

The Independent.

Entered at the Post-office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XXXVII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1885.

NUMBER 1931.

The Independent.

This issue contains 36 pages.
For Table of Contents, see Page 20.

MARY ARDEN.

AN ODE TO THE MOTHER OF SHAKESPEARE.

(Her birthday is the 6th of December.)

BY ERIC MACKAY.

O THOU to whom, athwart the perished days
And parted nights, long sped, we lift our gaze
Love-lit and reverent as befits the time,
Behold! I greet thee with a modern rhyme
To solemnize the feast-day of thy son.

And who the son unpurged in the smiles
Of thy fond face? 'Tis Shakespeare of the Isles,
Shakespeare of England, whom the world has
known

As thine, and ours, and Glory's, in the zone
Of all the seas of earth, and all its lands.

He was un-famous when he came to thee,
But sound, and sweet, and good for eyes to see,
And born at Stratford, on St. George's Day,
A week before the wondrous month of May;
And God therein was gracious to us all.

Thou art the mother of the man of men,
And he the chief of all who wield the pen,
A sage untrammelled by the doubts and fears
Of minds perverse, who profit not by tears,
And learn no lesson from the strokes of Fate.

Aye, that sublime and blithe and earnest soul,
Whose wine of thought we quaff as from a bowl
That Heaven has lent—thy child, O Winsome
One!

Was Nature's friend, and, through the setting
sun,
Behold the gateways of Jehovah's house.

He talk'd with trees; he summon'd to his side
Spirits of truth, and fairies near-allied
To good Queen Mab, and quaint, audacious
things,

To fill the Summers and to thrill the Springs
Of English forests till the end of time.

His fame is richer than a King's renown;
The wreath he wore has ripened to a crown;
And we who know how blank the world would
be

Without his works, are proud to bow to thee,
To thank thee, also, Mary! for the same.

He was a wizard, and he call'd to life
Soldiers and swans and liegemen for the strife
Of old-world cities; and he spake with those
Who died for Lancaster's beloved rose,
And York's usurping one, foredoom'd to fall.

He lov'd thee, Lady! and he lov'd the world;
And, like a flag, his fealty was unfur'd;
And Kings who flourished ere thy son was born
Shall live through him, from morn to furthest
morn,

In all the far-off cycles yet to come.

He gave us Falstaff, and a hundred quips,
A hundred mottoes from immortal lips;
And, year by year, we smile to keep away
The generous tears that mind us of the sway
Of his great singing, and the pomp thereof.

His was the nectar of the gods of Greece,
The lute of Orpheus, and the Golden Fleece
Of grand endeavor; and the thunder-roll
Of words majestic, which, from pole to pole,
Have borne the tidings of our English tongue.

He gave us Hamlet; and he taught us more
Than schools have taught us; and his fairy-
lore
Was fraught with science; and he call'd from
death

Verona's Lovers, with the burning breath
Of their great passion that has filled the
spheres.

He made us know Cordelia, and the man
Who murder'd sleep, and baleful Caliban;
And, one by one, athwart the gloom appear'd
Maidens and men and myths who were revered
In olden days, before the earth was sad.

O fair and fond young mother of the boy
Who wrought all this!—O Mary!—in thy joy
Did'st thou perceive, when, fitful from his
rest,

He turn'd to thee, that his would be the best
Of all men's chanting since the world began?

Did'st thou, O Mary! with the eye of trust
Perceive, prophetic, through the dark and
dim

Of things terrene, the glory of thy son,
And all the pride therein that should be won
By toilsome men, content to be his slaves?

Did'st thou, good mother! in the tender ways
That women find to fill the fleeting days,
Behold afar the Giant who should rise
With foot on earth and forehead in the skies,
To write his name, and thine, among the
stars?

I love to think it; and, in dreams at night
I see thee stand, erect, and all in white,
With hands out-yearning to that mighty form,
As if to draw him back from out the storm,
To make him thine, and make him young,
again.

I see thee, pale and pure, with flowing hair,
And big, bright eyes, far-searching in the air
For thy sweet babe; and, in a trice of time,
I see the child advance to thee and climb
And call thee "Mother!" in ecstatic tones.

Yet, if my thought be vain—if, by a touch
Of this weak hand, I vex thee overmuch—
Forbear the blame, sweet Spirit! and endow
My heart with fervor while to thee I bow
Athwart the threshold of my fading dream.

This much is true; this much at least is known;
He was thy son, and came to fill the throne
Of English Song! The Muse on him smiled,
And each, in turn, did lavish on the child
A nurse's care, to make him paramount.

Aye! this is true. It was ordained so;
He was thine own, three hundred years ago;
But ours to-day; and ours till earth is red
With doom-day splendor for the quick and dead,
And days and nights are scattered like the
leaves.

It was for this he lived; for this he died;
To raise to Heaven the face that never lied,
To lean to earth the lips that should become
Fraught with conviction when the mouth was
dumb

And all the firm, fine body turn'd to clay.

He lived for this; to sanctify the lives
Of perish'd maids, and uncreated wives,
Who each obtained a space wherein to dwell;
And for his mother's sake he loved them well,
And made them types of truth and tender
grace.

E'en thus, O Mary! have I seen thee pass
Along the banks of Avon, by the grass,
As fair as those creations of thy son;
But older grown, and with the look of One
Who knows the nearest way to some new
grave.

