

at once accepted by the Senate, and unanimously, as it was felt that the Jeffersonian gathering contained more books specially needed in Congress than were elsewhere within reach, and also that, having been accumulated with much pains, day by day, during Jefferson's Parisian residence, it would form a good nucleus for future accretions in all departments. In the House, however, the bill for making the purchase encountered steady opposition. At the outset a motion to postpone indefinitely was only defeated by a vote of seventy-three to sixty-nine. It was then proposed to purchase only such a part of the Jefferson books as were suitable for Congressional purposes. When it was ascertained that the books must all be bought or none of them could be had, there was talk of "selecting such books as might be useful to members and selling the rest at auction." But the most memorable motion was made by Mr. King of Massachusetts, who moved "to instruct the Library Committee, as soon as the Jefferson volumes should have been received in Washington, to select therefrom all books of an atheistical, irreligious, or immoral tendency, if any such there be, and send the same back to Mr. Jefferson without any expense to him." "The debate," says the chronicle, "became rather too animated, and was checked by the Speaker." The purchase was at last voted by a majority of ten.

—The threefold division of the Catalogue was no doubt suggested by these words of Bacon: "The parts of human learning have reference to the three parts of man's understanding, which is the seat of learning: History to his memory, poesy to his imagination, and philosophy to his reason." Under these three heads the books are classed in forty-four chapters. The volumes were reckoned by their owner about ten thousand, and the price paid was less than \$25,000. It is unlikely that any American library of its size was more valuable, or better selected. It is a shrewd saying: "If you would find out what a man's character is, get a sight of his personal account-book." Jefferson's book catalogue is suggestive of secrets regarding his life, and so it ought to be bound up with his works, and if possible in facsimile. In a book published at Boston in 1712 John Wise, a Puritan parson, wrote the following words: "The end of all good government is to promote the happiness of all, and the good of every man in all his rights, his life, liberty, estate, honor," etc. This and others of his utterances gave Wise fame as the first American Democrat. Two editions of his work were republished at Boston in 1772, for no pre-Revolutionary writer was such a master of style. The similarities in Wise to phrases in Jefferson's Democratic Declaration have awakened curiosity as to whether Jefferson had read the work of Wise. Much fruitless search has been made. The catalogue has an entry which may serve to thicken other proofs, in an index of the surnames of authors which Jefferson himself made, as he expressly states. Among them is the name Wise. The reference there made to chapter xv is erroneous. But the occurrence of the name tends to show that he had the book, and the more as the work of Wise was a pamphlet of not more than a hundred pages. In the chapter on Politics are many volumes of Political Tracts without authors' names. No. 183 is an octave of Tracts from 1769-73, which includes the year when John Wise was republished. It is worth search to discover whether John Wise is not now sleeping in the Congressional Library after inspiring Jefferson.

—The rise of the earliest Christian art has left its tide-mark still traceable in Irish art, while subsequent advances have mostly obliterated it from the continent of Europe. The interest of the art itself is narrow, though real. Its excellence is in its manuscripts, and in its less known metal work, forms of art which were quietly cultivated in Ireland when the rest of Europe was given over to invasion and decadence. St. Patrick was converting the Irish and laying the foundation of their monastic church while Genseric's pillage of Rome went on. When the period of invasion was over, and the arts began to revive on the Continent, Ireland followed, *hauud pari passu*, but in the same track, till her season of invasion set in, and permanently stopped her advance. We see in her, therefore, a curious example of arrested growth, whose interest is greatly in the light which it throws on its continuation elsewhere. We find on the Continent the complete development, while the early stages have disappeared. In Ireland the early stages are left, and the development has never followed. Every study that tends to connect Irish antiquities with the main history of Art in Europe is welcome, and this is the virtue of Miss Margaret Stokes's work, for which her knowledge of Christian antiquities and her association in the special studies of the late Lord Dunraven have given her special qualifications. Her little volume, which is freely illustrated, is not only valuable, but readable. It bears title—'Early Christian Art in Ireland' (London: Chapman & Hall; New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co.).

LEA'S HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION.—I.

A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. By Henry Charles Lea. 3 vols. Harper & Bros. 1888.

