. Balfour's advance from Theism to Christianity. The essence of Christianity he identifies with the doctrine of the Incarnation. That this is the central idea of Christianity is no doubt true, but it seems to me that it will require a very robust faith to survive the shock of Mr. Balfour's defence of it. The Incarnation he regards as a "mystery," in the scholastic sense of a truth which is beyond our comprehension. In defence of this untenable view he argues that "if we cannot devise formulae which shall elucidate the familiar mystery of our daily existence, we need neither be surprised nor embarassed if the unique mystery of the Christian faith refuses to lend itself to inductive treatment." The comparison is suggestive. By the "familiar mystery of our daily existence," Mr. Balfour means mainly the difficulty of explaining the relations of soul and body. And it must be admitted that, if we start from the abstract opposition of soul and body, their relation is not only mysterious but inexplicable. But it is not inexplicable, if we once admit that body in separation from soul, or soul in separation from body, are unreal and meaningless abstractions, and that any attempt to determine their relation by the mechanical conception of action and re-action is utterly inadequate. Now a similar line of thought must be applied to the relation of man and God. If we first suppose man to be complete in himself apart from God, we shall never succeed in explaining their relation; all explanation we have made impossible by the artificial separation of the one from the other. But if, as I have contended, man contains within himself the divine nature in potentiality, it is obvious that we shall never comprehend the true nature of man until we recognize, not merely that he has been made "a little lower than God," but that he is in the most absolute sense "made in the image of God." It is from this point of view, as it seems to me, that we must interpret the doctrine of the Incarnation. That doctrine is not mysterious in the sense of making the nature of God more unintelligible than ever, but it is essentially the true revelation of the very nature of God.

This, however, is not Mr. Balfour's view of the doctrine; its only basis, he contends, lies in the satisfaction which it gives to three of our "ethical needs."

The first of these "needs" is a belief in the supreme importance of man as compared with all other forms of known existence. The advance of science has so enlarged our perception of the illimitable extent of the physical universe, that it seems incredible that man should be the final cause of all creation. The doctrine of the Incarnation, however, restores our belief in the importance and dignity of man.

The highly artificial character of this reasoning is at once obvious. It is indeed difficult to speak seriously of an argument which would attribute the revelation of God in Christ as a predetermined device to prevent men of the nineteenth century from sinking under the burden of metaphysical speculation, scientific discovery and "imaginations glutted with material infinities." No such paltry artifice, surely, is sufficient to explain the central idea of Christianity. The expansion of our ideas of the physical universe, if, on the one side, it suggests how petty man is in merely physical bulk, on the other side suggests how god-like is that power of reason by which he is enabled to read its nature and history. But this is a relatively insignificant fact. The principle of evolution has led us to see that the development of the whole solar system, and therefore indirectly of the whole universe, has tended steadily and surely to the production of man, and to the gradual comprehension of the meaning of the whole as a self-determined Spirit. Interpreting the past in the light of this truth, we cannot resist the conclusion that in the Son of Man there has come to manifestation the innermost nature of the Divine. It is because Mr. Balfour has not got rid of the mechanical view of the eighteenth century rationalists,—strongly as he objects to Rationalism—that he regards the Incarnation as a device to teach us that God is mindful of man.

The second point in which the doctrine of the Incarnation meets our ethical needs is in freeing us from the materialistic view of the dependence of mind on body. It is true that there is no philosophical defence of that view; yet it is hard to get rid of, and hence the great value of the Incarnation, which shows that man is spiritual.

We have here the same artificial view as before of the accommodation of the doctrine of the Incarnation to the speculative difficulties of the present day. Mr. Balfour, indeed, holds that the dependence of mind on body cannot be defended, but he also holds, apparently, that neither can we prove the independence of mind on body. His view seems to be that mind can be shown to be independent of body only if it has no relation to body. We can safely say than no doctrine can ever establish so untenable a theory. To separate mind from body is to make it unmeaning; and Mr. Balfour in supposing that the doctrine of the Incarnation gives countenance to such a doctrine, is the victim of his own preconceptions. Mind is no thing-in-itself, which can be real apart from body: it is the principle of unity which enables the conscious subject to grasp the meaning of body and its affections, and to subordinate them to ideal ends. A mind entirely separated from body would be powerless even if it existed: only a mind which employs the body as its instrument has any reality. The whole conception of a separate mind is of a piece with the dualistic mode of thought which Mr. Balfour, undeterred by its historical disproof, is vainly seeking to reinstate.

Lastly, the doctrine of the Incarnation makes the problem of moral evil more intelligible, for it shows that God suffered for us and suffered innocently. Now, there is no doubt that the doctrine of the Incarnation reveals God to us as self-sacrificing. But Mr. Balfour will in vain try to persuade any man, who fully realizes what he is saying, that the essence of that doctrine is adequately expressed in the juristic conception of substitutionary sacrifice which he seems to endorse. What the doctrine of the Incarnation affirms, when it is interpreted in its spirit, and not accepted as a dead and unintelligible dogma, is, that evil is a stage in that process by which man is spiritualized. If this is true, the burden of the guilt of others will be borne by the innocent, not grudgingly, but gladly, as it was borne by the Founder of our faith. Mr. Balfour's contention, that God in the person of his Son has adopted the guilt of humanity, tacitly implies that man is in his immediate nature evil, and that he can attain to goodness only by turning against it. Accepting this truth, we are freed from the false view that evil is an accident, or that it is eternal. When we realize, with the faith of our Lord, that all things, evil as well as good, are the ministers of good, our human weakness will no doubt lead us at times to a temporary pessimism, but it can never lead us to a final despair of the rationality and goodness of God. What I cannot but call the vulgar interpretation of the doctrine of the Incarnation which Mr. Balfour seeks to commend to the lips of our perplexed generation, is dead and cannot be resuscitated, and least of all by such a collection of uncritical and self-contradictory preconceptions as Mr. Balfour calls his "provisional philosophy."

JOHN WATSON.

CARMEN.

PANGE lingua carmen quale
Pium decet studium;
Almae Matris hospitale
Laeta lauda gremium;
Adsit melos virginale
Juvenumque canticum.

Hic majores posuere
Semen, cujus segetem
Ipsi poterant videre
Tantum per imaginem,
Nobis tandem datur vere
Carpere dulcedinem.

Tum Collegium Reginae
Domus erat lignea:
Sed Scientiae divinae
Nihil obstant aspera:
Qui se dederit doctrinae
Tandem vincit omnia.

Brevis series annorum,
Surgit ordo lapidum;
Studium discipulorum
Erigit palatium;
Nam amore alumnorum
Nostrum stat collegium.

Hinc per annos it in mundum
Agmen altum artibus,
Totum teres et rotundum;
Homines emittimus
Aptos ad efficiundum
Quidquid rogat Dominus.

Nobis dederunt majores:
Quales ergo gratias
Nos reddamus debitores?
Grates vel dignissimas
Nostri referent labores
Studium et pietas.

T. R. GLOVER.

THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF CLASSICAL AND POPULAR LATIN.*

A study of the relations subsisting between Classical Latin and Popular or Dialectical Latin, opens up a historical problem of the highest interest. A clear conception of this two-fold character of the Latin language is of prime importance, not only to the student of Greco-Roman culture, but also to the student of the Romance languages.

The fact that Classical Latin reached its zenith when aristocratic influences were all powerful in the State, and that Latin purity declined with the depression of the nobles, readily suggests the view that Classical Latin was the medium of a limited circle, a refined and socially exclusive caste, whose suppression or expansion would alike bring about disastrous changes in the tone of literary society. This highly artificial language with every phrase polished, every sentence balanced, every sentiment the echo of some earlier Greek thought, was strained to the utmost as an instrument of literary expression, even by those stylists who contributed most zealously to bring it to perfection. It broke down under the mass of new ideas imported from all quarters. Cicero in his letters and philosophical treatises frequently complains of the inadequacy of the Latin language to furnish fit expressions for his thoughts. The old bottles could not hold the wine of the new ideas. This was the penalty of limiting the vocabulary of literature to what had been fixed by a privileged class, highly cultivated no doubt but narrow in its sympathies and the circle of its ideas, scorning the language of the lower orders and avoiding all intercourse with them, while too slavishly following after Greek models, expressions, and ideas. Had the surrender to these been less complete, and had the full resources of the Latin language been brought into play, those ideas which were a merely external addition of foreign learning would have been slowly assimilated by the Latin people.

---

*An address delivered before the University at its Fall Convocation.

There are large regions of thought that were never traversed by the Roman mind. In abstract words and philosophic terminology, Latin is very meagre. This was not due, as so many have asserted, to the limited endowments of the Latin race. The Latin mind with a freer vocabulary proved itself capable, in the metaphysical theology of Augustine and other Christian fathers, of grappling with the abstrusest subtleties of thought. It was due rather to the arrested development of the language, of which one of the chief causes was, the establishment of the Empire under Caesar Augustus.

The Empire was founded on the ruins of the aristocratic party. It depended for its stability on the fidelity of a powerful army and on the goodwill of the common people. Augustus was no purist in his speech, though, as a matter of policy, he patronized literary men, and made bosom friends of Vergil, Horace and their patron Macaenas. He had an eye to read the signs of the times as his great relative Julius Caesar had. He clearly saw that the long struggle between the nobles and the Commons, marked by many a stubborn contest for public honours and for public lands, was drawing to a close, and that the commons had won. As they favoured him, so did he favour them. With all his high birth and keen intelligence, there was in him a vulgar strain. Hence his great affability with the crowd, his familiarity of manner, his love of comic representations and his constant presence at the sports most affected by the vulgar. In his court were to be found, not merely scholars and nobles, now a broken and discredited class, but also in larger numbers and with much greater influence, the favorites and representatives of the people, on familiar terms with the high officers of State and of the army. Mingling among the various groups passed along Caesar Augustus, and though he was no vindictive man Roman writers tell us that it afforded the Emperor immense and mischievous enjoyment to shock the sensibilities of the nobles by using the language of the markets and the streets, and to see writhe under the infliction of his " broad Doric " those who among each other affected to regard him as the mere nephew of his uncle.

Thus finally did the Popular Latin gain the mastery over its polished and intellectual sister—The Classical Latin of Literature and high Society. The waves had long been undermining the dyke thrown up against the encroachments of the vulgar tongue; but, notwithstanding the strict guard of scholars, stylists, and nobles, reinforced by Greek rhetors, grammarians, and declaimers, the barriers were at last found ineffectual. A new political organization was favourable to a new order of things social and intellectual.

Our subject being so closely connected with the course of political events, a full discussion of it, if that were at all possible, would be the explanation of a great many other questions. This special study, so narrow in its apparent range, so based on minutiae, while appealing chiefly to the linguist and to the student of ancient literature, has also a still wider interest. The solution of it enables us with far greater intelligence to grasp the course of Roman history and of the Romance languages.

Until the middle of this century, it had not dawned upon the minds of scholars, that corresponding to the two hostile castes into which Roman society had been rent by violent class feuds, there was also a division of the speech into two branches, that of the Patricians and that of the Plebeians or Popular Party.

The fact that there was a popular dialect markedly distinct from the speech of the higher classes, was first pointed out by Fauriel and Ampère in France, but it was German scholarship that in this as in every other abstruse study, proved to a demonstration and illustrated by abundant examples the full extent of the contrast between the two. Two scholars especially contributed to put the question on a scientific basis. The first of these was Draeger in his Historical Syntax of the Latin Language. In this work he traced the different stages through which Latin has passed, and exhibited copiously the simple construction of Early or Pre-Classical Latin, the complexity of Classical Latin, and the return in Post-Classical Latin to the earlier simplicity of the Popular speech, whereby the way was paved for the simpler and more analytical Romance Languages in which Popular Latin finally issued. The second of these notable scholars is Schuchardt. In his work on the Vocalism of the Popular Latin, he has clearly established the laws of vowel change in Latin. By following the history of each vowel from the Indo-European Age through Latin to the Romance languages in their present form, he proves conclusively that vowels never change their quality or their quantity so long as they stand in an accented syllable. Whatever changes the consonants may have undergone, the vowel remains unchanged. It was on his conclusions, together with investigation of the various other Indo-European languages, that was founded the dictum of the New School Philology, now by all linguists accepted as an axiom: "The vowel is the soul of the syllable." This role of the vowel in language is in direct contradiction to the general belief and especially to the definition of Voltaire, who styled Etymology as that Science in which the consonants count for little, and the vowels for nothing at all.

That the Speech of Latium should have split into two such dialects as the Popular and the Classical Latin, and that its issue should be something so very different as the Romance languages, strikes us at first sight as strange when we compare the regular and almost undisturbed course through which the Greek language ran. The evolution of the Greek language was natural and from within. There were no violent social feuds or disastrous invasions to disturb the course of events as in Italy. Somehow or other, though the Greeks had less virility than the Romans, they showed more vitality. They were able to beat back for ages the waves of Gothic, Arabic and Turkish invasion, and did not succumb till a thousand years after the Fall of Rome.

The Greek of the Byzantine writers does not differ much in its elements from that of Plato or Aristotle, and Romaic or Modern Greek is more like Homer, three thousand years away, than Victorian English is like Chaucer, five hundred years away.