Yet most of all I see thee in the flush
Of thy first beauty, while the mother's "Hush!"
Hung on thy lip, and all thy tangled hair
Reclothed a bosom that, in part, was bare
Because a tiny hand had toy'd therewith.

Oh! by the June-tide splendor of thy face
When, eight weeks old, the child in thy embrace
Did leap and laugh, O Mary!—by the same,
I bow to thee and magnify thy name,
And call thee England's Pride forevermore.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

EUROPEAN TREATIES AND THE BALKAN PENINSULA.

BY JAMES B. ANGELL, LL.D.,
PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

It is of interest just now to notice the principal treaty stipulations which the Great Powers of Europe have made during the last thirty years concerning the territory in the Balkan Peninsula.

On March 30th, 1856, at the close of the Crimean War, Great Britain, France, Sardinia, Austria, Russia, and Turkey signed the Treaty of Paris, which was intended to protect Turkey against the ambitious plans of Russia to gain control of the Bosphorus. By the Seventh Article the following stipulation was made:

"Their Majesties engage, each on his part, to respect the independence and the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire; guarantee in common the strict observance of that engagement; and will, in consequence, consider any act tending to its violation as a question of general interest."

By the Eleventh Article both Russia and Turkey, as well as other powers, were forbidden to keep ships of war on the Black Sea.

It will be readily seen that the Seventh Article not only permitted, but really required, the Powers to interfere to prevent any attempt upon the independence or the territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire. They did, however, quietly allow Moldavia and Wallachia to unite within two years, and finally to become the Kingdom of Rumania. During the Franco-Prussian war, Russia, seeing her opportunity, declared her purpose to disregard the Article which forbade her to place armed ships on the Black Sea; and the Treaty of London, signed March 18th, 1871, by Great Britain, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Russia, and Turkey, abrogated the Eleventh Article of the Treaty of Paris.

Massacres in Bulgaria and Herzegovina, perpetrated by the Turks in 1876, attracted the attention of Europe, and a conference of the Great Powers recommended to the Sultan certain changes in territory and in administration. But he rejected the proposition. Russia then threw her armies across the boundary into Turkey, to protect, as she said, the persecuted adherents to the faith of the Greek Church. The Russo-Turkish war ensued. The Turks were vanquished. Russia seemed to have Constantinople in her power, but hesitated to seize it. She did, however, make the Treaty of San Stefano with the Ottoman Porte, March 17th, 1878. And a most humiliating treaty for Turkey it was.

It recognized the independence of Montenegro and of Servia. It established what has been called "big Bulgaria," comprising not only what is now found in Bulgaria and East Rumania, but also a large territory south and southwest of the latter province. A Russian Commissioner was to organize an autonomous Christian government in this Bulgaria, and a Russian army was to occupy the territory for two years. Certain changes were to be made in Epirus and Thessaly under Russian supervision. An indemnity for expenses of the war, amounting to 1,410,000,000 roubles was to be paid to Russia by Turkey. But, in a generous spirit, Russia offered to accept territory in Asia Minor and in Europe in liquidation of 1,100,000,000 roubles of this claim, leaving only 300,000,000 roubles for bankrupt Turkey to

pay in cash, or, in default of cash, doubtless at some future time in territory. In short, this Treaty set up a strong Slavonic state in the very heart of the Turkish Empire, and placed the Porte in financial bondage to the Czar.

Hence, naturally enough, Great Britain, under Disraeli and Salisbury, demanded a Congress of the Great Powers to revise the Treaty of San Stefano. Russia stoutly resisted the proposition to revise the whole treaty, but was compelled at last to yield to the demand of England. So the Congress of Berlin was held; and on July 13th, 1878, the Treaty of Berlin was signed by the Great Powers—England, Germany, Austria, France, Italy, Russia and Turkey. This Treaty is, in fact, a revision of the Treaties of Paris and London, as well as of that of San Stefano.

The independence of Serbia and of Montenegro was recognized and confirmed. The administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina was entrusted to Austria. The "big Bulgaria" of the San Stefano Treaty was cut up. The new Bulgaria being wholly north of the Balkans, a province of East Rumania was marked off south of the Balkans, and a still more southerly part of big Bulgaria was left within the domain of Turkey proper. The new Bulgaria was to elect its own Prince, who should be confirmed by the Porte, with assent of the Powers, to be autonomous, to have religious freedom, but to pay tribute to the Porte, which should be determined by the signers of the Treaty. East Rumania was to have a Governor-General, who should serve five years, and should be nominated by the Porte, with the assent of the Powers. It was to have administrative autonomy, but laws should be subject to the approval of the Sultan. The Governor-General could summon Ottoman troops, if the province was threatened. The Porte was required to inform the Great Powers, if he should decide to send troops, and to set forth the exigencies which justified such action.

Such were the provisions under which the governments of Bulgaria and East Rumania were organized. The Treaty of Berlin is the charter to which they owe their existence. That their recent union is in violation of that Treaty there can be no question, though no more so than the union of Moldavia and Wallachia was an infraction of the Treaty of Paris.

THE TRUE THEORY OF THE PREFACE.

A CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION TO ALL MAKERS OF BOOKS.