MR. LEA needs no commendation to the students of mediæval history as the most learned living guide to their studies in certain phases of mediæval life and thought. He has chosen for his themes the more obscure forces which were acting on the minds of men in the middle period, and which were training them for those more striking exhibitions of activity in politics and war which make up the narrative of the ordinary historian. He has little concern with the growth of kingdoms, with struggles for personal or family aggrandizement, least of all with the mere biographies of kings and prelates. His former works on 'Superstition and Force,' and on the 'History of Sacerdotal Celibacy,' showed the tendency of thought which is here carried out to a still greater extent. These earlier volumes contained studies in the great legal and social institutions on which mediæval life was based. They led the student into that strange middle world where men moved like the half-demented victims of terrible delusions. It was Mr. Lea's special interest to show that the singular manifestations of this mental condition were not, in fact, outbursts of fanatic madness, but were deeply rooted in the legal and social ideas of the time. Law, as the embodiment of racial instincts, has been the starting-point and the sure basis of his studies.

In beginning the history of the Inquisition he has been guided by the same principle. He expressly declares his conviction that "the surest basis for the investigation of a given period lay in an examination of its jurisprudence." We are thus able to feel that he has solid ground beneath his feet, and, no matter how incredible the instances of human weakness and credulity which he presents, we must believe that he has not borrowed one particle

from his own prejudice, nor drawn ever so slightly upon his historical imagination.

The whole period of the Inquisition Mr. Lea divides at the Reformation into two distinct parts, of which only the former is treated in these three considerable volumes. It will thus be seen that some of the most terrible and dramatic portions of the history, especially those relating to the Spanish Inquisition and its dealings with the Low Countries, still remain to be considered. It must be the wish of every scholar that the author may be spared to complete the work according to his present plan.

As in his previous work, so here, Mr. Lea takes his subject in its widest meaning. By the history of the Inquisition he means not merely an account of the institution itself, but an exhaustive examination of the social, intellectual, and political conditions which produced it. He means, further, an array of illustrations of its working and of its effects upon society, such as make any serious doubts as to the general accuracy of his presentation impossible. The survey of the conditions which made the Inquisition possible, we might almost say inevitable, occupies one-half of the first volume. It is a masterly summary of the process by which the Church rose to be the absolute dominating power over the minds of men. That process is shown in the gradual development of the idea of heresy, and its extension to include every form of departure from the usages of the Church. The awful episode of the Albigensian Crusade is treated as the natural outcome of the duty of the organized Church to insist upon uniformity of belief and practice as essential to true Christianity. It would be too much to say that Mr. Lea has made perfectly clear precisely what the heresy of the Albigensians was, whence it came, what was its relation to the other forms of mediæval divergence from orthodoxy, and the basis of its hold upon the population of southern France. These are still, and are likely to remain, obscure problems.

The description of the Catharan heresy, drawn from many sources, makes it very clear why the policy of persecution became a necessity. The very existence of Catholicism was endangered by a theory of the true Church which made it consist of a select body of saints, instead of being the natural home and refuge of all mankind. This doctrine was spreading very rapidly, and the dominant Church was forced to defend itself or perish. Singularly enough, the rescue of the Church came from an impulse strangely like that which was threatening its very life. There was no more potent cause of heresy than a sense of the insufficiency of the Church organization for its proper work in the world; this same sense of insufficiency produced the mendicant orders, who were to be the chief weapon of the Church against heresy. The fanatic devotion of Dominic and Francis, if it had been rejected by the Papacy, as at one time it seemed likely to be, might very easily have been turned into a critical and furious opposition. As it was, the means for the destruction of heresy were put into the hand of the Papacy almost against its will, and from that time onward persecution developed itself with resistless force.

In describing the Holy Office, Mr. Lea departs from the tradition which would represent it as a new creation, and shows that it was a development out of perfectly well-recognized principles of legal process. The "inquisition" was a form of procedure well known to the Roman law; its peculiarity consisted in its use as a means of hunting down the offender, and it was the gradual application of this process to the trial for heresy which produced

