The Nation

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE & ART

VOLUME LXII

FROM JANUARY 1, 1896, TO JUNE 30, 1896

NEW YORK

THE EVENING POST PUBLISHING COMPANY

1896

lasting advantage of England, Holland, and Germany. With interesting fulness he traces the efforts to preserve Protestant worship, now officially non-existent. He concludes that at least fifty of the exiled pastors revisited their flocks before 1700, and the fate of such of these returned ministers as fell into the hands of the Government shows that the secrecy observed regarding the Man of the Iron Mask was no unique feature of the vengeance of Louis XIV. Sent to prisons like those of the Île Ste.-Marguerite or of Vincennes without public trial and with every precaution to avoid communication with the outside world, they disappeared no less completely than apparently mysteriously from sight, and friends inquired in vain for years for the secret of a fate which modern publication of records has revealed.

Of the Camisard war Prof. Baird has much to say, and the picturesqueness of the struggle makes the story of the efforts of these peasants one of interest, though the evident hopelessness of their task, and the fanatical spirit of so-called prophecy which they exhibited, made the rising the work of only a fragment of the Protestant population of France. It demonstrated, however, in the sight of all Europe the absurdity of any governmental claim that, since the Revocation, Protestantism had ceased to exist in the dominions of Louis XIV.

Of more value for the permanent interest of the land was the restoration of organized French Protestantism effected by Antoine Court in 1715, with its reëstablishment of the synods and regular ministry. The story of these churches of the "Desert," as they styled themselves in language borrowed from Scripture and conveniently indefinite as to their habitat, is told from their beginnings in the Cévennes to their ultimate recognition by the French Government. In spite of life-imprisonment and galley-slavery for attendance on their services, they continued to grow, aided by the theological school which Court established at Lausanne about 1730. As the eighteenth century wore on, this opposition declined, so that though the last execution of a minister was as late as February 19, 1762 (François Rochette at Toulouse), the Protestants attempted to build church-edifices by 1755, and a year later could count 48 pastors—a number which had increased, when the memorable year 1787 arrived, to about 125. Yet the case of Calas, which Prof. Baird narrates at length, together with the efforts of Voltaire to right a great injustice, shows the popular and legal hostility to which Protestants were still liable. So far, however, did enlightened opinion outrun the slow processes of legal revision that the Government, speaking through its Comptroller-General, Turgot, in 1775, gave a recognition to the still proscribed Protestant bodies by invoking the services of their ministers in suppressing the bread riots. Such an act was natural from one who had written in favor of religious tolerance as early as 1753. It was Lafayette, however, who, on May 23, 1787, presented to the Assembly of Notables the resolution which that body transmitted without opposition to Louis XVI. praying that Protestant proscription might cease. The result was the Edict of Toleration, which did not, indeed, grant legal permission to Protestant worship, but relieved the Protestants from the worst of their disabilities. From this Edict the tide of the Revolution swung the cause of Protestant freedom rapidly onward to the law of April 7, 1802, by which the Reformed and Lutheran churches of France were given full rights, and placed under the controlling and supporting supervision of the state—a law with which Prof. Baird closes his history.

Altogether the volumes under review are scarcely less suggestive to the student of general history than to the investigator of ecclesiastical story in their demonstration of the difficulty and costliness of crushing opinion by force; and one application of this lesson to events of our own age is pointed out by Prof. Baird in his preface, when he remarks: "As history repeats itself, the close of the nineteenth century is even now beholding the counterpart, or the copy, of the legislation by means of which Louis the Fourteenth undertook to crush out the Huguenot religion from France, in laws remarkably similar, menacing the existence of Protestantism in the Baltic provinces of a great empire of our own times."

BENJAMIN'S HISTORY OF ELECTRICITY.

The Intellectual Rise in Electricity: A History. By Park Benjamin. Appletons. 1895.

THE present history is, in its two halves (the first down to Gilbert inclusive, and the second from Gilbert's successors to Franklin, inclusive), of very different orders of merit; the last part being much the more valuable. In the first part, in which we miss any reference to the graceful, useful, and beautifully printed translation by our countryman, Dr. Mottelay, of Gilbert on the Magnet, which we reviewed some months ago, every scrap of information has been diligently collected; but our comments will show that the work has its blemishes. In the second half, this work comes into competition with Dr. Priestley's 'History and Present State of Electricity,' which, besides being a thorough and full account of the matter, is also a particularly well-arranged account, which can hardly be said of Mr. Benjamin's. Priestley's is also entirely free from the sensational tone of our *fin-de-siècle* style. But there is enough, both of fact and of well-executed general sketches of historical situations, in the volume before us to establish it as the leading work on the subject in any language.