In Rome the case was very different from what it was in Greece. Not only were there powerful assaults from without which finally broke up the Roman Empire, but more ominous than these, there were social conflicts in the State which from the very first rent the fabric of Roman society, and split the nation into two opposing camps, each with its shibboleth. In no civilized nation was there a sharper cleavage between the high and the low. Patrician pride has become a by-word. Between the Patricians and the Plebeians there was absolutely no intercourse. Roman law simply registered the stern fact. Beteen these classes no connubium or legal marriage could take place. Everything that savoured of the people had on it the stamp of vulgarity. The language of polished society was quite different, therefore, from that of the streets or the market; yet not to such a degree that either class was unintelligible to the other. The difference was as great, to say the least, as that between literary English and the rude provincial dialects of England. It is this uncouth speech that under the smile of Imperial favour, came forth from the shadows under which so long it lay and that overthrew the literary speech, and the effete aristocratic society that had lost bodily and mental vigour through non-intercourse with the mass of the nation, the children of the soil, just as their language had lost the power of advance by cutting loose from its base of supply—the storehouse of national speech. These two dialects are in contrast, not only in accent and intonation, but also by differences in grammar, structure and vocabulary. In order to understand, even imperfectly, the contrast between the Popular and the Classical Latin, let us compare Plautus, 200 B.C., in the dawn of Latin literature, and Gregory of Tours,—a contemporary of Boethius,—at its close, 500 A.D., with Cicero or Livy, in the full zenith of Latin literary culture in the Augustan age.*

Mark the directness of speech, the homely vigour, the simplicity of structure, the short pithy sentences, the modern order of words, the abundant use of prepositions, the small use of the subjunctive, and the thought with no pre-occupation of art easily breaking through the words everywhere in Plautus and Gregory standing at opposite extremes of the history of the language. Now, compare with these a passage from Livy or Cicero. Observe the long roll of the sentence like that of some Atlantic breaker. All the processes of involved or synthetic style are brought here into play. The movement of the thought is marked by subtle distinctions in declension and conjugation, by subordinate sentences that qualify or explain, and by those minor touches that a masterhand knows how to give. All the terms are chosen in accordance with the best usage, every sentence is in itself well balanced and contributes to the general rhythm, each phrase is a work of art, is a symphony wherein the thought is balanced and caressed, until every even the minutest shade of it is expressed. Certainly if Boethius with his prim accuracy and labored style, be the natural evolution of Cicero through the legitimate line of Quintilian and Pliny—Gregory of Tours with his pith and artlessness must be in the natural line of descent from the contemporaries of Plautus.

---

*Paul Monceaux—Le Latin Vulgaire, p. 430 et passim.

The question naturally suggests itself, What is the origin of the Popular Latin? It is the primitive language of Rome—the Latin dialect, having close affiliations with Umbrian and Oscan. It lived upon the lips of the common people, unchecked by literature or grammarians. In its native rudeness and picturesque freedom it has been the language of Rome's soldiers, traders, the popular classes, and the illiterate in general. By unskillful hands it has been found written upon tombs, on religious offerings, and on the walls of Pompeii, up to the third century before Christ it was the sole language of the Romans. And through the long history of Rome, wherever the eagles of her legions flew, there it was carried on the rough lips of soldiers, traders and colonists.

It is interesting to observe the tendency of the language at the time of the second Punic War—say the time of Plautus. Not only is the construction of the simplest, without periods or much inversion of order, but instead of case forms the preposition is abundantly employed and phrases quite familiar to Italian and French. This abundant use of prepositions and phrases is due to the same cause, viz: the strong force-accent of the Latin language. This is the prevailing accent of northern nations like the English and Latin peoples characterized by energy and a practical bent, whereas southern nations of a more social and artistic genius use the sing-song or musical accent. So too in the different grades of society, the lower classes are abrupt and explosive in their utterance, while the voices of the upper classes are more musical and finely modulated. This fuller intonation is due to the larger use of the vowel sounds. This force-accent, characteristic of Latin, falling on the earlier syllables of words, imperilled all that followed the accent. Now, in this earliest stage of Latin, we see at work the Etymological laws which were gradually changing the form of the Popular Latin, to become at a later period French, Italian, Spanish, etc. We have already the Romance languages in germ. And had not Italy come into contact with Greece it is probable that Italian would have been born a thousand years earlier than it actually was. But after the Punic Wars, Greece intervened; then the Romans became ambitious of creating a literature. For this they sacrificed the national language. From this time there were two dialects, the Sermo Plebeius or Rusticitas and the Sermo Urbanus or Latinitas. Each went its own course, the disintegration or rather natural evolution of the popular speech, being all the more rapid as there was nothing now to check its course, since it had no literature and was scorned by scholars. On the other hand, the Classical Latin by bringing in the musical or rhythmic pronunciation of the Greek so expressive of the harmony of the Greek nature, toned down the harshness and abruptness of the Latin force-accent, which was a fitting expression of the energy and masterfulness that lay at the basis of Roman character. The blending of the two accents made of Latin the most sonorous and stately of all languages and the fitting speech of the masters of the known world.

With a fury of admiration and imitation the Romans threw themselves upon Greece and appropriated everything Greek: Greece's art, its versification, its divisions of literature, its modes of expression. They checked the destructive tendency of the Latin stress accent and preserved the life of unaccented syllables, giving to Latin the full vowel richness it previously lacked. They spared nothing to raise Latin to the height of its destiny, they enriched it, polished it, refined it, they checked it in its course of change to become something very different from the language of Latium and for some ages gave it a character of fixity.

The success of Classical Latin was very rapid. Already Plautus and Terence herald the great classics. Under the patronage of the Scipionic circle after the capture of Corinth, 146 B.C., and the complete subjugation of Greece, the language of good society assumes an established usage. With the early orators the Gracchi, Hortensius and the dictator, Sylla, prose composition spreads and becomes polished. Cicero adds rhythm to it. Verse already was full and strong, but a little embarassed and redundant in Lucretius; pliable in the hands of Catullus, and still infected with imitations of the Alexandrian poets. It becomes later free and precise in the hands of Horace and Virgil. Latin literature thus reaches its culmination in the Ciceronian period and the skillful versification of the contemporaries of Augustus.

Why, having reached this height, did it not sustain itself there? Why, having merely expanded its wings, did the genius of Latin literature falter and droop? Cicero says the Gauls were to blame for the deterioration in the tone and speech of good society. As one not to the manner born, a *novus homo,* he was more orthodox than the orthodox, more of a patrician than the patricians themselves. Notwithstanding all his zeal, he felt that there were influences at work more powerful than his own and that of his literary friends. He cast about for the cause and found it in the growing influence in Roman society of the Gauls. This is human nature. The fault is always somewhere else than in ourselves, in our stars, in something external—the foreigner—the wicked partner. There was some measure of truth in Cicero's reason, but it was not the whole truth. Even if it were so, what section of Italy had a clearer right to influence the course of Latin speech than the Lombard plains—the land of Virgil, Livy and the later Dante. Long before the Celtic Virgil or the Celtic Livy had won imperishable fame in Latin letters, the Celt had been invading the circles of Roman society. His accent was to refined ears in Rome as intolerable as that of the North country adventurers, who flocked from Scotland to the English court when the Stuart line mounted the English throne, but like these adventurers, the Italian Celt made his way. There was soul in him. He brought with him the breeziness of the North. His wit, his force of imagination, though it had often in it the Breton gloom, his vivacity, his hunger after ideas, his eagerness after culture and the intercourse of fine society, his physical strength combined with delicacy and tenderness of sentiment, were irresistible factors in his success. These qualities broke down gradually every barrier and gave him the open sesame of Roman society. But he could never rid himself wholly of his provincial accent. In his pronunciation, the initial Celtic accent, falling as in all Celtic dialects on the first syllable, was more destructive of final and intermediate vowels than even the popular pronunciation in vogue among the lower classes of Rome. But after all, whatever Cicero may say, this was only a secondary reason.

The true reason was that the growth of Latin had been too rapid. Its artistic forms were fixed before it had developed its resources. The roots of the language did not penetrate into the rich soil of national life and experience. It was not nourished from below. That which most contributed to disorganize the language was the influx of new ideas, especially of philosophic notions resulting from wider study. Cicero says, "One despairs of expressing in Latin what has been learnt from the Greeks." The proper term was often simply transcribed from the Greek. Latin in its poverty was incessantly forced to borrow. In the polished form at which it had arrived, it could be maintained only by increasing vigilance on the part of the Grammarians. Nowhere did the school-master flourish in greater esteem than at Rome. He appears at once with Latin literature- Nowhere was he held in higher honour or clothed with more authority. The example of Julius Caesar writing a treatise on Grammatical Analogy, the grammatical studies of the Emperor Claudius, a mass of anecdotes in Suetonius and Aulus Gellius, show how highly grammatical minutiae absorbed the interest at Rome. They discussed unceasingly the form and sense of words, the pronunciation, the orthography, the syntax and prosody of the language. This was not mere pedantry, but pure necessity. It was necessary in order to preserve it in its purity, to be always in the breech to defend a language always assailed and ready to crumble away. Classical Latin was a work of art, created by the patience and talent of several generations of scholars, supported by the favor of the patrician class, and exalted to the loftiest pitch by a succession of writers of the highest genius. As soon as it ceased to be the organ of the ruling class, and the fount of inspiration that had supplied it was exhausted, it was destined to fall.

For its irreconcilable enemy the vulgar Latin still lived on. It was always knocking at the gates. In the thousand trifles of ordinary life, it was in full vigour. After the establishment of the Empire there gradually rose an aristocracy of wealth. It recruited itself from the Italian provinces and the conquered nations. Its pride lay in its wealth and not in the richness of its culture. However well it learned Latin it was not the Latin of Scipio or Caesar. In the Imperial court those who give the tone are often powerful freed men of barbarous origin and surface refinement. From the second century of the Christian era, the Classical Latin was in full retreat. Under the Empire the provinces had been much more fertile in great men than Rome. At first the most celebrated writers come from Spain, as Seneca and Lucan, thereafter from Africa. These countries produced literary schools which in their turn reacted powerfully on Rome, and thus contributed to promote the decline of the literary Latin.

So rapidly did the Classical speech lose ground even in the Roman capital that the Emperor Hadrian preferred the Vulgar Latin to the Classical, and Ennius and Cato as writers to Cicero and Virgil. A wave of archaism passed over the empire. African writers were the fashion, because the Roman colonists of Africa retained most of the old Latin modes of speech. And this was not because the Classical writers represented in some measure the patrician class, but because it was much easier to understand the old writers, whose diction was so closely allied to the popular speech.

At the court of Marcus Aurelius, Greek only was employed. The Emperor Septimius Severus, A.D. 146—211 expressed himself with ease only in the Berber or Punic speech. When he spoke Latin he did so ill, and with an African accent. Outside the court the Popular Latin entered freely into the technical works of Vitruvius and the writers on agriculture, and into the romances of Petronus and Apuleius. It was installed at the bar, where Quintilian and Tacitus were astonished to meet it. Under its three principal forms, speech of the rustics, archaism and Africanism, it invaded the entire literature and was rapidly dislodging from its position as the language of the professions the Classical Latin which became almost a dead language in the second century of our era.

When Christianity appeared upon the scene it ranged itself on the side of the popular language. In accordance with the spirit of its Founder, to the poor was the gospel preached. As Tertullian expressed it, his business was to save souls and not to polish phrases. In his sermons addressed to his African hearers, Augustine says, "I often use expressions which are not good Latin. I do so that you may the more readily understand me." And he adds "I prefer to be called to order by the grammarians than to be misunderstood by you." When Saint Jerome, A.D. 345—420, the most elegant Latinist of Christian Rome, writes his historical works and his lives of the Saints, he uses the most polished language of which he was capable. But read his translation of the Bible intended for the people, his commentaries, his dogmatic and exegetical treatises. You would think they originated in a totally different age and from a totally different author. "Latin is modified incessantly according to the country and the time." There exists for example a Latin of Gaul, a Latin of Spain and a Latin of Africa. Christianity by adopting the Popular Latin in its service, thus sealed the victory of the Vulgar dialect over its polished sister the Classical Latin.

Two questions have often been asked to which only the briefest answers can here be given. The first is:

Was it not a calamity for the history of human thought that Classical Latin did not ally itself with the Popular dialects and thus possessed of an ampler store of diction and experience give expression to a wider range of ideas and touch at more numerous points the whole life of the nation?

To this the answer is that with deeper interests in Italy, Rome would have been less drawn to Greece. Her eminence comes from straining after Greek achievements in literature. Rome's narrowness and her altitude go together. She has in her literature the virtues of her defects and the defects of her virtues.

The other question is, Was it not a calamity that through the supression of liberty under Imperial rule, Classical Latin was not permitted to develope itself fully in all the spheres of mental activity on which it had entered, but was forced to halt in mid career?

To this the answer is, that rapidity of growth entails speedy decay. It was not the lack of liberty, but the lack of men of original genius that brought Classical Latin to an abrupt end. Rome has given us her best in the way of literary achievement. Had her national life been twice as long the effort could not have been duplicated. There are in history few resurrections of nations. The modern world was coming into birth.

It was well, on the contrary, for the history of human thought, that the stream of Latin speech instead of flowing on with a full current made up of the various provincial dialects, was forced into the narrow channel of the Classical tongue, for only thus could it have attained to the high water mark of the magic verse of Virgil, the mellifluous flow of Livy, the sonorous roll of the Ciceronian period, the "*curiosa felicitas*" of Horace, and the dramatic gloom of Tacitus.