that frightfully effective machinery known as "The Inquisition." Mr. Lea's account of the Inquisition proper, its organization, its legal process, and its relation to other authorities, forms the most important and at the same time probably the least popular part of his work. It occupies but one-half of one volume, a space altogether disproportionate, one must think, to its real value. The accumulation of horrors which fills the later volumes is tame reading compared to this calm, lawyer-like presentation of the devilish ingenuity with which the forms of law were applied to meet the ever-new forms in which the persistent hegemony of the Middle Ages presented itself. At first the power of inquisition rested in the regular ecclesiastical courts, and the inquisitors were only the regularly employed agents of the courts. But here appeared the danger which the Papacy was always forced to combat. Local courts were all too sensitive to local influences. The ecclesiastical judge, a man among men, would have too many human weaknesses to make him the blind servant of the Papal will. The inquisitor must be set free from all personal allegiances, except to the one dictating force at the centre. We are shown here how this emancipation of the inquisitor went on, step by step, in the face of every protest, until he finally stood as a man practically without limits to his action. Even a pope, if he were, perchance, too humane or too timid to suit the demand of the Holy Office, might well tremble before it. The Papacy had raised a spirit which it could not itself control.

Throughout this examination of the inquisitorial process Mr. Lea is calm and dispassionate. He resists with exceptional courage the temptation which any lover of the light must feel, to treat his subject with indignant contempt. He is enabled to do this by his thorough understanding of the spirit of medieval Catholicism. He sees clearly, as a superficial student cannot see, the enormous stake for which the Church was playing, and he sees also what there was of good for humanity bound up with its very life. The forms of heresy combated by the early Inquisition were undoubtedly full of dangers to the moral and religious condition of Europe. Their holders were not uniformly men of light. They too were victims of the darkness of the time; and on the whole, if one had to choose, one would rather trust the dangers of ecclesiasticism, with its great germ of living truth, than these wild offshoots of Oriental fanaticism, even though they did point out with unerring finger the plague-spots on the surface of the body of the Church.

It may be safely said that no presentation of the story of the Inquisition by previous writers can be at all compared with this for its clearness of vision, its comprehension of the problem, and its thoroughness of research. We reserve for a second notice the detail of the working of the institution presented in the second and third volumes.

SAYCE'S HIBBERT LECTURES.

Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Babylonians. By A. H. Sayce. London: Williams & Norgate; New York: Scribner & Welford. [The Hibbert Lectures, 1887.]

THE Preface to this work—one of its author's most extensive and most elaborate productions—opens with "a word of apology . . . for the numerous repetitions in the following chapters, which are due to the fact that the chap-

ters were written and delivered in the form of lectures." The explanation is inadequate, for there are also repetitions in single divisions. In the first chapter, for instance, we read in a note to page 72:

"The name of Sin, the Moon-god, is met with in an Hittite inscription, and a god who thus found his way to southern Arabia would be equally likely to find his way to northern Arabia";

and again (p. 50):

"Sin was the Babylonian name of the Moon-god. We learn from a Hittite inscription that his name had been carried into southern Arabia, and there is therefore no reason why it should not have been imported into northern Arabia as well."

On page 45:

"Josephus has preserved an extract from the Egyptian historian, Manetho. . . . In this it is stated that the earlier name of Moses was Osarsiph, and that he had been priest of Heliopolis, or On. Here it is evident that Moses and Joseph have been confounded together. The name of Joseph, who married the daughter of the priest of On, has been decomposed into two elements, the first of which is the divine name Jeho, and this has been changed into its supposed Egyptian equivalent, Osar, or Osiris."

And in a note to page 51:

"Manetho (ap. Joseph. . . .) states that the original name of Moses was Osarsiph, and that he had been a priest of Heliopolis, or On. Osarsiph is simply Joseph, Osar or Osiris being substituted for Jeho (Jo) or Jehovah. Joseph, it will be remembered, married the daughter of the priest of On."

Besides, another word of apology ought to have been inserted for the extensive repetitions in these 'Lectures' and the appendices to them of expositions made by the author in various previous publications.