BY BRANDER MATTHEWS.

APPARENTLY the true theory of the Preface is apprehended by very few of those who are by trade makers of books—to use Carlyle's characterization of his own calling. Mr. Matthew Arnold, indeed, master of all literary arts, is highly skillful in the use of the Preface, which, in his hands, serves to drive home the bolt of his argument, and to rivet it firmly on the other side. Those who have read one of Mr. Arnold's prefaces know what to expect, and fall to, with increased appetite, on the book itself. But not many men may wield the weapons of Mr. Arnold, and very few, as I have said already, are skilled in the use of the Preface. Many, ignorant of its utility, choose to ignore it altogether. More, accepting it as a necessary evil, ac-

defensive attitude had given way not a little, and we were prepared to exchange further cordial amenities and to be surprised once more into taking the place of the flattered, instead of the flatterer. All this has put us into a very happy frame of mind; so happy, in fact, that we stand a chance of deserving the epithet that New York and the West had applied to us, "concocted Bostonians." In the high tide of this gulf-stream of satisfaction, comes "Henri Gréville." I have never understood yet the reason for the grand heralding, the flourish of trumpets that has broken forth at the coming of this very agreeable, but by no means great, story-teller. The novel by which she is best known in this country is "Dosia," a charming story, but light and airy as thistle-down. But all at once, when it was rumored that Henri Gréville was coming to this country—was coming first straight to Boston—everybody here flew to the libraries for "Dosia," and in a twinkling an enterprising publisher brings out a paper-covered edition at fifty cents per copy. When "Dosia," was first brought out in translation here, about seven or eight years ago, it was widely read and admired for its freshness and grace and cleanliness. Here was a French novel that was rich and entertaining, without dirt. It had also received the approval of the French Academy. This latter fact, no doubt, gave it prestige. Several other stories, translated by Mrs. Sherwood, followed "Dosia," and the Gréville novels for a short time were very popular. Then came a lull; and Alphonse Daudet, with his original and strong studies of character appeared, and the public attention and taste were monopolized by that vivid idealized realism. Zola follows, with a realism that is stripped of even its own clothing, and for a time we are fed *ad nauseum* upon this garbage of the gutter, and are assured that it is the strong meat of truth. After this rank diet, comes Madame Gréville with her arch and artless "Dosia" and with Dosia's daughter just in the background, waiting to get into her English dress to be introduced to us. It will be a great contrast; but we are fond of contrast, and it will be a novel sensation to read once more a French novel that does not leave a bad taste in the mouth, and is yet lively and entertaining. That the author of "Dosia" is a woman, and a Frenchwoman, has doubtless something to do with the great interest that has sprung up about her. We have got accustomed to English visitors; authors and artists and clergymen by the score have come to us from British shores. But we have never before had a Frenchwoman novelist for a guest. This, I am sure, is part of the secret of the grand furor that greeted Madame Gréville.

Mr. Williams, the experienced manager of the Lecture Bureau, says that he has never had such an immediate response, such an enthusiastic greeting given to any coming lecturer. Hand in hand with all this go the social acceptance and courtesies. The first reception to Monsieur and Madame Durand was given three days after their arrival, by Mrs. Mosher, of Cambridge, in return for the friendly civilities bestowed upon her daughter by Madame Durand in Paris. This charming reception, on such friendly footing, brought Madame Gréville face to face at once with some of the pleasantest of the literary, journalistic, and artistic people of Boston. The stout matronliness of Madame's appearance did not consort with some of our preconceived notions of what we have considered the typical Frenchwoman—the fascinating syren, such as Balzac and Daudet have presented to us. We saw, instead, the matron that Philip Gilbert Hamerton has set before us in his pictures of French life—the wife and mother and friend that he is never weary of extolling, and of whom we are never weary of hearing. But this wife and mother and friend has the traditional tact of the Frenchwoman. As she stood near her hostess during the two appointed hours, her ready smile and quick response in her French-English, which suggested, by the way, George Cable's creole French-English accents—she was a great contrast to the women-folk of the British nation who come over with their husbands to visit us.

With naïve amiability she says at the onset:

"I left all prejudice behind me, and mean to follow the manners of the country, which is the only way to get along."

In the same breath she disarms all suspicion that this prejudice was ever an active factor, by saying that, from the first moment that she saw the American shores, she had been delighted, that nothing had fallen below her expectations. Then she goes on still more naïvely to give an account of her first dinner in this country, where, looking over the *menu* [with her husband, she said to him, "now we are in a new country we must have something new to eat," and, discovering "fried oysters" on the list, they immediately ordered the appetizing dish, because as she explained, "we never fry them in our country." She was delighted with the fried oysters, as she is delighted with everything; and all this she tells us with that French frankness, which, while seeming to reveal the whole thought, and taking us into entire confidence, yet covers and conceals an undercurrent of judicial criticism that is far keener and sharper than the outspoken comment of the Englishman, who half the time does not go beneath the surface of things. Regarding Madame, the other night, at the Cambridge receptions, observing her shrewd, penetrating glance, while she smiled and gave utterance to her gracious words, I thought of Burro's line:

"A chiel's amang ye, takin' notes."