It was well, too, that in the course of time the barrier interposed by Classical Latin was broken down, and the mighty river recovering its full volume was enabled at a later day to fertilize a wider area, and in its course to originate the Italy of Dante and Alfieri, the Spain of Cervantes and Calderon, and the France of Fenelon and Molière.

A. B. NICHOLSON.

LAUDATRICES TEMPORIS ACTI.

> "till thou shalt come
> Unto the Gorgons' land Cisthene's plain
> Where dwell the Three Grey Sisters Phorcys' brood,
> Swan-shaped, one-toothed, with but a single eye
> To share betwixt the three; on these the sun
> Shines not, nor ever the moon's gaze by night."
> Aeschylus *Prom. Vinctus*, 792--797

In the drear unshapen Northland,
On the hoarse-resounding shore,
Sat the three Grey ancient sisters,
Cold and cheerless evermore.

Sat upon a black-veined boulder,
Shivering on the wrinkled stone,
Ever rocking ever crooning
In a low weird monotone.

As the tempest shrilly howling,
Icy spray around them threw,
Still they sang, "Those ages olden
Were far better than the new."

And beneath the waves infuriate
Ever thud and ever dash,
And above the sullen conflicts
Of the air still boom and crash.

And far out to sea the ice-hills
Butt their sides with dull uproar,
Still the three Grey ancient sisters
Sit and shiver evermore.

Rocking on that wrinkled boulder,
Thus they spake as fell the spray,
"O, our Sire, great minded Cronos,
Give us back that olden day.

"We are cold and cheerless, father,
Rocking, crooning on this stone,
We who in the dreary Northland,
Live one-eyed and all alone."

So they spake; the son of Cronos
Heard the woe-worn suppliants' prayer,
Heard their pitiful petition;
Hearing made their griefs his care.

Down into that ice-bound ocean,
Fell the aged sisters three,
Fell and floated as the drift-wood,
Far into the Southern Sea.

There they found the warm sun's kindness,
Knew his genial loving ray,
And in gentle tears dissolving,
Wept their weary woes away.

Mingled with the dimpling waters,
And o'er the laughing summer sea
Wild birds hovering, screamed the requiem
Of those woe-worn sisters three.

JOHN MACNAUGHTON.

CRITICISM AND DEUTERONOMY.

IT is the purpose of this article briefly to give reasons for accepting the all but unanimous conclusion reached by modern criticism regarding the authorship of Deuteronomy; and then to enquire how far such a conclusion may be maintained, with loyalty to the recognized standards of the Church. This order of subjects is taken since the first question must be, What is the truth? That at all hazards. The next must needs follow in the case of one whose public adherence to the symbols of the Church is on record. In treating of this subject the writer makes no claim to Hebrew scholarship; in the matter of style and peculiarities of idiom he is entirely in the hand of the specialists; the reader therefore will be spared any details thereon, beyond the Revised Version of 1885 in the matter of the text we shall scarcely, if at all, venture. At the same time no careful student can escape forming some opinion on the questions raised, especially as magazines, reviews, novels, newspapers supply endless narrations and notices bearing thereon; even to the general reader some consideration seems imperative.

There are but two reasons adduced for the position that Moses was the author of the book in question: Jewish tradition; and the reference of our Lord to the Deuteronomic law of divorce as given by Moses.* With regard to the former there is positively no evidence worthy of credit to substantiate the same. True, this is a bald negation, but what more can be said when no evidence appears? Nor can the words of our Lord be pressed into the service by any one who, without a theory to support, considers the usage of language. Before me as I write is a book with this title: "The Psalms of David; imitated in the language of the New Testament by Isaac Watts, D.D.", and heading the versification, "The Psalms of David." No one dreams of charging the printer with forgery, or Dr. Watts with plagiarism, or David with the authorship. That, in our practical

---

*Mark x. 3, 4. Com. Deut., xxiv. 1.

Anglo Saxon speech. Sir Henry Maine in "*Early Law and Custom*" quoted by Prof. Andrew Harper in this connection writes:—"A gentleman in a high official position in India has a native friend who has devoted his life to preparing a New Book of Manu. He waits till there arises a king in India who will serve God and take the law from the new Manu when he sits in his court of justice." The *Laws of Manu* is a collection of precepts; religious, moral, ceremonial; based upon an early code, continued by a school of lawgivers, with emendations and changes suited to the times in which they were successively given forth. With this Hindoo there is no question of fraud; his book, should it be accepted, will be the Book of Manu; and he would be surprised should any impugn his integrity, or charge him with dishonest intent. As a scribe he is adapting the spirit of the Manu code to the existing needs of the day. No true criticism can ignore such facts as these, or fail to mark their bearing upon the undoubted oriental character of the Old Testament literature. It may be added, that the title in our English Bibles, "The fifth book of Moses called Deuteronomy" is no part of the Hebrew text, and is not found in the Septuagint or in the Vulgate, and consequently has no authority in itself. It may therefore be fairly concluded, that though consistent with the theory of Mosaic authorship, neither consideration can weigh against evidence to be adduced on the other side. The tradition is utterly without support; the reference to Moses by name is much too general to be pressed into critical service.

Turning to the book itself, on the very face there are indications that it was compiled, if not written, by another than the great lawgiver; the first six verses are an historical introduction by another hand; plainly the last chapter is not from the pen of Moses. A cursory reading will detect other marks of a codifier. Looking closer there is an expression "exceedingly confusing" on the Mosaic authorship theory, but clear as noonday on the supposition that another wrote it. The expression "beyond," or "over Jordan" is used ten times in Deuteronomy. Our English version has in seven instances rendered it "on this side Jordon," to escape the contradiction; for in each of these instances, "beyond Jordan" refers to the East, the land of Amalek and Moab. The revised correctly translates, rendering it manifest to the English reader that the writer dwelt on the West of Jordan, or in Palestine, where Moses never set his foot.* The other instances are from words placed by the author in Moses' mouth, and therefore correctly refer to the land West of Jordan; the speaker being on the East. These simple considerations suggest at once a narrator other than Moses, and a post Mosaic date.

In the entire absence of any definite external testimony as to the date of composition or to the person or persons who gathered the materials together, resort must be had to internal marks and comparison with other and similar documents. We may at once dismiss the plural "persons," used in the last sentence. That the writer used existing materials may be readily assumed; but there is such an evident unity in spirit, design and style, as to put beyond reasonable doubt the oneness of authorship. No such questions as the composite character of Genesis raises are germane here. The general principles upon which history is studied as compared with historical research in the earlier years of this century, have important bearings upon this question. What is known as the scientific method obtains, and thus far appears to be established; to say that it is not always correct in its conclusions, is only to say that it is worked by human instruments; but it is being worked with increasing confidence, and can no more be ignored in the progress of enquiry than can the surrounding atmosphere by the working man. Erewhile, history was little else than a gathering together of facts, real or mythical, very much after the fashion of a city directory, with little regard to the relation borne by the one event to the other, save chronological sequence or artificial classification. Now, the sources of information are themselves first examined, indications of interdependence if any noted, with other marks of credibility; then the facts are correlated and the progress marked as one period follows another in accordance with some general principles therein discovered. It were worse than folly to deny the application of this method to sacred history; the application must follow, and in fact is now being made in determining the dates and authorship of the books composing the sacred scriptures, and in reading the history of ancient Israel.

---

*The passages are I. 1, 5; III. 8; IV. 41, 46, 47, 49.

III. 20, 25; XI. 30.

We have already seen that Deuteronomy bears upon its very surface indications of a post Mosaic date. The application of the term "beyond Jordan," to the land of Moab, shewing residence on the west, carries the author or editorship on till after the conquest. The present form of the book being thus presumably later than the time of the Wanderings, a comparison of chapter xii with Exodus xx, 24, 26, would indicate a date at least not prior to the concentration of sacrifice at the temple site. This is further confirmed by the law of the kingdom, xvii, 14-20. It is not denied that Moses may have legislated in anticipation of the establishment of a kingdom, yet in the entire absence of any evidence, other than the record before us, that he did so; and in view of Samuel's protest* against the election of a king as a matter displeasing to God, the more rational view is that the time of the monarchy had been reached ere Deuteronomy was compiled. Moreover, even in its English dress, the style and spirit of the book is in advance of the earlier enactments. There is a spirituality of tone certainly not to be found in the acknowledged earlier requirements of the Mosaic code. (Comp. vi. 4—9. x. 15 ff.) Love to God is the ever present motive in Deuteronomy, and the style *e.g.* of the song of Moses (xxxii) is plainly in advance of any proved contemporary utterance. In fact vv. 7—12 look back to the events of a time long past; and can be consistently interpreted only as uttered in a time of prosperity, reviewing the mercies that had been of old. It is not, however, my intention to follow this aspect of the question further. Professor Andrew Harper's introductory chapter to his Deuteronomy in the Expositors Bible series, and Canon Driver's Introduction and Commentary, may be consulted for a more complete examination. It has been sufficiently indicated how one with the revised version in his hand can form in large measure for himself a conclusion as to the practically unanimous verdict of the critics of to-day, that Deuteronomy was wrttten long after the settlement of the tribes in Canaan, and in all probability after the Solomonic era. Being away from a library of reference, I write under correction; Professor Green is the only recognized scholar of the day who defends the traditional theory; and anyone who has walked through the quiet shades of Princeton can understand that as in Oxford the very air seems redolent of the cloister, so, in Princeton, a veteran's heart would naturally beat true to the traditions of yore.

---

*1 Samuel viii. 7, etc.

Does the maintaining of the post Mosaic composition of Deuteronomy in any way impugn the divine authority of the writing? or contravene the loyal relation a minister is supposed to sustain to the standards of his church? The latter question may be readily answered. The Confession of Faith in its first chapter does not even touch the questions of date or of authorship. The affirmation simply is that the scriptures are the Word of God; evidenced as such "by their majesty and purity: by the consent of all the parts, and the scope of the whole, which is to give all glory to God; by their light and power to convince and convert sinners, to comfort and build up believers unto salvation." So far as to the external evidence, which is no where bound up with questions of date or of authorship. "The Spirit of God bearing witness by and with the Scriptures in the heart of man, is alone able fully to persuade it that they are the very *word* (not words) of God." The standards leave us free to reverently discuss "the sundry times and divers manners" of God's declaration of His will, permitting change in our views as to the sequence and the forms of Old Testament revelation; they do not leave us free to touch the substance of that living Word which shines with the same divine truth at all times, and under every form of revelation. This however may be justly insisted upon, that the nearer we approach the truth regarding the time and method of a particular revelation, the better will be our understanding of the messages thus delivered.

The ascription of words by a writer to Moses at first sight appears to discredit the record, and yet few if any one of our readers would hold that Luke *e.g.* has given the very words uttered by Paul to the men of Athens on Mar's hill. In the Evangelists the teachings of our Lord are certainly given in translations. God spake in the prophets undoubtedly, but the prophets were orientals, and the language of the orient was used. To quote Canon Driver, "an author, therefore, in framing discourses appropriate to Moses' situation, especially if the elements were provided for him by tradition, would be doing nothing inconsistent with the literary usages of his age and people. In this there is nothing implying an interested or dishonest motive on the part of the author, and this being so, its spiritual and moral greatness remains unimpaired ; its inspired authority is in no respect less than that of any other part of the O. T. Scriptures which happens to be anonymous." The Western mind is not that of the Oriental, nor does it enter readily into sympathy with the orient, yet undeniably the holy men of old who spake as moved by the Holy Ghost were orientals, spake after the manner and thoughts of the orient, and we enter the more thoroughly into the message they were inspired to deliver as we place ourselves in sympathy with the sundry times and divers surroundings in which they uttered the truths most surely given through them to us by God. And the scientific method, reverently and candidly applied to the Scriptures, does enable us the more readily thus to appreciate their message.

With the late Professor W. Robertson Smith, we say that "no criticism can be otherwise than hurtful to faith if it shakes the confidence with which the simple Christian turns to his Bible, assured that he can receive every message which it brings to his soul as a message from God himself;" but the criticism which shakes faith is not that which searches for truth, but that which is fearful, and treats truth as an invalid to whom the fresh free air might be fatal. Possibly, for us who are advancing towards the bourne, traditional views may last our day, but we are recreant to our trust if we leave the heritage of a dead weight to those that must follow us. It needs no prophet's eye to see that new conditions will meet those who are now stepping on the scene of active life ; we should leave them free to tell "the old, old story," unencumbered by the shackles of effete traditions which have entangled too often our weary feet, and proved the bondage of many souls.

JOHN BURTON.

THE STRUCTURE OF MAN—AN INDEX OF HIS PAST HISTORY.

TWO views are held now-a-days regarding the appearance of man on the earth. The generally accepted one is that so sublimely and poetically described in the opening chapter of Genesis: "God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him." The other view is that man has been slowly evolved through the gradual improvement of a long line of ancestors, who have lived on the earth for probably millions of years. The creationist believes that man is the product of a sudden and special act: the evolutionist believes that man is the product of a series of vital processes, lasting from the foundation of the world down to the present time. The creationist emphasizes the view that man had a supernatural origin; the evolutionist emphasizes the view that man came by natural descent.

Now, there are three main lines along which proof may be submitted in favour of the belief in the natural descent of man. The first is the testimony of the rocks, the second is the testimony from embryology, and the third is the testimony from comparative anatomy, that is, from a comparison of a man's body with the bodies of other vertebrate animals. The evidence from these three sources is very extensive, and fills many volumes of the scientific literature of the world. This paper will only glance at the evidence from comparative anatomy.