In the period antecedent to the death of Bacon there is much baseless conjecture. Thus, Mr. Benjamin guesses that Gilbert lived in London in Linacre's house. But he could easily have ascertained that Dr. Gilbert lived in the lane called Peter's Hill, south of *Little* Knightrider Street, while the Linacre house was No. 5 of Knight Rider Street proper, and, we believe, on the north side. While thorough scholarship was not an indispensable qualification for Mr. Benjamin's task, we could wish there were fewer indications of the lack of it. On the second page of the first chapter we read that Homer ("Iliad, Z.¹ 513; T.¹ 398") calls the sun ἠλέκτωρ. A proof-reader familiar with the looks of Greek words would have challenged that. Boesius is the name which Mr. Benjamin gives to the philosopher Boetius. We are familiar with Boethius and even Boecius, but do not remember Boesius. Under the reign of "Aelfred," Mr. Benjamin informs us that Scotus Erigena "began the assertion of the scholastic philosophy." There are three errors here. In the first place, Erigena (whom it is no longer permissible to confound with another Irishman at the court of the Mercian King) was not a subject of Alfred. In the second place, the scholastic philosophy did not consist in any assertion. It was the philosophy taught in the lecture-rooms (*scholæ*) of the mediæval universities. The only philosophical proposition concerning which the scholastic doctors were agreed was the practical infallibility of Aristotle. What marked their teaching was, first, its general form (it was usually either a commentary or a disputation, or both), and, second, the algebra-like formality of its statements. Scotus Erigena was not a scholastic; for, first, he lived over three centuries before the regular organization of the universities, and in a deeply dissimilar civilization (or want of civilization); second, he is not an Aristotelean; third, the 'De Divisione Naturæ' is neither a commentary nor a disputation; fourth, it is not marked by great formality of statement; fifth, it is in no sense a school-book. The university of Alexandria, according to Benjamin, was "begun by Alexander." We apprehend it will be necessary to take the will for the deed, to make that out. As ornaments of that university are mentioned Archimedes and Hipparchus. The former did study and the latter may have studied there; but Archimedes did the work of his life in Syracuse, and Hipparchus at Rhodes and elsewhere. He did not observe in Alexandria.

Mr. Benjamin's references are not seldom inaccurate. The following is a single specimen: "Vincenti Bellovacensis: Speculi Naturales, etc., tom. ii., lib. ix., c. 19." On one of the first pages there is a faulty reference to a passage in Pliny, which is all the worse because Pliny is not quite accurately reported. Even the scientific statements are often careless. Thus, we are told that the orientation of the Great Pyramid is in error by 19′ 58″, and that a surveyor "with the best modern compass" could hardly do better. Now, to begin with, the error of orientation is only about 1¼°, which, being the *minimum visibile*, is as small as the probable error of the best possible naked-eye observation. No modern surveyor, when he wants to do nice work, dreams of employing a compass; and, for that reason, there has been no attempt to develop a compass of precision. But in all magnetical surveys the deviation of the needle is ascertained far more closely than the figure given.

But let us come to the substance of the work. The author has unfortunately a theory. If it were a very broad and instructive theory, especially if it were very solidly founded, this would be no misfortune. But it is neither broad nor solid. It is that the knowledge of the earliest form of mariner's compass came from the Baltic town of Wisby, that it came to Wisby from the Finns, and that it had been, perhaps, an ancient heritage of the great "Turanian" race. Apparently because that theory is sadly in need of support, the author accepts without the slightest reserve the theory of Mr. Terrien de Lacouperie of the Elamite origin of the earliest Chinese civilization. Singularly enough, however, when it comes to accounts of the Chinese possessing compasses before the Europeans, he becomes unexpectedly sceptical. The letter of Klaproth of 1835 is generally supposed to have proved the proposition that the Chinese, some time before A. D. 400, at latest—that is, many ages before the Europeans—knew that a needle could receive directive force from a lodestone. As for the Egyptians, Dr. Benjamin reaches the sane conclusion that they knew nothing about magnets, though the process by which he reaches that result is open to some objection. As for knowledge of the magnet on the part of the Greeks and Romans, it is easily stated. Dr. Benjamin drags in irrelevant matter from Rossignol's essay on the mythology of Greek miners; but, for the matter in hand, the well-known passage in the 'Ion' of Plato gives all

the information there is. Namely, the Greeks knew that a lodestone would lift an iron ring, and that another, and so on; but they knew nothing of the polarity of the magnet.