We are far from inclined to make it appear that Prof. Sayce is apt to repeat himself from lack of fresh matter for new lectures or dissertations. His learning and fame shield him against such an imputation. No other archaeologist is more often before the public with discoveries, or observations on discoveries, in his fields of study. And what he has to say always betokens ample familiarity with the latest research, and often ingenuity. What we object to in him, as in some of his fellow-laborers in Assyriology, is an excessive propagandist zeal in the interest of that science, from which springs an irresistible habit of inculcation. In the 'Lectures' before us, everything picked out of the monumental rubbish of Babylonia and Assyria which can throw the least flicker of light, however evanescent and calculated to deceive, upon the gods and goddesses of Babylon, Borsippa, Nipur, Larsam, Eridu, etc., is pressed upon the reader with as much persuasive effort as if the salvation of Christian souls depended on a true recognition of Ea, Mullil, and Ninip, Zarpanit, Davkina, and Ninkigal, and their like. And a very large part of what is thus offered as knowledge of a high order—though not without reservations as to entire accuracy, made in view of daily fresh light—rests, in reality, on a frail network of conjecture. The conjectures are surely of interest to the scholar, and worth the trouble of examination—as are the problems of Etruscan or Basque etymology—but they should be dealt with as topics for the learned, without missionary ardor. The subject, on the whole, is not worthy of enthusiasm; for Chaldean mythology, as revealed to us by the pedant scribblers on clay tablets, is as completely devoid of poetic charm and primitive naïveté as the Assyro-Babylonian history of the monuments is devoid of all traits of nobility or naturalness.

A study of "the religion of the ancient Baby-

lonians" is, it is true, not without interest in regard to Biblical inquiry. It imparts to us, for instance, information about Nebo, Merodach, Bel, Babylonian divinities mentioned in the Old Testament—the first in Isaiah, the second in Jeremiah, and the third in both. But how much does that new information amount to? Before cuneiform decipherments had been made, we believed with Gesenius that the gods mentioned were divine embodiments of the planets Mercury, Mars, and Jupiter, respectively. Now we have learned that "Nebo must have once been an elemental god," that "Babylonian astronomy made him the presiding deity of the planet Mercury, just as it made Merodach the presiding deity of Jupiter," and that "the Merodach of the historical age" was "the great Bel or Baal of Babylon," though different from "the older Bel of Nipur." According to this, Gesenius was right when he identified Nebo with Mercury, and Bel with Jupiter, and mistaken in regard to Merodach, in not identifying him with the great Bel of Babylon, but deriving his name, which, in Jeremiah (1, 2), is coupled with Bel's, as Nebo's is in Isaiah (xlv, 1), "a stirpe *Mord, Mort, que et mortem et cedem significat*," just as "*Mars, Mavors, et mors ejusdem originis esse videntur*" ("The-saurus," s. v.). And the gain is a different meaning, without a new rendering, for a line in Jeremiah. Whether King Merodach-Baladan or King Evil-Merodach bore the name of Jupiter or Mars, is, of course, wholly indifferent.

Incomparably more important to Biblical students would be the remarks concerning the names of Joseph, Moses, Saul, David, and Solomon, if they were sufficiently substantiated. Collectively they would greatly impair the value of the Scriptural narratives of all early Hebrew history, even if considered merely as reflections of popular tradition. The story of Joseph would cease to be a recollection of Egyptian life, and become something like a Babylonian myth—because it appears "probable that the name of Joseph was originally identical with the Babylonian *asipu*," which may be the designation of "the god of the oracle," especially as among the names of the cities captured by Thothmes III., in Palestine, there is one which is read *Iseph-el*, and may be translated "Joseph, the God." The name Moses would be a reminiscence of the Babylonian *māsu*, "the hero" or "leader," "an epithet applied to more than one divinity," but "in a peculiar sense associated with the sun-god"—the character which represented the idea of hero also representing "the idea of a 'collection of books,' . . . 'a scribe' or 'librarian,'" terms so appropriate to the lawgiver "to whom Hebrew tradition referred the collection of its earliest documents, and the compilation of its legal code." Besides, Moses was said to have died on Mount Nebo, which bore the name of "the prophet-god of Babylon, . . . the patron of writing and literature," as a star "accounted one of the seven 'heroes' or *māsu*"; and in the story of him we also meet with the name Sin, which was that of another Babylonian god, and "Sinai itself," which Moses reached after traversing the wilderness of Sin, "can scarcely signify anything else than the mountain sacred to the Moon-god." Saul and Solomon also bear the names of Assyro-Babylonian gods, popularly bestowed on them instead of their original names. For the former, "the one asked for" (Heb. *Shāul*), the people wisely discovered the "singularly appropriate" mythological name Savul, or Sawul, by which the sun-god was known at Babylon, whence if "Rehoboth of the river" designates that city, the Edomites also receiv-