Biologists submit proof that animals and plants are now, and ever have been, undergoing change. The changes were very slight at first, but as time went on and the differences became more marked, the individual animals or plants exhibiting these marked differences came to be looked upon as belonging to different varieties or different species, according to the judgment or opinion of different men. When biologists, however, use the term species, they do so without implying that the individuals composing it are entirely separate and distinct from those of another closely related species. In fact, the evolutionist always considers that if he could trace back the descent of any two closely allied species or families, he should always come to a common ancestor. The kernel in the belief of the creationist is that species is fixed and invariable, and has remained so ever since creation : the kernel in the belief of the evolutionist is that species is very variable, that offspring of both animals and plants come into being, exhibiting all degrees of variations and that these variations become greater and greater in succeeding generations, and have in past ages slowly but surely evolved all the varied forms of life that ever existed.

According to this view, each animal is linked to every other animal by "the ties of blood relationship." The animals of today sprang from those of yesterday; these of yesterday sprang from those of the day before, and so on backwards in time, further almost than the mind can reach. There has been organic continuity : no break in the history of life. The evolutionist claims that historic continuity is the order of nature and of all that man has accomplished. Back of the civilization of all nations lies savagery, back of savagery, our beast ancestors, and behind these a long line of animal forms, extending to the dawn of life on our earth. There is no biologist of note, in either Europe or America, who does not hold and teach the view that man came upon this earth by a process of natural descent from ancestors that were man-like, but not men, and ape-like, but not apes.

The weakness in this doctrine is this : thus far science has furnished no instance of a species giving rise to another perfectly new and permanent species. In other words, there has been no experimental proof of the doctrine. We have had an immense amount of experimentation, and have accumulated an enormous number of facts, all showing that many existing species of animals and plants are profoundly changed, through changes in their surroundings. For example, many animals which ordinarily live in fresh water may be gradually accustomed to live in salt water, and *vice versa*. Some aquatic animals when subjected to great pressure pass into a comatose state, from which they revive on removal of the pressure. Birds eggs, when hatched on end, or partially covered with glue, or incubated at a higher or lower temperature than the normal, or kept moving during incubation, instead of producing normal young, produce monstrosities. In the same way, hanging the cocoons of insects in a position different from the usual one, will produce insect monstrosities. Sea urchins' eggs may be made to develop into monstrosities by simply immersing the recently fertilized eggs for half a minute in fresh water, and then returning them to the sea water. In short, the facts are numerous which show that variations in the quantity or quality of the food, variations in heat, in light, in movement, in pressure, and in moisture—all produce variations in the form of animals and plants. An interesting result of some of these experiments has been to show that a few species which had been differently named and which were believed to be different, turned out to be one and the same spieces, existing in two different forms because of being subjected to different influences. All this experimental work, however, has so far produced not a single new species of animal from existing ones. But nothwithstanding this defect in the proof, leading biologists everywhere regard organic evolution as one of the solemn facts of the universe.

Assuming, then, that all higher animals have descended naturally from pre-existing ones, and that their primitive ancestors underwent variations in external and internal structure, which in course of time became so great as to conceal all superficial resemblances, we should still expect to find some deep-seated and well-marked traces of this relationship to existing animals. To put the matter in a concrete form, if the theory of organic evolution be true, we may expect to find in man a considerable number of bones, muscles, arteries, nerves and other organs, closely resembling similar organs in apes and in other vertebrate animals. Ever since the publication of Darwin's works on the *Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man*, biologists have used the doctrine of evolution to explain and elucidate obscure structures in the anatomy of a great many animals. In no animal has this method of study yielded so many interesting results as in the case of man. Structures in the human body, that were a puzzle to the early anatomists, have become luminous in the light which this theory throws upon them.

Of course, there are certain anatomical resemblances between man and the lower animals which everybody sees. Both have a head, body, fore and hind limbs; both have a pair of eyes, nose, mouth, a tail, and a hairy covering. Some of my readers may demur to the statement that man resembles the domesticated animals in having a tail and a hairy covering, but it is true nevertheless. A large nnmber of facts and a great amount of evidence have been adduced to prove that man at one time had abundance of hair, all over his body. The main proof is afforded by a study of the hair tracts upon infants. Careful observations on a large number of infants of all races shew, not merely that the hair covers the whole body, but also that it is disposed in regular tracts or regions, just as the feathers upon birds, or the scales upon fish. An unobserving person sees no order in the motions of the planets, except that of the sun and moon, sees no order in the directions in which the winds blow, in the migrations of birds, or the sequence of human history, and yet there is an order in all these things which is as apparent to the close observer, as the daily movements of men and women. And in the same way the student of comparative anatomy has observed and mapped out the hair tracts on man, and sees in their growth and regular disposition a close resemblance to those on the orangutan. Occasionally there is born a human being covered with hair from head to foot including the face and hands. A Russian possessing this peculiarity travelled with Barnum's circus a few years ago. He was called the "Russian dogman" from a supposed resemblance of the man's face to that of a dog. But the Russian was normal in every other respect, and the presence of hair on his face and body pointed backward to the time when all the ancestors of man were covered with hair.

As to the matter of tails, man is limited to a short one, possessing only four or five, or at most six bones. The number is very variable, and the organ is so short that most people are quite unconscious of its existence. If they recognize its presence at all, they consider it merely a part of the spinal column, and so it is. It is generally believed by biologists that man's ancestors had "a hairy covering, pointed ears and a long tail." All three structures illustrate a process which has gone on in many other parts of the body, viz., *retrogression*. We mean by this term that a structure or organ of the body was at one time larger or more prominent than we now find it to be in man. Other examples of organs that have undergone retrogression are the muscles which formerly moved the ears, those which moved the scalp, or moved the skin.

Besides organs which have undergone retrogression in the body, we meet with others which have undergone the very opposite change, viz. *progression*, that is, they have increased in size, and improved in function. All organs are undergoing one or other of these two processes. The muscles of the thumb on both back and under surface have undergone a higher differentiation and more subtle development; in fact, the hands as a whole, and especially the flexor muscles have vastly increased in efficiency over those found in any other animal. The arch of the foot, the heel and great toe, and in fact the whole lower limbs have become more perfect in adaptation to the upright gait. The muscles of speech have undergone improvement and are distinctly better adapted to articulate speech than anything we find in the lower animals. Wiedersheim, in a recent book (1895) bearing the title of this paper, discusses no less than 169 organs or structures which are undergoing either retrogression or progression in the human body.

Let us glance at a few of them. First and perhaps the most striking of all is the presence of gill-slits in the human embryo. Of course we are all familiar with the fact that fish have gill-slits or openings on the side of their neck, through which water passess from the mouth, for the purpose of respiration. But not so many are aware that all animals from fish upwards—amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals have at some period of their lives gill-slits. So perfectly general is this fact that it forms one of the distinguishing characteristics of vertebrate animals. As a rule, adult man shows no trace of these slits, but now and then there is born into the world an unfortunate child possessing these tructures. When this happens the child is unable to swallow food, because the food passes out at the unclosed gill-openings. But even in adults we have traces of these primitive gills. There are few surgeons engaged in large hospital practice who have not had patients from whom they have removed morbid growths or tumors, occuring along the neck at points which mark the site of the original gill-slits.

Such facts as these are inexplicable to the creationist. He cannot understand how, at any period of a man's development, there should appear on each side of his neck, gill-openings like those on a fish. With the evolutionist the case is quite different. He expects to find such ancestral structures on every part of a man's body, and gill-slits are just one out of many structures which inseparably connect man with the lower animals, and doint back to a time when man's ancestors were gill-bearing and gill-breathing animals.

The hard palate or roof of the mouth furnishes some interesting evidence regarding man's past history. As a rule, the transverse palatine opening, or suture, as it is called, runs right across the palate in nearly a straight line in the Caucasian. But in the negro, the line is slightly oblique, and in the orangutan the line is quite oblique. In the orangutan too, there is a pair of bones at the front part of the upper jaw, out of which grow the two upper incisor or cutting teeth. We find no such two bones in the jaw of either the European or the negro, but we find them in other vertebrate animals, all the way down to fish. Now, while a perfectly formed human being does not possess these two bones as separate pieces, we do find them in the mal-formation known as hare-lip. In this deformity, the opening always occurs exactly where the two bones meet in the jaw of the orangutan and in lower animals, and there is no escape from the conclusion that here, as in the case of the gill-slits, the gap between the bones and the adjoining ones has never been closed, resulting in this well-known deformity

Normally, in man, the wisdom tooth comes late in life and is the first to decay. It is undergoing retrogression in all white races. Sometimes it never appears at all, being either not formed, or if formed, retained within the gum. This tendency to retrogression is not nearly so marked in Negroes, and still less so in Mongolians and Australians. On the contrary, we find in the latter race complete rows of powerfully developed canine and molar teeth, growing more perfect from front to back, including the wisdom teeth. In fact, their teeth resemble closely those of apes, both in size and number. The ancestors of Europeans seem to have had equally good teeth, if we may judge from teeth found in skulls of the mammoth age. Occasionally too, as in a skull in Freiburg museum, we find a jaw with three bicuspid teeth in place of two—an exact resemblance to the teeth of the American monkey. Every large collection of skulls will contain one showing four molar teeth in place of three. Until recently, the possibility of man's developing a third set of teeth has been denied, but lately the evidence presented in its favor is indisputable. Some people get a third tooth—not a full set; and traces of a third dentition are found in the seal, the pig and the anteater.

The muscles in man vary in number from 200 to 250. This very variation in number will no doubt surprise many. Testut, a French anatomist, has a work of 900 pages, treating of variations in the number, form and location of the muscles in the human body. From the point of view from which we are considering man's structure, all muscles may be classified as belonging to one of the three following classes:—

1. Muscles which are undergoing retrogression, that is, vestigial muscles.
2. Muscles which appear only occasionally, that is, atavistic.
3. Muscles which are improving in structure and function, that is, progressive muscles.

A considerable number of examples of muscles which are undergoing these changes might be given, but a few must suffice. For example, in connection with our rudiment of a tail, we find two or three reduced muscles, whose function in our distant ancestors was evidently to move the tail, and so thoroughly is this fact recognized by anatomists that all standard text-books mention the muscles, extensor coccygis, levator coccygis, curvator coccygis, and abductor coccygis. The muscles which move the skin are other examples. These are only feebly developed in fish and amphibia, but in reptiles and birds they play an important role in the movements of scutes, scales and feathers. They are most fully developed in mammals, in which they spread like a mantle over the head, back, neck and flanks. In man, however, and in the anthropoid apes there are only feeble traces of this musclature. It spreads over the upper part of the chest, neck and face, but confers no power of movement. In this respect it forms a most marked contrast to the same muscle in the horse, in which it produces the rapid movements of the skin which protect the animal from the bites and stings of insects.

Several interesting muscles, all undergoing retrogression, are found in connection with the skull. Chief of these is the one for moving the scalp forwards and backwards; but few people are able to use it. Next to this one may be mentioned three small muscles greatly used by our ancestors, one for moving the ear forward, one for moving it backward and one for raising it. Besides these, our fortunate ancestor had other muscles situated on the pinna, and used for opening or closing the passage into the outer ear. Similar muscles are still functional in the ox, but not in man or in monkeys.

The *transversus nuchae* is a good example of an atavistic muscle. Only 53 people out of every 100 possess this treasure, but the 37 who are without it never know it. The pyramidalis muscle is sometimes altogether absent; sometimes present on only one side of the body, but whether present or absent, a man never misses it. The same thing is true of the palmaris longus, a muscle found in the fore-arm, and of the plantaris, a muscle found in the calf of the leg. Only 4 out of a 100 have a sternalis, only 20 out of a 100 have the epitrochleo anconeus. All of these muscles, however, are present and useful in lower animals.

One cannot help asking why a man has muscles, which so far as we can judge are of no use to him. On the hypothesis of the evolutionist they are natural and rational; in fact, we expect to find them in man, for they are present in monkeys and in lower animal, but on the hypothesis of a special creation, their occurrence in man seems inexplicable.

The pinneal body, situated on the mid-brain was, for years, one of the great puzzles of the anatomists. It was once supposed to be the very citadel of the soul, and many speculations were indulged in as to its special function. A comparative study of the organ, however, shows that it occurs in all vertebrate animals. It shows also that the organ grows out from the roof of the brain in much the same way as the optic nerves do. But whereas the optic nerves go on developing and increasing in size, the pinneal body after developing for some time, suddenly stops growing, and then slowly diminishes in size, sinking finally into the insignificance which we observe it to occupy in man. This retrogression, however, does not occur to the same extent in all animals. In a species of New Zealand lizard, this organ develops more than in any other known animal, and on comparing it with the vertebrate eye, one is much struck by the resemblance, down to even minute details. As a result of this comparative study, the conviction is forced home on us, that the pinneal body was at one time in the history of the vertebrates a normal eye, and that it has in recent ages been undergoing degeneration. The cyclops had a single eye *in the forehead*: our ancestors appear to have had three eyes—the normal two, and one on the top of the head.