It is next to impossible to prove the negative proposition, that the mariner's compass (in some crude form) was not known at a given date. Such is the stupidity of man that it would be known for a very long time before it came much into use. On an Arabian vessel we first hear of it, Mr. Benjamin assures us, in A. D. 1240. Since the needle was floated on water, and was magnetized then and there (only soft iron being at hand), it would be used only on cloudy nights when the sea was pretty calm. It might go a long time unrecorded in a book; and it might be recorded in numbers of books before it was recorded in one which Western scholars have read. To show how slow progress was in those days, the compass is mentioned (as Klaproth shows) as a familiar thing in the laws of Alfonso X. of Castile dated A.D. 1263; and yet the evidence seems to be (we are indebted to Mr. Benjamin for this) that Spanish galleys were never supplied with it before 1403. The rational conclusion seems to us to be that it was probably known in the Mediterranean before A.D. 1200; but, owing to the choppy seas, it was little used in these waters until it was balanced on a point.

We now turn to northern waters. The Norsemen used to follow the method of Noah, except that they sent out ravens instead of doves. The earliest description of the mariner's compass (in precisely the same form as that of the Arabians of A. D. 1240) which Mr. Benjamin finds is in Neckam's book 'De Natura Rerum,' written about 1180. He gives a flattering portrait of Neckam, and compares his book with the 'Origines' of St. Isidorus. But surely the two greatest merits of an encyclopædia are to be full and to be compressed. The work of St. Isidorus in twenty books has both those merits in an eminent degree. Considered as an encyclopædia, the work of Neckam is contemptible, being both small and garrulous. Within a few years after Neckam, notices of the compass in northern waters multiply. M. Paulin Paris gave in 1842 some verses by Guyot de Provins and some others by another poet. Dr. Benjamin has very prettily translated several of these; but the originals would have been quite worth giving, too. Within fifty years of the first passage in Neckam we know of near a dozen passages referring to the compass. The contrast between this state of things and the single Arabian passage may be attributed to the thorough overhauling of early European literature. The inference is, that the compass could have been very little known, if at all, in Normandy much before the earliest of these quickly succeeding notices. Therefore, although the balance of evidence inclines toward the supposition that the compass was known in the north before it was known in the Mediterranean, it inclines only slightly that way. As far as investigation has gone, there is no evidence whatever of the compass having been known in those early days in the Baltic. True, it is mentioned as of great importance in the laws of Wisby; but it is probable that that law was a late insertion. We should expect that the compass would in its early shape have been used in the Baltic, owing to the fogs and the smooth sea; but positive evidence is altogether wanting.

Mr. Benjamin seems to regard the invention of the early mariner's compass as an exceedingly difficult one. If that be just, then decidedly the probable hypothesis about its introduction is that of Klaproth, that the Arabs got it from the Chinese, and that from them the knowledge was carried through, or crept round, Europe to the north. But it may be doubted whether the invention is so difficult that it might not, without improbability, be supposed to have been independently invented in different places. Is it incredible that a man playing with two lodestones should find out their polarity, and then magnetization, and then the directive virtue of the needle?