Gathered about this gracious speaker were various Boston notabilities—Howells's dark, kindly face being almost as much an object of interest as that of the principal guest. Colonel Higginson, always with that look as if the soldier was trying to run away with the scholar, lifted his stalwart shoulders above the crowd; and Samuel Longfellow, shy and reticent, but with a gentle word for everybody, went about with the student's air of half-absent speculation and attention. It was a very characteristic Boston company, the feminine element being largely in the ascendant, and well represented by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe and her daughter, Mrs. Anagnos, Mrs. Louise Chandler Moulton, Mrs. Agassiz, Miss Elizabeth Peabody, and a host of society people. Harvard professors and students, clergymen of all creeds, journalists, artists, and reformers, all seemed to mix and mingle with the greatest amiability, as if they enjoyed it immensely, as I have no doubt they did. The *mise en scene* was very picturesque; for the house is admirably constructed for picturesque effects: one of the new houses built after no set pattern, the broad door open at once into a wide hall and parlor, the one divided from the other simply by a *portiere*, no partitions, no wall of division interfering with the fine spaces, or hiding the beautiful yet unobtrusive sweep of the stairway at the right of the library and dining-room at the left, but showing everywhere, from every point, the glory of the tinted lamps, and the comfortable blaze of various hearth-fires.

The course of Madame Gréville's lectures are to be given in a small hall, one of the smallest in the city: but the tickets have sold so surprisingly that the management, no doubt, a already regretting that a larger hall was not selected; but not even an experienced lecture manager could foresee that Madame Gréville would so suddenly become the fashion. It was expected that friendly courtesies, for friendly reasons of acquaintanceship, like Mrs. Mather's reception, would be offered; but that all party-giving Boston should start up to dine and lunch and high-tea the French novelist was not foreseen when her visit was first arranged.

The first lecture upon "Russian Life," of which life Madame has had an experience such as few women not Russian by birth have had, is to be given in French; and it is for this lecture that the seats have sold most rapidly. Wagglish and cynical people elevate their eyebrows and have their little joke over this, wondering how many who will sit and look wise as they listen to Madame's rapid French will follow her words with understanding. There is, perhaps, a little too much doubt and cynicism in this attitude; but the following of a fashion, when that fashion is in the region

of "culcha," is demoralizing to a good many Bostonians. Two years ago we had pretty good proof of this in the Browning rage. It was when Mr. Thaxter was in the full swing of his Browning readings. It got to be "the thing" to go to Mr. Thaxter's readings, and "everybody" as we say, first and last, was to be seen there. One day I met a very distinguished man in his speciality of thought, and we got to talking of these readings. I asked him if he had been to them: "Yes; I went once, he answered, but I didn't understand a word. I was there and F. was there, and G. was there"—naming other noted men—"and when we came out I said to F.: 'Did you understand it?' 'Not a word,' F. answered."

Distinguished as these gentlemen were, it was not given to them to understand Browning—or that portion that Mr. Thaxter chose to read; and they were frank enough to own it. But the lesser people who listened, also without understanding, were not frank enough to own it, even to themselves. So we go on here in Boston in rather a headlong pursuit of whatever may take our fancy, or whatever may seem to point the way to that upward height of culture, for which we are said to have such an unbounded reverence. We humbug ourselves a good deal, no doubt, and we follow false gods, and make vain pretenses; but, at the bottom of all this, there is, even with those whose ambition is beyond their power of accomplishment, whose desire is to shine, to seem, rather than to be—even with these, there is, underneath all the sham, all the pretense, a most real admiration and respect for intellectual aims and attainments. How else, through dreary hours, can these people sit and listen to dreary essays, to drearier discussions upon all sorts of fine-spun theories and speculative philosophies? It may have become the fashion; but to have such a pursuit become the fashion argues a certain amount of upward leading which is not to be despised. I have no doubt that, if Madame Gréville stays long enough with us, she will be invited to one of these intellectual bouts. Direct, straightforward and full of simplicity in her own style of expression and method of thought, she would unquestionably have the courage which goes with such simplicity, and frankly admit, as did my friend upon the Browning reading, that she understood—not a word.

BOSTON, MASS.

Hymn Notes.

ANTI-SLAVERY HYMNS.

III.

BY PROF. FREDERIC M. BIRD.

A REFORMER must usually be something of a fanatic, and we can scarcely expect these ardent brethren and sisters to dwell altogether in the prosaic realm of hard fact and common sense. In one of Mr. Garrison's lyrics, the Negroes are expected to come out superior to their oppressors and patrons alike:

"Uprising, take your place
Among earth's noblest race,
By right, the first!"

The Italics are his own, or those of "Songs of the Free."

In some of these pieces the Negro is idealized and sentimentalized into a creature of the finest sensibilities, with grave, somber, and cultured views of life. Mrs. Abdy sings:

"O what can afford the poor slave reparation,
His spirits restore, or his vigor renew?
Golconda's vast treasures were no compensation,
Too trivial a boon were the mines of Peru."

True enough from the abstract and Northern view point; but in the concrete, the average slave would have been content with a single gold piece of the lowest denomination. The abolitionists were doing God's work—that has been clear enough for many years now. Their cause was that of Truth and Justice, and they had to further it in their own way, by any and every means. Their position was secure while they kept to general principles; but when they drew on imagination for details, one may (at this distance of time) enter into the mental state of the unconverted Philistine public, or even of the Southerner, if he could have kept his temper. A mountain may give the most picturesque view of a village ten miles off, but not the most minute and realistic.