Another very interesting vestigial organ in man is the vermiform appendix. Everyone has heard of appendicitis, or inflammation of this organ, and the surgical operation for its removal. Now, what we find in man as a small bag or pouch, is actually one of the four stomachs of the horse or cow. This stomach is always present in animals which live on a vegetable diet. But in the cat, dog, or any other animal which lives chiefly on an animal diet, no such stomach is found, but only a remnant of it, as in man. The organ was no doubt useful to ancestral man, but is now slowly disappearing and has become a menace and a disadvantage. Aggregations of hard particles of food become fixed in it, and this is sometimes followed by inflamation and death of the patient. When removed from the body, a person suffers no inconvenience: it is, so far as we can make out, an entirely useless and even dangerous possession. To the creationist the organ is a puzzle; to the evolutionist it is only another index of man's natural descent from anthropoid ancestors.

A. P. KNIGHT.

GREEK COMMERCE AND TRADE ROUTES.

IT was in an early stage of European history, that the Greeks first turned their attention to commerce and to navigation. But they were by no means the first to carry on trade on the shores and in the waters of the Mediterranean. By land, we are told, the Hittites* came down to the shores of the Aegaean, partly to round off their Empire, and partly also to find new markets for the wares of the East, which passed through their Eastern trading centres, Carchemish on the Euphrates, and Hamath on the Orontes. To this day traces of them are found on the lower course of the Halys, and a few miles outside Smyrna. Their great road passed to the Aegaean coast by way of Northern Asia Minor from Northern Syria.

The importance of the extreme Eastern corner of the Mediterranean may be gathered from the group of great commercial cities about it, nor should we forget that in later days Antioch on the Orontes was the second city of the Roman Empire.† But great as may have been the importance of the Hittite commerce, it need not delay us. Those who are interested in the monetary side of commerce will have to reckon with the Hittites, but for our present purpose we may postpone the money question. Again, the seeker after an unexplored field for original research need only be set on the track of the Taphian *ληστῆρες*, lovers of the oar,‡ and he will have his work cut out for him. I only know their name and the fact that they were pirates in very early times.

In historic times we find a nation called Carians on the South-Western corner of Asia Minor. In earlier days they played a grander part in the world's history than was reserved for them afterwards. They were "certainly not Semitic," says Busolt,[*] "but Indo-European, and connections in all probability of the Lydians and Mysians." In very early times they held the Islands of the Aegaean, and even as Aristotle[†] tells us, Epidauros and Hermione before the return of the Heracleids. They were a nation of pirates[‡] in early times until overcome by the Greeks, by Minos, we are told, and expelled from the islands.[§] They then retreated to their brethren on the mainland.[‖] In the naratives, partly true and partly false, of the migration of the Ionians, we find that in the case of every city there is some connexion, war or peace, with the Carians. Miletus, in fact, was half Carian.[¶] I shall have to recur to the Carians later on. For the present I may merely mention the inventions Herodotus set down to them:—helmets, devices on shields, and straps for holding shields.[**]

---

* So says Professor Sayce, who is not the most reliable of authorities. *Liberavi animam meam.*

†See Merivale, *Romans under the Empire*, vol. v. p. 15.

‡ *Odyssey* i, 105, 419.

But beyond all question, the most important race of traders at the epoch, which we are considering, was the Phoenician. My readers must forgive me if I condescend to particulars about them, to what may seem a needless extent. It may not be so needless as it seems, for we shall find that the importance of the Phoenicians in the development of commerce is superlative.

In Genesis x, 15, we read that Canaan begot Sidon his firstborn. If the writer means thereby, to indicate that Sidon was the first and foremost of the Canaanite cities, he is certainly right.* This city was for centuries the leading Phoenician state. It first of all extended its influence to Cyprus, and thence Sidonian traders ventured westward along the shores of Southern Asia Minor, as far as Rhodes. Again, they turned southward, and the Egyptologists assert their influence in Egypt. In fact, we are told that the naval supremacy of Thothmes iii, (of the 18th dynasty, 1703-1462 B.C.) was probably due to his employment of Phoenician fleets. From 1400 onwards, Sidon's fame pales before that of Tyre. Henceforth, we may roughly class them as Phoenicians, with no nice distinction of Tyrian and Sidonian. The name 'Tyrian' is, I believe, not to be found in Homer. The people are known as Sidonians or Phoenicians, much as we ourselves are now classed in the Levant as Franks.

---

[*] Busolt, *Gr. Gesch* i, 33. Georg Meyer (*Bezz. Beitr.* 1885, cited by Roberts *Epigraphy*, p. 319,) maintains Carians spoke an Indo-European dialect. This would not, however, prove their nationalty. Some scholars connect them with the uncircumcised Philistines, especially the Cherethites, the foreign guard of David, and lay stress on Caphtor the original home of the Philistines which is considered to be Crete—a Carian island in early legends. See Robertson Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, lecture ix; Amos ix, 7.

[†] ap. Strabo viii, 374.

[‡] Sallust i, *fr.* Cares insulani populi piratici famosi victi a Minoe. So Thuc. i, 8, *οὐχ ἧσσον λῃσταὶ ἦσαν οἱ νησιῶται, Κᾶρές τε ὄντες καὶ Φοίνικες· κ. τ. λ.*

[§] Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* i, 189, believes in the story of Minos.

[‖] Carians, etc., in Asia Minor; see Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* i, 212-220.

[¶] See Hdt. i, 146.

[**] Hdt. i, 171, *τριξὰ ἐξευρήματα* (and Carians generally).

Starting from Rhodes, it was possible for the commercial Semite to take any one of the three trade-routes. He could coast up the Asiatic peninsula, or sail among the Cyclades to Greece, or cross the sea to Crete. The Phoenicians apparently did all three. Certainly they established themselves in Crete.† You must not quite give full credence to all that enthusiastic historians tell you about them and their remains. They go too much on the principle that, wherever a bull or a cow occurs in legend, the Phoenicians had gone before it.‡ The proof of the Phoenicians in Crete is not Europa, nor her bull, nor even the Minotaur. I might mention the river with the very Semitic name Jordan (or Iardanos as it is called in Crete §) as a more certain indication, while there are others.

We may ask what led the Phoenicians so far, and we may answer, "Slaves, Tin and Purple." Slaves were to be had in most places, for war was continually being waged and captives were generally sold. Tin was got somehow or other from the Caucasus at first, later on from the Cassiterides, wherever they may be after all.* But purple was only to be had where the murex throve. And round the shores of the Aegaean in the waters of Corinth and in the strait of Euripus, it abounded. Therefore we are not at all surprised to find the Phoenicians at Corinth, on the Euripus, in Laconia† and among the islands, notably on Cythera.‡ Wherever we find the worship of Aphrodite prominent above other cults, we may be sure the Phoenician Astarte was there too. She is far more reliable than Max Duncker's cow, as a test. No one need be reminded of Cytherea, § nor of the Paphian Venus. Again, at Corinth we find a strong local worship of Melicertes, which is after all only the Tyrian Melqart writ large. Thera Melos and Thasos, ‖ and by the Hellespont Astyra Abydos and Lampsacus, were all Phoenician stations.¶ In Attica too they probably had an establishment at Marathon. In fact, as Thucydides tells us, they planted "factories" on headlands and islets for trading purposes only.** How very early and how very far Phoenician trade flourished, is proved by the articles found in the tombs at Mycene. Baltic amber and Egyptian knives are found there side by side. Even an ostrich egg has been discovered.

---

*This seems to be the only explanation. It should be remembered, however, that the Sidonians were a Semitic people and not of Hamitic origin, as the genealogy implies.

† Busolt i, 174.

‡ In this case it would seem necessary to suppose they founded Durham Cathedral.

§ *Od.* iii, 292, *Ἰαρδάνου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα.*

The Phoenicians became known as the bringers of certain articles—glass, metalwork, purple robes, gold, tin, etc. The very names of many of these, *ὀθονη* (linen), *χίτων* (a long trailing robe),

---

*It used to be a matter of faith that these islands either were Cornwall or lay off it. Brazil was first reckoned an island, and North America was roughly grouped among the West Indies, so the fact that the Cassiterides were islands need not exclude Cornwall. But there is some ground for the view that they lay off Spain.

† Hor. *Od.* ii, 18, 7, Nec Laconicas mihi Trahunt honestae purpuras clientae.

‡ Hdt. i, 105, *τῆς οὐρανίης Ἀφροδίτης τὸ ἱρόν. . . . . . καὶ τὸ ἐν Κυθήροισι Φοίνικές εἰσι οἱ ἱδρυσάμενοι.*

§ Hom. *Od.* xviii, 193, *ἐϋστέφανος Κυθέρεια.*

‖ Hdt. ii, 44, *ἀπικόμην δὲ ἐς Θάσον, ἐν τῇ εὗρον ἱρὸν Ἡρακλέος ὑπὸ Φοινίκων ἱδρυμένον, οἳ κατ' Εὐρώπης ζήτησιν ἐκπλώσαντες Θάσον ἔκτισαν.*

¶ Busolt i, 181.

**Thuc. vi, 2, *Φοίνικες . . . ἄκρας τε ἐπὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἀπολαβόντες καὶ τὰ ἐπικείμενα νησίδια ἐμπορίας ἕνεκεν.*

χρύσος, κασσίτερος, are Semitic. If we read Homer,* we find instances of this traffic in fine wares. The Phoenicians are at once traders and cunning craftsmen, making *πέπλοι*, silver *κρητῆρες* and cups, and amber necklaces.† They have no settled habitations, but come for a year to trade, and then go, taking their gains and their plunder with them; for the occasional kidnapping of any one available was by no means unknown.‡

But by Homer's time, we already find the Greeks at home on shipboard. The question rises how it came about that they drove the Phoenicians from Greek waters. In Homer, they sail the sea, trade and plunder equally. In later times, the Phoenicians are never seen save in a Persian fleet. We must also ask if the Greeks learned navigation from them. We may answer the latter question first and that in the negative. I believe there is no single Greek term of navigatian borrowed from the Phoenicians. Our conclusion is that the Greeks, breaking away from the Indo-European family, struck the sea on their own account and learned seamanship for themselves. When they did this and asserted their right to their own waters, the Phoenicians made off to less contested fisheries and markets, where competition was less keen. No doubt the murex beds were becoming exhausted, which would also affect their decision. So they went west and made Sicily their own, with a factory established on every suitable spot, and Carthage close at hand to help when needed. Their dealings with Spain and their settlements at Gades are well-known to every school-boy.

But when the Greek had driven the Carian from the sea, and had then invaded Asia with his colonies all along the coast, he began to look further afield.§ The first great epoch in Greek Commerce is that of the Calaurian Amphictyony.‖

Il. vi, 288; xxiii, 742; *Od.* iv, 615 (silver cup.)

† *Od.* xv, 415. (*χρύσεον ὅρμον ἔχων, μετὰ δ' ἠλέκτροισιν ἔερτο.*)

‡ Cf. the story of Eumaeus the swineherd told in *Od.* xv.

§ Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* i, 183, says that Greek navigation began in the big gulfs. Homer gives proofs of the extent and daring of the early Greek navigators, *e.g.* free-booting expeditions to Egypt, but that these were spasmodic rather than regular is shown by the presence of the Phoenicians in Greek waters.

‖ Busolt, i, 55.

This comprised a group of cities uniting in the worship of Poseidon on the island Calauria. They were Orchomenos, Hermione, Epidauros, Aegina, Athens, Prasiai, and Nauplia.[*] It was the age of the Minyae and the Argo. We need not linger over it. The Amphictyony declined at a very early date and gave place to the Euboean cities, Chalcis and Eretria, as the West became open to trade, and the all-important character of the East was lost.

The pastures of Euboea were famous for their sheep and these for their wool. So with Euripus hard by, it is easy to see how Chalcis could become famous for woollen stuffs and dyed goods. Moreover, it had great resources in iron and copper ore,[†] part of which was manufactured in Euboea, while the rest was sent to Corinth. Eretria too became a great port. The rivalry resulting soon drove the two cities into war, the cause or occasion being the rich Lelantine plain. The war was long and fierce, and was fought on land. Nor was it without great results outside Euboea. The Greek world was divided. Samos and Corinth took the side of Chalcis, while Miletus Aegina and Megara aided Eretria. Hereafter, Milesians avoid localities, where Chalcis and Corinth are strong, and *vice versa*. So when the West became open, and Corinth and Chalcis led the way in colonizing it, Miletus had to turn East. First let us follow the fortunes of Greek trade in the West.

In the 8th century the Greeks began to push towards Sicily. This of course meant prolonged struggles with the Phoenicians. But the Greeks had unknown allies in the Assyrians. The great empire of Assyria, like Russia to-day, wanted access to the sea. This meant the acquisition of the Phoenician seaboard, and two centuries of war procured it. Naturally with all their energies thus taxed at home, the Phoenicians could not make much of a stand abroad.

The first Greek colony in Sicily was Naxos—the joint foundation of Naxos and Chalcis in 735—a place afterwards famous for its wine-trade. Then came Syracuse, the colony of Corinth, which afterwards grew to be the chief town in the island. Besides the usual products of a new country,* it developed a great manufacture of pottery and brass-work. The second city was Akragas, which drove a prosperous trade in oil and wine with Carthage. I need not enumerate the other Greek colonies on the island, nor shew in detail the spots won from the Phoenicians, Sicanians and Sikels respectively.

---

[*] Mr. J. W. Headlam of Cambridge, points out that this was a pre-Doric amphictyony. Chalcis and Corinth are unnamed. It had only religious importance in historic times.

[†] The copper gave the city her name.