The latter half of Mr. Benjamin's history, after taking leave of Gilbert, is, on the whole, much the more interesting. To be sure, no startling discovery was here possible. The succession of discoverers was Von Guericke (Hauksbee?), Gray, Du Fay, Watson, and Franklin. Mr. Benjamin modifies a little here and there our notions of what each did. It appears that that Sagredo who takes the leading part in Galileo's dialogues, not only was a living person, like the personages of Aretino's dialogues, but also probably discovered the secular change in the variation of the compass. He mounted a lodestone of five pounds so that it would support twenty pounds. It was in experimenting with that lodestone that Galileo found out the effect of the armature in causing the magnet to grow in strength. The Jesuit Nicolaus Cabæus is another old physicist whose achievements, as Mr. Benjamin states them, are of quite another order of importance from what we had supposed. To make our meaning clear, let us say that there are five departments of work in any branch of pure physics, like electricity; namely, (1), the phenomena have to be brought out and seen; (2), suitable instruments have to be invented for their study; (3), the process of experimental analysis, or cross-questioning of Nature, must be applied so as to produce statements of the laws of the phenomena; (4), measurements have to be made (though, of course, there was little of this in the pre-Franklinian days); and (5), hypotheses, mechanical or other, must be constructed and experimentally verified to show the inward nature of the phenomena. What we have hitherto been told about Cabæus was that he extended the list of electrics; that is, he slightly increased the range of a known phenomenon. But it now appears that he observed that when little bodies are attracted to an electrified body and strike it, they are at once thrown off from it. Now this observation was the first step necessary in the experimental analysis of the phenomenon, ultimately leading to a knowledge of its laws. Nor was that all. For it seems that Cabæus was the first to plunge a lodestone into a mass of iron filings and notice the result; and, further, that he made an analogous experiment by plunging electrified amber into a quantity of sawdust. Here he took a step of the second kind, in our enumeration; for these things were instruments of observation of high importance.

In many places, Mr. Benjamin fills up the gaps of history in this way. Nor does he neglect the historian's more difficult tasks. He pictures the fad for experimentation that was caused by Charles II.'s interest in it. He shows that that interest was pretty deep, too, and that it had a most stimulating effect upon experimental science in England. In France, on the other hand, the hollowness of Louis XIV.'s endeavor to interest himself in science, combined with the total absence of interest on the part of Louvois, are fully proved to have had a very unfortunate effect on French science. All such general sketches have been executed by Mr. Benjamin upon a basis of thorough study.

There are many contested points in the history of electricity from Gilbert to Franklin. One of these is whether Cuneus, a gentleman of Leyden, had any hand in the discovery of the Leyden jar. In the first printed account of it by the Abbé Nollet, in the 'Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences' for 1746, it is said that Cuneus had seen some of the experiments upon which the celebrated Musschenbroek of Leyden was then engaged, to ascertain whether the effects of electricity would not be increased by enclosing the electrified body in glass, and that Cuneus undertook to repeat one of them at his home. But instead of leaving the flask in which the conductor to be electrified was placed, on the table, he held it in his hand, and thus got a strong shock. It was afterwards said that Cuneus had nothing to do with it; that that was a story got up to detract from Musschenbroek's credit. But Dr. Priestley, writing his history only twenty years later, was in a condition to collect testimony. He says: "The views which led to this discovery in Holland were, *as I have been informed*, as follows." He states that Cuneus accidentally made the experiment in repeating an experiment by Musschenbroek; but he does *not* say, as the Abbé Nollet does, that to Cuneus belongs the credit. As Cuneus never made any reclamation, the inference is that he immediately communicated his experience to Musschenbroek, and that the analysis of the phenomenon was completed by the latter. Perhaps Cuneus did not of himself find out that the shock depended on his holding the bottle in his hand. Mr. Benjamin inclines to disbelieve entirely in any share in the discovery by Cuneus.

Mr. Benjamin is quite wrong in speaking, as in one place he does, as if the use of experimentation as an instrument of discovery was at variance with the Cartesian philosophy. We will also venture to doubt his confident assertion that Sir Kenelm Digby, in his 'Two Treatises, in the one of which the Nature of Bodies, in the other the Nature of Man's Soule is looked into in the way of Immortality,' plagiarizes extensively from the 'Principia' of Descartes. The latter work appeared from the press of L. Elzevir in Amsterdam on July 10, 1644. Descartes had set out from the Hoef in May for Paris; for the censure (we presume) would not in those days permit "author's corrections" of the proofs. He arrived in Paris at some time between September 27 and October 1, inclusive, and there first received copies of his book. Digby had been in Paris all along. There is evidence that his book (a folio of medium thickness) had been substantially written in the previous spring. The dedication is dated in August. The last imprimatur was affixed September 26. Now, there could hardly have been time for extensive plagiarisms (for every hypothesis, if plagiarized, is modified) between the date at which Digby could have seen the 'Principia' and the date of the imprimatur. Descartes remained in Paris ten or twelve days, during which, though much pressed for time, he had several prolonged interviews with Digby. He never made the least reclamation, though he hinted that Digby was a bold theorist, for he says to the Princess Elizabeth, "Pour ce qui est de l'état de l'âme après cette vie, j'en ay biens moins de connoissance que Monsieur d'Igby." Digby and Descartes never corresponded, and Descartes was a cautious man in the matter of communicating unpublished ideas, while Digby, on the other hand, was a talker. Finally, although no man ever more widely missed the *style* of Nature than Digby did in his physical hypotheses, yet those hypotheses have a strong-

ly marked style of their own. They have nothing of the flavor of eclecticism. Nor can we admit that any hypothesis of the 'Two Treatises' is so precisely accordant with that of the 'Principia' that it is necessary to attribute them to one author. Digby, by the way, is a better psychologist than physicist. He treats of the association of ideas, and even proposes a physical hypothesis to account for it.