One of these hymns, apparently for new con-

verts, regards their former indifference as the sin of sins:

"To thee our crimes we now confess—
Our most hard-hearted, shameful sin—
In disregarding their distress
To whom thou gav'st a darker skin."

And yet there were thousands of conscientious people in the land, in those days, who had other things to think about, duties that lay nearer. We may excuse them for being politically unenlightened, without blaming the zealots of one idea which was to prove itself true and essential to the national health; as later thinkers are constrained to sympathize with both Luther and Erasmus.

I see no trace in the books of the idea, powerful with so many in later days, that the Peculiar Institution was to be objected to quite as much for the whites' sake as for the blacks'. Slaveholders are "admonished" and "appealed to," but there is scarce a sign of sorrow for them as victims of a curse entailed from former generations, with its inevitable blinding and narrowing of mind and heart.

"Freedom's Lyre" gives what may be the full text (I have not seen it elsewhere) of a fine and delicate hymn, now much valued in England, and introduced to general notice by Sir R. Palmer's "Book of Praise," where it began with the fourth stanza altered, as

"Saviour, I lift my trembling eyes."

In some books it begins with the second:

"Saviour, I think upon that hour."

It is now credited to M. G. Thomson, 1831; but here to the "Liberator," so that it may possibly be American. This is a point to be inquired into. The piece is little known with us, and some readers may thank me for copying the whole of it from this book of 1840.

"Saviour! I bring to thee my chain,
For heavier bonds on thee were flung;
I bare to thee my bosom's pain,
For bitterer pangs from thee were wrung."

"I think upon that awful hour
When thee, the Shepherd of the flock,
The Prince of Peace, the Lord of Power,
The priest did scorn, the soldier mock."

"And, bleeding from the Roman rod,
And scoffed at by the heartless Jew,
I hear thee plead for them to God—
'Father! they know not what they do.'

"And then I lift my trembling eyes
To that bright seat where, placed on high,
The great, the atoning Sacrifice
For me and all is ever nigh."

"Be thou my guard on peril's brink!
Be thou my guide through weal or woe,
And teach me of thy cup to drink,
And make me in my path to go!"

"For what is earthly change or loss?
Thy promises are still my own,
The feeblest frame may bear thy Cross,
The lowliest spirit share thy throne."

For any light which may be cast upon the origin of this I will be thankful.

A few denominational hymn-books since 1840 were not afraid to introduce the generally forbidden topic of slavery; especially Adams and Chapin's "Hymns of Christian Devotion," 1846; Longfellow and Johnson's "Book of Hymns," 1846; Prindle's Wesleyan Methodist Collection, 1845; and the Free Will Baptist "Psalmody," 1858. Their hymns on this subject were mostly taken from "Songs of the Free" and "Freedom's Lyre," with a few later additions, the best of which was perhaps Henry Ware's:

"Oppression shall not always reign."

This is general in character, and seems not to be earlier than 1848.

Equally vigorous and more specific was one by Mr. T. W. Higginson, who afterward fought as he argued and prayed:

"The land our fathers left to us
Is foul with hateful sin."

This bears date 1846, and seems to me the clearest and ablest of the abolitionist arguments in verse. It was a hot shot straight from the gun, and meant to reach the enemy's works.

Of course the very finest thing ever written for this cause was one which could be sung only once for all, since it celebrated final victory: Whittier's ecstatic and magnificent "Laud Deo."

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY.

Biblical Research.

THE SO-CALLED GOSPEL Papyrus.

BY PROF. BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

THE Papyrus fragment of the Third Century, an account of which was given in the INDEPENDENT of July 30th last, still continues to call forth discussion, the drift of which is, as was there predicted, to oppose Bickell and Harnack in considering it a fragment of a lost Gospel. The Rev. F. E. Woodruff gave a very careful account of the discussion in the September number of *The Andover Review* (pp. 372-377), and came to the same general conclusions as were advocated by Dr. Hort and in the paper in

THE INDEPENDENT referred to above. Nüsgen has a paper on the subject in the Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben (1885, 9, pp. 462 and 470.) And now Hilgenfeld treats the whole matter independently in the latest number of the Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie. (1886, I, pp. 50-55.) It is to this last paper that I wish to draw the attention of the readers of THE INDEPENDENT; and it is the more worth our notice that Dr. Harnack more than hinted that no one who was not afflicted with imbecilla ignorantia, born of apologetical zeal, would venture to differ with him.

Hilgenfeld entitled his paper significantly, "No Undiscovered Gospel," and goes carefully over the whole ground. It will not be necessary for us to follow him into the details of the restoration of the passage. Suffice it to say, that he substantially agrees with Bickell here, reading as follows:

τὰ δὲ τὸ φαγεῖν ὡς ἐξήγγον, Πό[ντιος ἐν ταύτῃ] τῷ νεκτὶ σκανδαλισ[θήσεσθε κατὰ] τὸ γραφεῖν Παράξω τὸν [ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ] πρόβατα διασκορπισθή[σεται, εἰπόντος τοῦ] Πέτρον Καὶ εἰ πάντες, ο[ὐκ ἐγώ, εἶπεν] Ὁ ἀλεκτρίων δις κοκκί[ζει, καὶ σὺ σήμερον ἂ] παρ[ίσση με τρίς].