I now pass to Italy. And first I would begin with Cumae, the colony of Cyme. This very ancient town was the source of light and learning to the barbarous Italians, who learned their letters from the Greek traders, and also readily took up the metal vases, manufactured in patterns adapted to local taste and specially imported. Athens did a large trade in such things, and they found their way throughout Italy. Nor did the merchants of Cumae fail to make great profits out of the Campanian wheat crops. †

Another city with a large Italian trade was Sybaris. Its luxury was the product of successful trade in objects of Greek art sent off to Etruria. Sybaris had a close connection with Miletus, and passed on the rich woollen goods of Miletus to the interior overland. The straits of Messina were closed to the Sybarites, but their land-route answered their purpose equally well. One hundred and fifty miles north-west of Sybaris, stood Croton, with better harbour and roads than any South Italian port, Taras excepted. It was chiefly famous, however, for agriculture and cattle rearing.

Taras, the greatest South Italian port, was a Laconian colony, and a very successful one. Its pastures supplied abundant wool for manufacture into purple webs, and besides possessing rich fisheries, it turned out a great deal of pottery. Altogether, it was an important, rich and luxurious place.

---

*Ar. *Vesp.* 838. Sicilian cheese was the best, *τροφαλίδα τυροῦ Σικελικὴν κατεδήδοκεν*. Plut. *Nic.* i. *πάχυς ὠνθυλευμένος στέατι Σικελικῷ* (lard.)

† Busolt, i, 284, notices the interchange of commercial terms: from Greek to Latin, statera (*στατήρ*), epistula (*ἐπιστολή*), ancora (*ἄγκυρα*), prora (*πρῶρα*), gubernare (*κυβερνᾶν*), nummus (*νόμος*), and from Latin to Greek, *μοῖτον* (mutuum), *κάρκαρον* (carcer).

From Sicily and Italy the Greeks followed their Phoenician rivals still further West, the Phoenicians leading the way. About the year 630, the Samian Kolaios * set out on his merchantman for Egypt, but fell in with violent East winds which drove him to Tarsis. No Greek had yet reached the Spanish peninsula, though dark rumours of a fabled land of silver had long since been current in Greece. Kolaios disposed of his wares at unusual advantage; and on his return set up a brazen cauldron of six talents in the Heraion in Samos. Many captains began to follow in his train, and gradually to gain a reliable knowledge of the West. The Phoenicians, it may be said, were as jealous of their knowledge of the Western Mediterranean as the Spaniards of theirs of the New World.

About 600, the Phocaeans founded in the land of the Ligurian Salyes, about five miles from the Eastern mouth of the Rhone the town of Massilia - probably on the site of a former Phoenician factory, a fact which at once would show it to have been a suitable spot for trade. The surrounding country is stony, but it gave the Massiliots rich crops of oil and wine. Their city throve to such an extent that in their turn they too sent out many colonies to fit places along the adjoining coast. I need only mention Zacantha Emporiai Olbia and Nicaea. Thus they became masters of the gulf of Lions. The trade from the lands on the Bay of Biscay passed into their hands, while the route by the Rhone was thronged with merchants taking the commodities of the interior down to Massilia. England sent her iron on the backs of Gallic horses, and the Baltic its amber, to be exported far and wide through the Greek world. The wide-spread influence of Massilia is proved by the extraordinary distribution of her coins, which are found in the valley of the upper Rhone, in the Canton Tessin, in Lombardy, in the Italian Tyrol, and in Etruria.

Turning Eastwards, we find the Adriatic a Corinthian sea. Corinth was in earlier times, as in the later, the great port of Greece. Her greatness preceded and survived that of Athens. We have seen how the Phoenicians* had a hold on the place before Athens was more than an inland canton. Out-doing the Aeginetans and Megarians, the Corinthians made their city the

---

*Hdt. iv, 152.

Liverpool of Greece, and the Newcastle too. From very early times, beside their shipping trade, they had great manufactures. Their pottery found a market in the heart of Italy, whither the Chalcidians of Messene and the Tarentines sent it on. Their bronze workers turned out some of the best weapons and vases: and in weaving and dyeing the Corinthian manufacturers were preeminent. They were also the earliest ship-builders of Greece. In 704, the Corinthian Ameinokles built four men-of-war for the Samians, who were allies of Corinth throughout.

No doubt, also, it was through Corinth and Aegina that the manufactures of the Laconian perioeci found their outside markets. The perioecic towns were famous for their iron and steel works, their brass foundries, their potteries, their wood-carving, and their woollen goods. *Λακωνικαί* (slippers) are articles familiar to every reader of Aristophanes, coming chiefly from Amyclai. †

As the Chalcidians and Corinthians had so much at stake in the West, it is not surprising that the latter at an early date (664) colonized Corcyra. From here the colonization of the Adriatic spread. But in this case metropolis and colony were on the worst terms very soon. The first naval battle of the Greeks was between Corinthians and Corcyraeans.

I may here add a last word to this account of Commerce in the West. The Chalcidian route lay overland through Phocis to Crisa. This was a short cut and saved their ships a long voyage round the Peloponnese and the stormy Cape Malea, and the great danger of passing Eretria. It was also cheaper than to send their goods over the Isthmus by Corinth. It only involved after all 150 kilometres of land transport.

But the Chalcidians also turned North, and the triple promontory in Macedonian waters was early known as the Chalcidice. It fairly bristled with colonies.

I now turn to the Milesians. We have seen the West filled with their enemies and their trade driven overland from Sybaris. Their only chance of colonial success was in the East. So Pontus became almost a Milesian lake, but that the Megarians had a share in it too, for the same reasons. There is certainly some doubt about the dates of the earliest Milesian settlements, but

---

*The verb *Κορινθιάζομαι* sums up the story of the Phoenician port.

†Ar. *Vesp.* 1148, *Thesm.* 142, *Eccl.* 74, 269, etc.

apparently Sinope was first founded in 770. Trapezus (which still bears its old name—Trebizond) in 756.[*]

Propontis had the Milesian Abydos and Cyzicus, and the Megarian Astacos Selymbria Chalcedon and Byzantium. Turning up the European side of the sea we find the Milesian Apollonia Odessus Tomi Istria Tyras and Olbia, and the Megaric Mesembria and Callatis.

The Tauric Chersonese, with its towns Theudosia and Panticapaeum and Phanagoria opposite the latter, was also Milesian. With all three ports in direct communication, Miletus drove a great trade, largely in slaves and brass, with the Phoenicians.[†] The slave route lay from Tanais (at the mouth of the Don) past Panticapaeum to Byzantion (a great market) out into the Aegaean, Delos being the great insular depot and Pagasae that on the mainland. It is interesting to note that the slaves of the middle ages came from the same region.[‡]

Nor was the corn trade with Greece less. Then, as to-day, the Crimea was one of the great corn-supplies of the world. It was this which gave to Byzantium, and gives to Constantinople, its great political and commercial importance.

Turning Southward we find Greeks living in Crete and trading there freely, even in Homer's age. In Cyprus too, as early as the 9th century, there were Greek colonies. We find them in Homer.[§] The subject of Cyprus is a highly interesting one, with many questions of Phoenician influences, Assyrian conquests, Cinyrad priesthoods, and so forth, but these need not concern us, for though they are all closely connected with commerce, they would lead us too far afield.

[*] Ovid *Fast.* iii, 9. Hic quoque sunt igitur Graiae—quis crederet?—urbes Inter inhumanae nomina barbariae? Huc quoque Mileto missi venere coloni Inque Getis Graias constituere domos?

[†] Ezekiel xxvii, 13, Javan (*Ἰάων* some say), Tubal and Meshech they were thy merchants: they traded the persons of men and vessels of brass for thy merchandise.

[‡] See Skeat, *s. v. Slave. F.* esclave-*G.* sklave *M.H.G.* slave, a slave-*G.* slave, a Slavonian captive. Similarly the Scythians fetched from the same region gave their name to a class of slaves (public police) in Athens.

[§] *Od.* xvii, 442, *αὐτὰρ ἔμ' ἐς Κύπρον ξείνῳ δόσαν ἀντιάσαντι. Δμήτορι Ἰασίδῃ, ὃς Κύπρου ἶφι ἄνασσεν.*

In the 8th century, B.C., Egypt was exposed to constant danger from the Ethiopians or Cushites to the South. At the same time, it may be remembered, there was always the fear of the Assyrians, and she spent her time rather inefficiently in intriguing against them alternately. For although Sennacherib was overcome in 701, by pestilence (typified in the Egyptian statue by the mouse[*]), Esar-haddon in 672, became master of the country, and later on Assurbanipal. Worn out by the struggles of the Assyrians and Ethiopians, the country was in a bad condition. There arose Psammetichos (Psemtek)[†]—partly Egyptian and partly Ethiopian, and established the 26th dynasty—marrying into the legitimate family in 650. One main source of his power was his army of "brazen men"[‡]—Ionians and Carians—men from Asia Minor. He gave them a home in the country near Bubastis on the Pelusiac or Eastern mouth of the Nile. Once come, they stopped and throve, till Apries (Hophra), King 586—570, had 30,000 of them.[§] It is interesting to know that Mr. Flinders Petrie has found the graves of some of them at Nebesheh.[‖]

But Psemtek opened his land to Greek traders as well, and they willingly came; and foremost among them, the Milesians, who established themselves strongly on Bolbinitic mouth of the Nile. It is interesting to know that Necho's canal to the Red Sea debouched near Bubastis, and we may be sure that the Greeks made the most of the trade with East, which was always great and would now be vastly stimulated. It seems, however, that Necho did not finish the work. Still, that he was a patron of commerce and enterprise is very certain. It was by his orders Africa was first circumnavigated—by Phoenician sailors.*

---

[*] See Hdt. ii, 141. Isaiah 37, 36.

[†] Hdt. ii, 152f.

[‡] Hdt. ii, 152, *χρησμὸς ὡς τίσις ἥξει ἀπὸ θαλάσσης χαλκέων ἀνδρῶν ἐπιφανέντων.* 154, he gives them a home.

[§] Psemtek II (the Psammis of Herodotus) 594-589 led a great army of Ionians, Carians and Phoenicians to Abusimbel, where their names have recently been found scratched upon a temple wall. Hdt. ii, 163, *εἶχε δὲ περὶ ἑωυτὸν Κᾶράς τε καὶ Ἴωνας ἄνδρας ἐπικούρους τρισμυρίους.*

[‖] J. H. S. xi, 273.

Amasis, the usurper who succeeded Apries, was also a Philhellen, and caused Naucratis † to be founded on the Saitic mouth of the Nile (the western). He allowed those Greeks who did not wish to settle, but merely to do business, lots of land for altars and temple enclosures. Aegina Samos and Miletus seem to have been most concerned with Egypt.

We must now pass on to Cyrene. You can read in Pindar and in Herodotus of its foundation, of the Theraeans and the oracle, of Platea and of the mainland settlement and of the great house of Battus the Stammerer who became King. ‡ I will not spoil a poem by a prose rendering in an article on commerce, but I would point out the great importance of Delphi in matters of colonization. The god directs that a colony be founded, he names the spot, and he blesses the enterprise. If it be attempted without his blessing, failure is certain. Let Dorieus be witness. § In 623, Cyrene was founded hard by the Caravan-route from the interior, and soon became the centre of a group of prosperous colonies. The country was highly suitable for the breeding of cattle and sheep, and horses, certain favourites for the various Greek race meetings Wheat, oil and wine were also largely raised and exported. Above all, silphium a drug now, I believe, no longer found there, then abounded and was exported in great quantities. We have still on a vase a contemporary caricature of one of the Battiad Kings presiding over the sale of this commodity. ‖

I have given in rude outline a sketch of the main lines of Greek

---

*Hdt. iv, 42. On the circumnavigation of Africa see Grote iii, 284. When going West, they said they had the sun on their right hand, *i. e.* to the North, which Herodotus thinks proves them liars, but convinces Moderns of the truth of their assertions.

† Hdt. ii, 178.

‡ Hdt. iv, 150, ff. Pindar, *Pythians* iv and v.

§ All roads led to Delphi, and priests who learn other men's secrets have often a knack of acquiring useful information. It thus came about that the priests of Delphi knew more Geography than most men, and so could best direct the prospecive colonist.

See Gildersleeve's Pindar.

commercial enterprise. We have seen the Greek trader fetching his slaves and his corn from the Black Sea, his amber from the Baltic, his iron from England, the wares of the East from Egypt, silphium from Cyrene, hardware from Laconia, and hides, tallow and wool from Italy and Sicily. We have seen each corner of the Mediterranean in turn invaded by Greek merchantmen, which bear away their gains to Cenchreae and Peiraieus. And when we reflect that the Greek trader invariably left more in the shape of ideas than he took in profits, we begin to realize what an important factor in civilization is Commerce, what vast powers are in the hand of the merchant, and how great and noble, after all, in spite of the vulgarities of the tradesman and the sneers of the superfine, Commerce really may be. We can only hope that the Englishmen of to-day will not fall short of their Corinthian Chalcidian and Milesian prototypes, who twenty-five centuries ago, by their commerce, civilized Italy, with Italy Rome, and with Rome the world.

T. R. GLOVER.

BOOK REVEIWS.

Christianity and Idealism: The Christian Ideal of Life in its relations to the Greek and Jewish Ideals, and to Modern Philosophy. By John Watson, LL.D. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1896.