We find it very difficult to let this interesting work go without saying anything more about it. An excellent present for a scientifically minded young person would be Mottelay's translation of Gilbert on the Magnet (Wiley) and Benjamin's 'Intellectual Rise' (Appleton).

The Herschels and Modern Astronomy. By Agnes M. Clerke. [The Century Science Series.] Macmillan. 1895.

LITTLE could Dr. (afterwards Sir William) Watson, as he strolled through Walcot Turnpike, Bath, late in an evening about Christmas time, 1779, have thought that his stopping in the street to look through the telescope of a "moon-struck musician" was to lead the way to the immediate inception of one of the most remarkable careers in the history of astronomy. Such, however, was the fact. Frederick William Herschel, born at Hanover, November 15, 1738, into a family possessed of an irresistible instinct and aptitude for music, having landed as a lad at Dover with but a French crown-piece in his pocket, drifted through a series of ably filled engagements as a professional musician until, in 1776, he had become Director of the public concerts at Bath. But while all this time a musician in body, he was an astronomer in spirit, at no time losing sight of the vision of the skies; and it was in the latter capacity that he had the good fortune to attract an able and willing patron, whose friendship provided precisely that opportunity which was needed for full development of his powers. All the while that, in his official capacity, he had "to engage performers, to appease discontents, to supply casual failures, to write glees and catches expressly adapted to the voices of his executants, and frequently to come forward himself as a soloist on the hautboy or the harpsichord," he was absorbingly occupied with a self-imposed task of minutely reviewing all the heavenly bodies and every spot of the celestial vault. During the progress of this unprecedented task it was that the above incident happened; for young Herschel, then engaged in a series of observations on the lunar mountains, had brought his seven-foot reflector into the street in front of his house, and was gazing diligently when Dr. Watson chanced to pass by. Fortunately he did not rest with merely expressing great satisfaction at the view of the moon courteously afforded by the young German; he called the next morning to make his further acquaintance. Instantly this led to an introduction to a local philosophical society, then to the Royal Society of London, and in little more than two years to an audience with his Majesty George III. Thenceforward the great Herschel's life and work are the common knowledge of every astronomer—and it is a little singular that a century should have elapsed with no thoroughly competent history of that life and work, and no republication of Herschel's unsurpassed volume of technical papers, which have still to be sought in the original editions of the 'Philosophical Transactions.'

No less astonishing is it that his equally famous son, Sir John Herschel, now dead nearly a quarter of a century, has thus far experienced a like fate. Miss Clerke's 'The Herschels and Modern Astronomy' is almost the sole attempt to acquaint the lay reader with these great names. Sir William's sister, Caroline, has been more fortunate, and her accurate 'Journals and Recollections' form the chief authority for her brother's eminent life. Indeed, he often referred to her for the dates of events in his earlier years. Collateral information about him is meagre; but in the case of Sir John Herschel there is this important difference, that his long and intimate friendship with Sir William Rowan Hamilton led his conscientious biographer, the late Dean Graves, to make ample inclusions of Herschel's letters. Still, his life, as Miss Clerke modestly says, has yet to be written; and, as we are at liberty to judge from her excellent success with the little volume now before us, no one could tell the fascinating story of that life more entertainingly than Miss Clerke herself. Her evident sympathy with the breadth of his aims in physical investigation, her accurate knowledge of methods, and her singular felicity of expression all fit her worthily for this noble task.