For details of this kind, however, it will be wise for us to await the fac simile which appears to be promised in the forthcoming "Corpus." It is hard to believe, for instance, that ἐξήγγον is right in line 1, though Wessely claims to have read ΠΟΝ, and Bickell thinks that he saw the ΠΟΝ, while the Π is plain. And the exact position in the line of the legible ΠΑΡΝ of the last line will go far to determine the reading of that line. It is enough that the restoration proposed by Hilgenfeld substantially agrees with that of Bickell.

In the important matter of the nature of the writing from which the fragment has been torn, however, he disagrees entirely with Bickell as well as Harnack. With reference to his opinions—especially Harnack's—he writes as follows:

"Would that a calm consideration of the fragment corroborated such high expectations! It is clear that we must understand before the fragment: 'At (if not before) the meal (before they went forth) Jesus said.' And if our thoughts must turn for what Jesus said, to the words of institution of the Supper, or to his declaration that he would no more drink of the fruit of the vine, we should obtain a truly odd gospel, which presupposed the facts of Jesus's life as already known, and only used them to string together the discourses, or here rather the utterances. It is just so, it may be answered, that we conceive of our 'Collection of Sayings.' But what belief can be put in a record of the sayings of the Lord which does not stand on its own feet, but leans on a body of narratives presupposed as known? Bickell (p. 9), and Harnack find here an entirely different transition from the Lord's Supper to the announcement of the denial, from that given in Matthew and Mark. But whence do they know that what was spoken 'before the supper,' was not perhaps an earlier prophecy of the denial of Peter, or a prophecy of the betrayal (Mat. xxvi, 31 sq.; Mark xiv, 30 sq.; Luke xxii, 31 sq.; Jhn. xiii, 31 sq.). And what can they mention as the discrepancy in the transition, except that the close of the feast and the departure (to the Mount of Olives) are mentioned only in order to set the time for words of Jesus? The words themselves are more concisely given than in our first two gospels. But do not also writers compress the language, who are quoting words of Jesus from our canonical Gospels? And whence, elsewhere than from our first gospel, which loves to correct the LXX translation according to the original has the πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσεται (Zach. xiii, 7 ΠΑΡΑΓΕΤΕ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΡΑΓΕΤΕ ΤΟΙΣ ΠΟΙΜΕΝΑΣ καὶ ἐσκοπάσεται τὰ ποιμένα) come? . . . The words of Peter also, Mt. xxvi, 35, Mark xiv, 29, have here no independent meaning, are not introduced with ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν, or with ὁ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ, but, much more concisely by a genitive absolute, as only the occasion of the (second) prophecy of Jesus of the denial of Peter. Was not such a construction the most natural one for an author who was proceeding to speak of the prophecy of Jesus after the farewell supper—whether he wished as a student of the gospels, to keep the two prophecies apart, or in a fiery persecution after the middle of the second century to warn against apostasy and denial? For the latter case we may compare, perhaps, the Epistola Canonica of Peter of Alexandria. And neither ὁ ἀλεκτρίων nor τὸ κοκκίζει can make us give the preference to the prophecy of Jesus in this fragment, in comparison with the presentations of it in Mat. xxvi, 34, and Mark xiv, 30. Is it a happy way of taking the words of Jesus, to make him say that the cock shall twice crow (as if this did not happen every day, much oftener!), and Peter still shall three times deny Jesus 'to-day'? I can, can count such a cock-crow as an awakening call of Gospel study. It can only serve to warn us to vigilance in testing such discoveries."

Is Hilgenfeld indeed among the prophets? Or is it possible that the fragment does not, after all the confidence of its earliest publishers, come from a "lost" gospel?

ALLEGORY. PA.

* The force of this argument depends, of course, on our theory of the relation of Mark to Matthew.

† This, of course, depends on Hilgenfeld's reconstruction of the last line.

Sanitary.

THE STATE SANITARY ASSOCIATION OF NEW JERSEY.