THIS book is a worthy sequel to the distinguished author's *Comte, Mill* and *Spencer.* It may be described as a supplement to that work in an exceedingly important and interesting particular. The bearing of the Idealistic Philosophy on Religion, which was not dealt with there, is here presented in a very lucid and convincing light. It seems pretty clear, and most attentive readers of this work will find it made clearer to them than ever, that no other philosophy than the system here expounded or one in its main lines closely akin to that, can give any adequate account of the large department of human thought and feeling covered by the name Religion. Of course some will indignantly resent any interference of philosophy in this region. We may be content with accepting our Faith on mere trust as a supernatural deposit handed down through some authoritative custodian. Or, what is better, we may cling to it because the truth and beauty of its conceptions commend themselves directly to our immediate consciousness, satisfy the thirst of the heart and prove themselves by the inward peace and joy they bring, as well as by the practical results of acting them out in our lives.

But many of us are invaded by the "disease of thought" and feel impelled to search for some account of these things—such as we are helped towards here—which will satisfy the importunities of the understanding. It is difficult to see how that can possibly be found on the basis of any Sensationalist or Sceptical or Agnostic theory of knowledge. It is plain that all such systems if consistent must necessarily regard the Religious instinct as destitute of any real object, as condemned forever to feed upon the wind and grope after mere illusions. Surely this in itself constitutes a strong presumption *in limine* against the adequacy of such systems. There must surely be something wrong about a reasoned account of the Universe and Man which can find no place for the only possible principle of unity in the one, God, and the most distinctive and constant characteristic of the other, Religion. Now, one of the most interesting and striking things in this book will be found to be the quite remarkable lucidity and cogency with which it is demonstrated in the second part, that these same theories which obviously fail to find any basis of reality for Religion, are not less incompetent to find any basis of reality for knowledge in general. What annihilates Religion is shown equally not only to annihilate Science, but to make the simplest statement of fact unmeaning and impossible: in short, to reduce our world and ourselves to a shadow, peopled by shades which are somehow necessarily doomed to the incorrigible illusion that they are realities grasping realities. There are several places in this second part where one could have wished that the limits of space imposed upon the author, had left him room for further expansion, but few, I think, who read with care what is said can fail to reach one clear conclusion: any attempt at philosophising that does not start with the conception of a world which is an organic system essentially rational, must lead to the stultification, not only of all philosophising, but of all affirmation and denial whatever.

The ordinary reader, however, will feel that the best justification of the point of view defended in the more technically philosophical second part of this little volume is, that it forms the reasoned basis for the treatment contained in the first part of the Greek, Jewish and Christian Ideals,—a treatment, for a philosopher by profession, unusually sympathetic and concrete, and free from the flavour of a predetermined Procrustean Schematism. The chapter on the Greek Ideal in particular, commends itself to the writer of this notice who can claim some familiarity with the ground as vastly more satisfying, for instance, than the corresponding chapter in the book by the Master of Balliol on the Evolution of Religion. Any ordinarily intelligent person will find these opening chapters full of interest and suggestion.

J. M.

Schopenhauer's System in its Philosophical Significance. By William Caldwell, M.A., D. Sc., Professor of Moral and Social Philosophy, North-western University, U.S.A. Edinburgh and London. William Blackwood & Sons, 1896.

IN this scholarly work, Mr. Caldwell endeavours to suggest the significance of Schopenhauer's thought as an organic whole, and to connect it with certain broad lines of philosophical and general thought and with certain broad principles of human nature. After showing the scope of the system, and the spirit in which it ought to be studied, the author seeks in successive chapters to trace out the theoretical roots of Schopenhauer's philosophy, to estimate the value of his doctrine that art, ethics and religion liberate man from the practical bondage of life, to give a critical statement of his metaphysic, and finally to gather up the positive results of the whole system. Mr. Caldwell has spared no pains in the execution of this comprehensive task, and it may be safely said that no student of modern philosophy, and indeed, no one who is interested in the speculative problems of the present day, can afford to neglect this important work. Whether he agrees or not with the author's high estimate of Schopenhauer, and with the supreme importance which he assigns to the practical life, every sympathetic reader will find himself stimulated and aided by the forcible presentation of problems of perennial interest and importance. JOHN WATSON.

Hegel's Educational Ideas. By William M. Bryant, M.A., LL.D., Chicago. Warner Book Company, 1896.

THIS is a small, but delightful and instructive book. It could only have been written by one who, like Dr. Bryant, has made a thorough study of the philosophy of Hegel, and who has had a long experience in the art of education. Only those who are familiar with the depth and the difficulty of the Hegelian philosophy can adequately appreciate the clearness and force with which the author employs the fundamental ideas of that philosophy to throw light on the problem of education. It must not be supposed, however, that Dr. Bryant is merely a slavish follower of Hegel: not only has he re-thought everything for himself, but he has often amplified and applied what Hegel only incidentally suggested, and everywhere he brings to his task the experience of a practised instructor of youth. It would be hard to find anywhere a more suggestive work on education, whether in its theoretical or in its practical aspect. JOHN WATSON.

CURRENT EVENTS.

The Eastern Question.

THE conferences at Balmoral between the Queen and the Czar evidently led to a common understanding between them and their advisers, not only regarding the Eastern but also regarding the farther Eastern question. Great bodies move slowly, and when Russian policy had been acting in Turkey along one line for years, it could not be shunted on to another with indecent haste; but once the Czar was convinced that the cause of Russia as well as of humanity would be served by a change, the insuperable difficulty to effective intervention disappeared. France simply must keep in accord with her huge ally; and Russia would of course consult the *amour propre* of France in the arrangements, as effectually as she has consulted that of China, though practically annexing to Siberia as much of Manchuria as she wishes and the whole Lioa-tung peninsula, with what will soon be the impregnable harbour of Port Arthur. What decision has been come to regarding the Sultan is not yet known; but it seems to have been determined that if he does not take the action that Britain, France and Russia advise, coercion shall be applied. That is all that is necessary. His strength heretofore consisted in his knowledge that the European concert would not go beyond phrases. When he knows that there is a concert of another kind, he is not likely to give trouble. If he does, so much the better. His deposition would be some little amends to outraged public justice. The action agreed upon is certain not to be extreme. Lord Salisbury is conservative, and the Czar is more so. Neither is anxious to precipitate a complete solution of the Eastern problem, nor to awaken racial, religious and national animosities that would set the world on fire, nor even to dethrone a monarch for his sins. The Queen would stipulate for only this one thing, that the forces of hell should no longer riot in Armenia, and in taking her stand there she should be sure to have with her the Czar's wife and probably the Czar himself. We have reason to believe then that the massacre of last September at Eguin will prove to have been the last act in the frightful orgy of blood and lust and rapine that has digraced our age, and forces the most enthusiastic Turcophile—Ashmead Bartlett always excepted to pray for the downfall of the Ottoman Empire.

Britain in Egypt.

It is not unlikely that in connection with this settlement Lord Salisbury and the Russian Chancellor arranged what politicians call "a saw-off" between the farther East and Egypt. On the one hand, Britain's only interest in China is commercial, and that will not be injured even by Russian occupation of Manchuria, for sea-borne goods can always be depended on to compete successfully against thousands of miles of railway transit. On the other hand, British public opinion after long hesitation and oscillations has come to the definite conclusion that the Nile valley from mouth to source must be under the same flag as British East Africa and Zanzibar, where, as well as at Suakim, connection can be made with India. This is a bitter pill for France, who has always considered herself heir-at-law to Egypt, but Russia seems to have hinted to her that the range of the alliance does not extend beyond Europe, or that at any rate Russia will not support a policy of "worry," which has no other effect but to tighten the intruder's grip. No better illustration could be desired than the effect of the decision of the conjoint tribunal regarding the use of the half-million sterling of the Egyptian surplus for the expedition to Dongola. The European press chuckled for a little while over the rebuff to Britain; but Lord Salisbury has chuckled over it from that day to this. He did not lose a moment in ordering the money to be advanced from the British treasury, which fortunately happened to be in a comfortably plethoric state at the time. So well has the incident fallen in with his settled policy that it would not surprise us to hear bye and bye that the preposterous judgment was purchased with British gold. Is it not declared again and again from platform and press in the United States that protectionist patriots have to fight against the bribery and corruption of the Cobden Club, and is not American labour entreated to rise in its might and crush the hydra-headed monster? Why, the Club is hardly able to get more than a sergeant's guard to its annual dinner! Its work having been done, John Bull has apparently no more objection to Lord Farrer celebrating its triumphs than he has to Mr. Lowther calling for protection against Manitoba as well as Minnesota. But that is just another proof of John's perfidy and hypocrisy. All the time he is doubtless supplying the Club with millions to buy American voters. May he not also have squared the mixed tribunal that guards the Egyptian Caisse! The old fellow is a regular Joey B., and requires to be constantly watched by a free and incorruptible press, or he will end by grabbing the earth. What makes the whole business worse, too, is that there are Americans who assert, after having travelled abroad, that it would be a good thing for the earth and expecially for the commerce of the United States if he had only grabbed more extensively. Fortunately, however, those eccentric individuals are in so decided a minority that they do not need to be confuted.

The Neutrality Treaty
between
Russia and Germany.

The Emperor William, like other mortals, has occasionally to drink something bitter, and he never knows when Prince Bismarck may present to his lips a whole chalice full. He is helpless against the man to whom the Empire owes so much, almost as helpless as if he were a recruit and not the master of scores of legions. The old ex-Chancellor, watching the diplomacy that has left Germany practically isolated, and isolation for Germany is vastly different from what it is for Britain, cannot resist the temptation of saying, "I told you so," or "See how differently I managed things when at the helm!" His latest revelation that, at the very time when the Triple Alliance seemed to be the dominant factor in the European situation, he had concluded a secret treaty with Russia, which was in force till 1890, when his successor, Count Caprivi, refused to renew it, takes one's breath away. The sole reason why Austria-Hungary incurred the responsibilities of the Driebund was that she thereby secured the support of the legions of Germany, should she become involved in war with Russia. Now she learns that Germany, in such a case, was bound over to neutrality! The sole reason why France is willing to beggar herself in purse and reputation and mortgage her future in order to make Russia a sure friend is that she may have Russia's help when the hour strikes for *revanche* and winning back again her lost provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. Now she learns that in 1890 Russia pressed Germany for a renewal of the Neutrality Treaty, which in the event of war would have left France as solitary as she found herself in 1870, when Napoleon counted, but counted in vain, on the co-operation of Austria and Bavaria. The revelation should teach a few lessons to ordinary mortals. It throws a flood of light on Prince Bismarck and on the ethics of diplomacy. He played a double game and is not ashamed of letting the fact be known to the whole world. It makes us ask, what are treaties worth? It vindicates the action of Britain in refusing to join either the Triple or the Dual Alliance. It emphasizes Lord Dufferin's warning that force governs the world, that might is right, and therefore that the nation which believes that its life is so precious that it has a mission for humanity must be prepared to defend its life and honour against all odds. Our own hands must guard our hands and preparation cannot be improvised, when the crisis comes. The old proverb, "if you wish peace, be prepared for war," is even truer now than in the days of Rome, because modern armies and navies, with effective equipment, cannot be created in a month or a year. Other events have impressed this lesson, that they live surrounded by deadly dangers, on the British people, so that in recent years they have applauded every proposed addition to their defensive and offensive forces. This revelation will clinch the lesson. The plea that the strength of the British fleet obliges other nations to run a race with her is silly. They know that a resistless fleet is indispensable to the existence of no other people; whereas it is required by the nature of the Oceanic Commonwealth of which she is the centre, by her world-wide commercial interests, by the fact that the patrol of the seas and her food supply go together, and by the immensity of the interests of which she is the guardian. Our true well-being is bound up with hers, and we are realising that we—in conjunction with her—have a mission to fulfil. How we can best unify our interests and our forces must then be the supreme question for every section of the British Empire.

The threatened Famine in India.

Millions in India are always within sight of starvation, and but for recent rains famine would have held sway over regions peopled by seventy millions, fellow-subjects and in great part of our own race. The Government with its splendid force of trained civil servants has made preparations on a gigantic scale to cope with the danger, which is sure to be considerable and may be extreme. Its expenditure has sent the rupee higher than it has been for years past. What a responsibility Britain has taken upon herself, the croakers cry! Well, is it so noble to shirk responsibility? In former times, the millions were allowed to starve. Can men and women, who have never had less than three meals a day, fancy that their responsibility—no matter what their power—is confined to their own family, City or Continent? What else could Britain have done in India than what she has done and is doing, is the question to ask? She has brought order out of chaos, given peace to warring creeds and races, chained human tigers, introduced civilization, established justice, opened wide the doors for all the forces of Christianity to enter. She has covered the land with a network of railways, and is now extending these to the distressed districts, so enabling traders to carry food to the people, and inspiring even natives to lend money for the purpose; is building schools and hospitals, tanks and reservoirs; instituting relief works, and ordering supplies from all quarters. India is perhaps the greatest monument of her fitness to govern races unfit for self-government; but what else could she do, we ask? Retire within her own islands and live at ease, the croakers say. It is a fine programme and may inspire them, but fortunately there are still people in the world made of other stuff.

The Presidential Election.