But to return to Sir William. Miss Clerke has admirably told the authentic anecdote of the odd old German organ-builder, Schnetzler, who, exasperated at the staccato performance of Herschel's rival, became wild with delight when, on ascending to the loft, Herschel took from his pocket two leaden weights with which he held down an octave, all the while improvising a majestic counterpoint. "I vil luf dis man," cried Schnetzler, "because he gif my pipes time for to shpeak." And here is her crisp description of the very beginnings of Herschel's building of his own telescopes (page 15):

"In June, 1778, when fine folk had mostly deserted Bath for summer resorts, work was begun in earnest. The house was turned topsy-turvy; the two brothers attacked the novel enterprise with boyish glee. Alexander, a born mechanician, set up a huge lathe in one of the bed rooms; a cabinet-maker was installed in the drawing-room; Caroline, in spite of secret dismay at such unruly proceedings, lent a hand, and kept meals going; William directed, inspired, toiled, with the ardor of a man who had staked his life on the issue. Meanwhile, music could not be neglected. Practising and choir-training went on; novelties for the ensuing season were prepared, compositions written and parts copied. Then the winter brought the usual round of tuitions and performances, while all the time mirrors were being ground and polished, tried and rejected, without intermission. At last, after *two hundred* failures, a tolerable reflecting telescope was produced, about five inches in aperture; . . . but those two hundred failures made the Octagon Chapel organist an expert, unapproached and unapproachable, in the construction of specula."

It was with this new instrument that, in the following March, Herschel began his astronomical work by an observation of the great nebula in Orion, the record of which is still preserved by the Royal Society.

Herschel married at fifty Mary Baldwin, only daughter of a London merchant, and widow of Mr. John Pitt. Her jointure, we are told, relieved him from pecuniary care, and her sweetness of disposition secured his domestic happiness. Miss Burney records in her diary a tea at Mr. De Luc's, adding, of the newly married wife, "She was rich, too! And astronomers are as able as other men to discern that gold can glitter as well as stars." Their only child was John Frederick William, born 1792, and his biography is here presented for the first time by Miss Clerke with some approach to suitable fulness. The wider sympathies of the son make his life of greater general interest than his father's, and not a single phase of his beautiful character escapes that careful touch which marks the perfect biographer.

Astronomy, before the Herschels, had been mostly dry formulæ and drier figures, and the irresistible momentum imparted to modern physical astronomy by the elder Herschel received a marked accession of impulse from the life and work of his brilliant son. Before their day, astronomers had mainly been content with inquiry as to precisely *where* the heavenly bodies had been and would be; anything beyond the crudest speculation as to *what* these orbs might themselves be, rarely occurred. Not only has the older astronomy not been neglected, but the new astronomy of the nineteenth century has made uninterrupted progress with every decade; and this broad movement, begun by the Herschels in England, was ably promoted by Arago in France, nor has America failed to lend a hand. Not only was a "knowledge of the construction of the heavens" the ultimate object of the elder Herschel's observations, but his conception of the sun, as ruler, fire, light, and life of our planetary system, was more than a half century in advance of his time, and no less prophetic. As early as 1801 he wrote: "The influence of this eminent body on the globe we inhabit is so great, and so widely diffused, that it becomes almost a duty to study the operations which are carried on upon the solar surface." In our day many great observatories are charged with almost the sole duty of that study. Neither to the younger Herschel was astronomy merely a matter of right ascension and declination; of poising, clamping, and reading off; of cataloguing and correcting—a mere "inventory of God's property," as Thoreau has aptly said. "It was his peculiar privilege," remarked Dean Stanley in his funeral sermon, "to combine with those more special studies such a width of view and such a power of expression as to make him an interpreter, a poet of science, even beyond his immediate sphere."

Unintentionally we have left little space for Miss Clerke's chapter on Caroline Herschel—probably the best of all the brief treatments of her life extant. Traits of modest simplicity and singular self-effacement were preëminently hers, and the story of her self denial for her brother's sake will never grow old. Miss Clerke's welcome book is one which no philosophic student of modern astronomy can pass over, and its importance as pure biography places it in the first rank among the lives of famous pioneers in science.

The Oxford Church Movement: Sketches and Recollections. By the late G. Wakeling. With an Introduction by Earl Nelson. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan. 1895.

IN the great variety of books that have grown up about the Oxford Movement there have been many degrees of interest. Mr. Wakeling's place is near the bottom of the scale. It comes very near to being a *lucus a non lucendo*, there is so little in it about the Oxford Movement, speaking carefully. Dean Church, in his admirable history of the Movement, dates its conclusion from the condemnation of Ward in 1845. Certainly its influence upon the church for good or ill went on for a long time after that, but, though nearly related to the Ritualististic Movement, it was quite a differ-