In addition to the work being done by its State Board of Health, the State of New Jersey has good reason to congratulate itself on the benefits resulting from the annual convention of the New Jersey Sanitary Association. It has just held its eleventh session at the State House, at Trenton. It brought together, as heretofore, most of the prominent sanitarians of the state, and representatives of many of the Local Boards. In addition to valuable discussions that occur, the papers offered are generally of high value, the authors being selected with reference to their special knowledge of the subjects to be treated. At the first session, on November 19th, the first paper was by J. C. Bayles, M.E., of Orange, N. J., and editor of the Iron Age. His subject was "House Drainage Requirements in Sanitary Codes." It was claimed that most sanitary codes are too elaborated in their specifications, and that the enforcement is too often in great contrast with this particularity. Only essential things should be required, and the fulfillment of these should be secured. Mr. Bayles contended that all pipes in buildings, or under them, should be of iron, because, if properly coated, it is less liable to get out of order and more certain to be properly laid than earthen pipe. He chooses pipes of four-inch caliber, weighing three pounds to the foot, and laid with a fall of not less than a quarter of an inch to a foot under buildings. He is opposed to any traps whatever on the main soil or sewer pipe in the house, and even would dispense with the trap just outside, now generally used as a water-seal between the house system and the sewer. His reason is, that thus both flush and ventilation are better secured, and that these are the chief pledges of pure pipes. To his mind, the risk of gas from properly ventilated sewers is not to be compared with the risk from an inside system, with its flushing and ventilation checked by traps. Most authorities agree that there should not be inside traps on the main house line, but claim that one trap on the outside does not interfere with proper flushing and ventilation, and that the water-seal is needed as a security against the ordinary sewer or cesspool air. His direction that the pipes, where passing through outside walls, should have spaces that will allow for two or three inches of settling, and that all joints should be fitted, filled, and calked with lead, is in accord with the approved method. The outline of code he proposed is short, simple and effective. Dr. Henry Mitchell, the able Health Officer of Asbury Park, read an article on "Methods of Sanitary Inspection of Houses and Premises, and the Remedies for the Evils Disclosed." Recognizing the house as the unit of sanitary care, he showed that the inspector must have considerable expert knowledge, be a close and kind observer, and know all the details of a real examination. The Books of Blanks now furnished by the State Board give a good outline. The time is not far distant when in this country the regular visits of the sanitary inspector will be welcomed and demanded by every intelligent physician and householder. It was urged that men should put themselves in training for this calling. The greatest weakness of local boards of health is in the dearth of good inspectors. Dr. Mitchell gave an elaborate and accurate description of what a competent inspector would inform himself about, and how he would acquire the necessary information as well as aid the household in correcting errors. Dr. R. Wescott, of Elizabeth, the President of the Association, in his address presented the reasons why physicians should also be sanitarians, and why the state should recognize the need and the economy of expenditure for health. He claimed that the gospel of cleanliness has so much to do with public order and public morals that the physician and the statesman should unite in efforts in this behalf. Reviewing the death rates of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Jersey, he showed that the avoidable losses counted into thousands of persons, and hundreds of thousands of dollars. In estimating the loss to the state he calculated the loss of productive capacity in sickness as well as by death, the larger sickness of many who recover, the loss of time in their case, the effects of invalidism, and said, that, even in this hard, cold view, the removal of all avoidable disease was the great privilege of economists. He urged that the people be more fully informed as to the principles of health, and showed the present to be an opportune time for the diffusion of sanitary truth. The address was not only a stirring appeal, but a careful presentation of well-arranged facts and well-ordered arguments in favor of sanitary administration. The Report of the Committee on School-house Inspection and Teaching of School Hygiene, by Professor Green, of Long Branch, and Prof. I. Mackson Watson, of Elizabeth, showed in what way a school-house and its premises can be thoroughly inspected. The teaching of school hygiene was not only insisted upon, but methods

and subjects illustrated. It is not anatomy and physiology that we want so much as practical drill in the details of sanitary care, so that teachers may teach it as if the children were apprentices. The embarrassments in "The Collection and Removal of Garbage," and how they were to be overcome, were presented by Commissioner Raymond, of Brooklyn. He commended the Boston method; described the patent boat, which unloads at the bottom and so prevents floatage, and directed how to secure division of garbage and the use of part of it for feeding swine. If only municipalities avoid contracting for the work, and enact a uniform system, it is made the policy of all householders to conform thereto.

The Paper on "Ventilation of Sewers and House Drains," by Rudolph Hering, C. E., of Philadelphia, urged the need of thorough ventilation and explained the methods best adapted to secure it. He advocated the venting of each important trap at its crown, and the separation of the house system from the outside sewer system by an intervening trap. While admitting the value of some anti-siphonic traps in certain localities, he claimed the best reliance to be upon the vent. The changes which take place in tubes, by heating of air, by moisture, by the effect of winds, etc., were accurately stated. The paper elicited much discussion and commendation. A valuable paper, by Prof. Geo. H. Cook, on artesian wells, with special reference to the determination of their availability along the New Jersey shore, closed the sessions of the Association. This last paper will be published in the State Geological Report, and that of Mr. Hering in the State Health Report.

Fine Arts.

THE AUTUMN ACADEMY EXHIBITION.

The Autumn exhibition of the National Academy of Design has now become one of the most important events of the art year. When first proposed, some five years ago in the Academy Council, the idea met with much opposition, and the argument was advanced that there would be few canvases sent in, especially by the stronger painters, whose custom it was to return to the city only when frost and snow forced them to do so; as did not until then to work up the material gathered during the Summer and Fall months into finished pictures. This statement had much weight, and had it not been for the continued pressure brought to bear by the artists and art public upon the managers of the Academy, would have effectually disposed of the matter. It was finally and wisely resolved, however, to make a trial; and accordingly, in October of 1882, the first Autumn exhibition was held. Notwithstanding its early opening, and the failure of representation by many of the better men, as had been predicted, the exhibition met with sufficient public support and encouragement to justify its being held the next year. This second exhibition was an improvement on the first. The stronger painters found it to their interest to return earlier to the city and send in their works, and with still greater success last year. The present exhibition, which opened to the public on Monday last, inspired a large amount of pleasurable anticipation and interest, which combined to make it in every way an important event in the world of art.