In the election of Mr. McKinley the United States escaped a disaster that would have been infinitely worse than war. War is a definite evil. We can put into statistical tables the numbers of killed, wounded and missing; the railways wrecked, tunnels blown up, bridges burned, fields devastated, and debt incurred. Should however the war issue in the triumph of a good cause, we can set that over against the loss, and each succeeding generation will honour the martyrs and say that the gain was well worth the awful price that had to be paid. Indeed, history seems to teach that there is no other way to higher planes of living, either for the individual or the nation, but the way of blood and tears. But, dishonour is an indefinite or rather an infinite evil. The step once taken, there is almost no way of repentance to be found. Every citizen shares the taint, and his children have to reap the harvest. It must sicken many of the best people in the States to think that the question of repudiating their debts should have been submitted to the arbitreament of the ballot, and that grave fears were actually entertained to the last by competent judges, lest in the count of heads the evil should win. The Constitution puts such tremendous power in the hands of the Executive that, once installed in office, he could begin the work of repudiation immediately; for, of course, to pay debts at the rate of fifty or sixty or seventy cents to the dollar is repudiation. The man who can persuade himself that he may do that, will not remain long at the fifty cent rate. The honest section of the community would do well to make up its mind to fight at once rather than consent to the first step in such a toboggan slide to the pit.

In reviewing the conflict, cheering and discouraging signs of the actual condition of the people are discernible. The enormous majorities in the New England States, in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania show how sound they are; how many of their people rose superior to party, even where the Republican leader represented what was most offensive to them; what a solid reserve force there is in that old core of the Republic, and how it may be depended on to stand in the breach against any floods of fool fury that may arise. On the other hand, it is impossible to under-rate the strength of the elements that gathered round Mr. Bryan or to deny that under certain conditions these may triumph four or eight years hence. Whether they shall or shall not triumph then depends largely on the use which the Republicans make of their victory.

There are two courses open to them. Recognition that they are indebted for success to the sound-money Democrats who preferred the national honour to their free-trade and other party principles should constrain them to put their pet policy of protection into the background and form a truly national organization whose aim would be the removal of those abuses to which Bryanism owed its extraordinary vitality. Are they not equally bound with Democrats to put aside party views and watchwords when the national ark is endangered? That was done in Britain, when Parnellism threatened the unity of the nation. There are however no signs that it is likely to be done in the States. Mr. McKinley is not the man to initiate a policy, and the machine politicians who do his thinking for him would smile at the suggestion that salvation might be found in union with Democrats. The other course is to work the old McKinleyism for all that it is worth, and to try again the experiment—whether with or without Reciprocity Treaties—which the people rejected when they got the first taste of it a few years ago. Recent indications are that this is thought to be the path of wisdom, and it only needs four years of vigorous work along this line to bring to a head the troubles now brewing everywhere in the States.

Venezuela and a General Board of Arbitration.

This time last year Jonathan was a very whiteheaded boy in Venezuela. He is not so popular now, and by the time the boundary arbitration is decided he is likely to be cursed as a Judas and Benedict Arnold rolled into one. On the surface, Lord Salisbury seems to have conceded a principle which he refused when a smaller power asked for it; but there is a difference between a board with two Venezuelans on it, and a board of four judges all of the same race; and there is a difference between the unlimited arbitration up to the Essequibo which Venezuela claimed, and arbitration outside of districts occupied for fifty years, especially if this covers the Dutch period, as no doubt it does, while the quarrel is 74 years old. It surely might be quite right to refuse the one claim and to assent to the other. As to the acknowledgment by Britain of a hegemony by the States over as many of the Central and South American republics as desire it, every English speaking man ought to hold up both hands for such a principle on more grounds than one, though it is doubtless unpalatable to the other powers of Europe. It does not touch Canada, for Canada is an integral part of the British Empire. If we seceded and called ourselves "independent" we too might have to supplicate the eagle to take us under his wing; for, in spite of Mr. Lincoln's story that calling the tail of a calf a leg does not give the calf five legs, there are still people who fancy that we have only to call Canada independent to make her so in fact. How long the sensitive, quarrelsome, semi-bankrupt, semi-civilized Spanish-American states will accept leadership is another question. One or two of them may, if it means that Statia is to pull chestnuts out of the fire for them to eat. Not otherwise.

But the British people would welcome any settlement with Venezuela, if there was tacked on to it provision for a general Board of Arbitation to settle all disputed questions between them and their kinsfolk. Faith in the principle of arbitration has taken possession of the best people of both countries; and it is a good thing therefore that it is to be tried in a simple form and under favourable auspices. Even if the court does nothing else, it will serve as a buffer and give time for reflection. Our neighbours need that, above everything else; for they are a sentimental and sensation loving people, and they will now be able to get up steam to any extent simply that they may blow it off into space. New York markets will no longer go to pieces even if a President should rage and congress pass warlike resolutions without a day's delay and without a dissenting voice.

Cuba and the President's Policy.

Mr. Cleveland is evidently puzzled about Cuba, and Mr. Olney is coming to understand that modern diplomacy is one of the fine arts. The Senate's Foreign Committee however rushes in where presidents and secretaries of state fear to tread; but instead of hurting Spain it merely gives a bad scare to the stock market and helps to bring down a few American banks. Mr. Olney stood on firm constitutional ground when he let the congress know that in such matters the two houses are merely debating clubs and that as the President had already outlined his policy nothing they might 'resolute' would have any effect. Fancy a Secretary of State taking such a tone with the House of Commons! No matter how strong the government, it would be voted out on the spot. Little wonder that Senators feel the snub and cite precedents to justify their action. Such open contempt would pierce the hide of a rhinoceros. Their historical parallels amount to nothing. Reasons can be given why each tub stands as it does, and meanwhile Mr. Olney stands by the Constitution. Mr. Cleveland manages the supreme business of the nation as he chooses, and the United States is the land of liberty! In this case, fortunately, Mr. Cleveland is entirely right. He would have the power all the same were he entirely wrong.

But what is to become of Cuba? Who can say, for who knows the facts? Spain is a unit in the determination to hold on to the last, and apparently all the elements in the Island which represent or guarantee civilization are on her side, and yet the rebellion is not crushed. Probably the explanation of her dismal failure is to be found in the corruption that exists in the military departments, and in the incapacity of the officers, who are ignorant and jealous of each other. Spain has proved herself unfit to govern colonies, and that means that sooner or later the last fragments of her Colonial Empire will wrench themselves or be wrenched from her grasp. What then? Is the pearl of the Antilles to become, like Hayti, another illustration that Quashee is utterly unfit for self-government? Clearly, there is no provision in the Constitution of the United States for dealing with such a problem. The only country that could govern Cuba satisfactorily and that would soon turn it into a Garden of the Lord is Britain, and she has no intention of interfering.

Common sense is not yet sufficiently in the ascendant in the United States to make them either co-operate with Britain to secure justice for Armenia or invite her co-operation to give peace and order to Cuba. The Cuban embroglio is therefore likely to end in the ruin of Cuba, the ruin of Spain, and in no good to the United States.

G.

ADDRESS THE Kingston Business College

· · KINGSTON, ONT. · ·

For information concerning the Commercial and Short-hand Courses.

J. B. McKay, President. A. Blanchard, Principal.

BOOKS!

University Text Books, Stationery, Fountain Pens, and College Supplies, for all Departments of Queen's, at

R. UGLOW & CO'S.

Successors to John Henderson & Co., Kingston.

KINGSTON LADIES' COLLEGE

A Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies.

CLOSEBURN, KINGSTON.

FULL STAFF OF UNIVERSITY GRADUATES.

SPECIAL ATTENTION given to students preparing for Departmental and University Examinations.

THE MUSICAL DEPARTMENT is in charge of Stocks Hammond, Esq., Mus. Doc.

For terms and prospectus apply to Mrs. Cornwall, M.A., Principal of the College.

G. M. GRANT, Chairman, Board of Directors.

Queen's University and College

INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER IN 1841.

THE ARTS COURSE of this University, leading to the degrees of B.A. and M.A., D.Sc., and Ph.D., embraces Classical Literature, Modern and Oriental Languages, English, History, Mental and Moral Philosophy, Political Science, Mathematics, Physics, Astronomy, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Assaying and Metallurgy.

Medals are awarded on the Honour Examinations in Latin, Greek, Moderns, English, History, Mental and Moral Philosophy, Political Science, Mathematics, Chemistry, Physics and Astronomy, General Biology.

THE LAW COURSE leads to the degree of LL.B.

THE THEOLOGICAL COURSE leads to the degree of B.D.

THE MEDICAL COURSE leads to the degree of M.D. and C.M.

Calendars and Examination Papers may be had from the Registrar.

REV. GEO. BELL, LL.D., Kingston, Ont.

Kingston Conservatory of Music

AND SCHOOL OF ELOCUTION.

O. F. TELGMANN, Director. 258 PRINCESS STREET.

Summer Term begins Monday July 6. Fall Term begins Aug 31.
Winter Term begins Nov 9. Spring Term begins Feb. 2.

LONDON AND LANCASHIRE LIFE.

HEAD OFFICE : MONTREAL.

LIBERAL ! *Assets in Canada, over $1,600,000.*

STRONG ! *Low Rates.*

PROGRESSIVE ! *Prompt Settlements.*

BOARD OF DIRECTION :

SIR DONALD A. SMITH, K. C. M. G., M.P., CHAIRMAN.

R. B. ANGUS, ESQ.

DR. SANDFORD FLEMING, C. M. G.

ROBERT BENNY, ESQ.

A. T. PATERSON, ESQ.

MILLS & CUNNINGHAM, General Agents, Kingston.

B. HAL. BROWN,
MANAGER.

STANDARD WORKS

IN

CANADIAN HISTORY.

POPULAR HISTORY OF CANADA. By W. H. Withrow	$3 00
TEN YEARS OF UPPER CANADA IN WAR AND PEACE—1805-15. By Mrs. Edgar	1 50
CAPE BRETON. Historic, Picturesque, Descriptive. By J. M. Gow	3 00
HISTORY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. By Alexander Begg, C.E.	3 00
HISTORY OF MANITOBA. By R. B. Hill	1 50
HISTORY OF THE COUNTY OF LUNENBURG. By Judge DesBrisay	2 50
THE INDIANS OF CANADA. By Rev. John McLean, Ph. D.	1 00
THE LIFE OF SIR ISAAC BROCK. By D. B. Read, Q.C.	1 50
A VETERAN OF 1812. The Life of Lt.-Col. James Fitzgibbon. By Mary Agnes Fitzgibbon	1 00

WILLIAM BRIGGS, Publisher, 29-33 Richmond Street West, Toronto.

NISBET'S THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

The Levitical Sin-Offering. By H. Batchelor.
Christianity According to Christ. By J. Munro Gibson, D.D.
Christianity and Evolution: Modern Problems of the Faith.
Daniel, An Exposition. By Very Rev. R. Payne Smith.
Future Probation. A Symposium.
Gospel According to St. Paul, The. By J. O. Dykes, D.D.
Immortality. A Clerical Symposium.
Inspiration. A Clerical Symposium.
Mental Characteristics of Our Lord. By H. N. Bernard.
Landmarks of New Testament Morality. By George Matheson.
Non-Biblical Systems of Religion.
Patriarchal Times. By Thomas Whitelaw, D.D.
Sabbatical Rest of God and Man, The. By J. Hughes.
St. John's First Epistle. By J. J. Lias.
St. Paul's First Letter to Timothy. By A. Rowland.
Vox Dei. By R. A. Redford.
Zachariah, His Visions and Warnings. By W. L. Alexander.

Published at 6s. sterling per Volume.

Now Reduced to 75 Cents, Postpaid.

JOHN YOUNG,

UPPER CANADA TRACT SOCIETY, - - - - 102 YONGE STREET, TORONTO.

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY,

PUBLISHED JULY, OCTOBER, JANUARY AND APRIL,

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF ALUMNI AND FRIENDS OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON, CANADA.

Publishing Committee.

JAMES CAPPON, M.A.
A. P. KNIGHT, M.A., M.D.
G. Y. CHOWN, B.A.
N. F. DUPUIS, M.A.
A. SHORTT, M.A.
J. McNAUGHTON, M A.
G. M. MACDONNELL, B.A., Q.C.
DONALD ROSS, D.D.
R. V. ROGERS, Q.C., LL.D.
JOHN HERALD, M.A., M.D.

All business communications should be addressed to the Business Manager,

N. R. CARMICHAEL, M.A.,
BOX A,
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY,
KINGSTON, CANADA

KINGSTON SCHOOL OF MINING AND AGRICULTURE

Incorporated by Act of Ontario Legislature, 1898.

SESSION 1896-7.

Department of Mining.—Classes open Oct. 1. Prospectors' course begins Jan. 6, 1897.

Department of Dairying (Fortnightly Classes), commencing Dec. 3, 1896, to April 10, 1897.

Department of Veterinary Practice will be opened Oct. 11th, 1896.

For Calendar containing information about fees, Courses of Study, &c., apply to

W. MASON, *Bursar*,
School of Mining and Agriculture, Kingston, Ont.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF MEDICINE

AND

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS

A Thorough Course in Medicine and Surgery Leads to the Degree of M.D. and C.M.

Practical and Clinical Instruction is given in the amphitheatre of the Kingston General Hospital, L'Hotel Dieu, Hospital for the Insane, and the Provincial Penitentiary.

Exceptional advantages are afforded for the study of Practical Anatomy.

The Forty-fourth Session commences on Thursday, October 1st, 1896.

Animal biology, including physiology, histology and embryology, is in charge of DR. KNIGHT, who devotes his whole time to them. Each student, during his course, mounts over 200 microscope specimens, illustrating physiology and embryology.

Pathology and bacteriology are now taught by Prof. W. T. CONNELL, who devotes his whole time to these important branches.

Further information and Calendar may be had from the Dean, FIFE FOWLER, M.D., or DR. HERALD, Secretary, Kingston, Ont.