The exhibition numbers some two hundred more canvases than were hung last year, necessitating the use of the north and northwest galleries for the first time since the Autumn show has been held. While the general average of the pictures accepted and hung is undeniably higher than that of the preceding Fall showings, and compares very favorably with that of the last Spring exhibition, it is greatly to be questioned whether the Hanging Committee, who also act as the Jury of Admission, would not have done more wisely to have diminished the quantity, and thus improved the quality of the exhibition as a whole, even had they to still keep the two galleries above mentioned closed. There are certain large canvases—some, we grieve to say, by academicians and associates—and a host of small and mediocre works, which could have been kept out greatly to the benefit of the Academy, the exhibition, and the many really strong and good works hung. Much is expected of a hanging committee, which chances, by the fate of the method of alphabetical rotation, to number among its members such painters as Winslow Homer, George Inness, Harry Chase, and Alfred C. Howland; and while these gentlemen and their associates have certainly hung the works accepted to the best advantage; and have for the first time in the history of academy exhibitions, subordinated, as far as possible, the glaringly bad canvases of certain well-known and antiquated painters, who claim a definite amount of line space, in accordance with an equally antiquated rule of the institution, they have, nevertheless, it would seem, shown decided weakness in not putting an effectual bar to the stream of small and poor pictures that have been poured in upon them. It is to be hoped that this fault may be remedied next year,

which can easily be done, if the members of the committee will put all thought of filling every gallery out of their minds, and make quality and not quantity the standard of the exhibition.

Of the 675 paintings hung this year, the South Gallery contains the best examples, with one or two solitary exceptions. There are a few good canvases in the West Room, fewer still in the North and East Galleries, and little of any note in the Northwest room and the corridor. Landscapes form the vast majority of the works shown, and the motives of the majority of these are drawn from the Autumn season and its country scenes. There are a few portraits and a comparatively small number of genres, while marines are decidedly in the minority. The younger school of landscape painters, are, on the whole, well represented; such artists as W. Bliss Baker, C. Harry Eaton, Chas. Warren Eaton, J. Francis Murphy, Bruce Crane, and M. de F. Bolmer, all having characteristic examples. Of the older men, Winslow Homer and George Inness are strongly represented, while Edward Gay, who has heretofore been rather in the rear ranks, makes a bold stride to the front in a masterly large canvas, "Washed by the Sea." Among the figure painters, F. S. Church, Percy Moran, Gilbert Gaul, F. D. Millet, J. G. Brown, and Wm. Morgan lead, while a comparatively new aspirant for artistic honors, Margaret W. Lesley, of Philadelphia, is well up to the front. Of the marine artists, F. A. Silva, F. K. M. Rehu, and M. H. De Haas are best represented; and in portraiture, Daniel Huntington, Felix Moscheles, and Wilson de Meza stand pre-eminent. It is impossible in this brief sketch to do more than outline the general character of the exhibition, which, as has been promised, is on the whole interesting, strong and encouraging. Discussion and description in detail of the more prominent works must be left until next week. Suffice it here to say that a visit to the galleries will well repay any one interested in the development and progress of American art.

Science.

THE Nautical Almanac office has just published in very handsome form the results of the recent investigations of Professor Newcomb and Professor Michelson upon the velocity of light. In 1879 Professor Michelson, slightly modifying the method that Foucault had invented in 1850, and executed in 1862, made at Annapolis a new determination which far exceeded in accuracy anything ever done before. Foucault's result in 1862, was 298,000 km. per second. Cornu, in 1874, by a different method, got 299,400, and in 1878, by a repetition of the work, 300,400. Michelson's Annapolis result is 299,910 km. Before it was known that Michelson was at work upon the matter, Professor Newcomb had taken it up and had secured a government appropriation of \$5,000, upon the recommendation of committee of the Academy of Sciences. After Michelson's work appeared, it was concluded that it would still be worth while to go on with the determination, as the apparatus was partly finished, and the method to be used differed in some details; but the co-operation of Michelson was secured, and the observations and results given in the present volume belong to two independent series of operations in the years 1880, 1881, and 1882—one, under the charge of Professor Newcomb himself, at Washington, and the other at Cleveland, Ohio, where Professor Michelson is now connected with the Case School of Science. Professor Newcomb's result is 299,860 km. Professor Michelson's is 299,858, but depends on a much smaller number of observations. The accordance is surprisingly close; far less than the probable error, which, according to Professor Newcomb, may easily be 25 or 30 km. If we combine this value of the velocity of light with Nyren's constant of aberration, 20".492, we get for the solar parallax 8".794.

As Professor Newcomb states in a brief preface, it was hoped to reach a probable error as small as 5 or 10 km., so that the distance light travels in a second might serve as a check upon our standards of length. For reasons stated in the publication, this degree of accuracy was not attained; but, as the result is abundantly good enough for all astronomical purposes, Professor Newcomb does not propose to repeat the experiments, though he expresses his willingness to co-operate with any one who will do so, and, moreover, expresses the belief that, with the help of past experience, and without any radical change in the apparatus, the precision originally aimed at could be reached.

...The new alloy, known as "platinoid," is essentially nickel silver, with the addition of from one to two per cent. of tungsten. The color is white, like silver, and the alloy retains a polish untarnished by exposure to the air for a long time. It is found, also, that it has a high degree of electrical resistance, with a small amount of variation in degree with changes of temperature; qualities which, it is claimed by electricians, render the alloy peculiarly suitable for the construction of galvanometers and resistance coils.