
A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

APRIL, 1902
No. CXCIV.

NEW SERIES.
No. 14.

The London Quarterly Review.

CONTENTS.

London:
CHARLES H. KELLY,
1, CASTLE ST., CITY RD., E.C., AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

PRICE HALF-A-CROWN

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1902.

PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER'S THEORY OF THE DIVINE PREDICATE.

THERE is no proposition on which the late Professor F. Max Müller was more wont to lay stress in his writings than that the real crux in discussions on the nature and origin of religion lies in the interpretation we give of the predicate *god*. Our theorists on the science of religion are busy in showing from what psychological causes men came to conceive of the existence of supernatural beings, and to form the ideas of them they possess; and from what motives the worship of these beings, and the rites and usages appropriate to such worship, arose. It is now fairly well agreed that in some extremely wide sense religion is practically as universal as the race; that if a tribe or individual can be discovered destitute of all traces of religion, it is a case rather of sinking below the level of humanity than a proof of what humanity naturally is. Probably, wherever men are found in possession of the idea of supernatural powers, and paying some kind of homage to them, most

would be disposed to recognise the presence of religion. Supposing, however, the question of *how* man comes into the possession of the idea of supernatural powers satisfactorily answered—and there is assuredly no lack of theories on that subject—another and more difficult inquiry awaits us: How does man come to speak or think of these supernatural powers, or of the material objects that represent them, as *gods*, or what precisely does he mean by this particular predicate? For it is a fact worth observing that not *all* supernatural powers—not even all to which man pays worship, which therefore fairly fall within the general definition of religion—are regarded by him as gods. The worship of the gods is religion, but we cannot convert this assertion and say that all supernatural beings to which man renders worship are conceived of by him as divine. Worship, ritual, cultus, of every kind—the Roman Catholic worship of saints and angels, for example, as well as the worship of God and Christ—are included in religion; but, as this very example reminds us, "objects of worship" and "gods" are not identical ideas. The highest religion teaches us that they ought to be; but if we mean by religion primarily that which relates man to the divine—to God or gods—it is assuredly the case that a large part of the religion of mankind is directed to beings who are not regarded as gods, and who by the mere fact of their having worship paid to them do not become so. It is the more needful to emphasise this, as, in the explanations offered of religion, the opposite is often assumed. If we meet, *e.g.*, with animal worship, it is assumed that these sacred animals are gods; if ancestors are worshipped, it is assumed it is as gods; if we have tree-worship, it is assumed that the tree is a god. It would be easy to show by a survey of religions how mistaken is such an inference. On the animistic explanation of religion, for instance, it is thought sufficient to appeal to the tendency of the untutored mind to attribute to natural objects, as trees, clouds, or rivers, a soul or spirit analogous to that which we are conscious of in ourselves. But such souls or spirits, even though all

nature were conceived of as filled with them, are not necessarily "gods," and are not ordinarily regarded as such, any more than the gnomes, genii, or fairies of popular belief. Worship of ancestors, *e.g.*, is found in the religion of ancient Egypt, in China, in Hinduism; but ancestors are not worshipped as gods. Animals were worshipped in Egypt, and animal-worship in various forms is found over the world; but, while specific animals—as the Apis Bulls—were regarded as strict incarnations of deities, sacred animals are not necessarily, or even generally, gods. The question, therefore, comes back upon us with increased force—What is it specifically which constitutes a being, or power, or natural object, a "god"? What is the force or meaning of the divine predicate? It is one of the merits of Max Müller's philosophy of religion that he fastens so distinctly on this as the real gist of the problem, and his whole philosophy may be said to be a more or less successful attempt to answer this question.

It may elucidate the subject we are to consider if, in the first place, one or two of Professor Max Müller's own declarations are quoted on the point. It is well known to readers of Professor Müller's works how strenuously and repeatedly he contests the view that fetishism is *the* original (or *an* original) form of religion. It is to him, on the contrary, "the very last stage in the downward course of religion."[1] In this connexion the following interesting passages occur:

> Religion not only does begin, but must begin, we are told, with a contemplation of stones, shells, bones, and such-like things, and from that stage only can it rise to the conception of something else—of powers, spirits, gods, or whatever else we like to call it. Let us look this theory in the face. When travellers, ethnologists, and philosophers tell us that savage tribes look upon stones and bones and trees as their gods, what is it that startles us? Not surely the stones, bones, or trees; not the subjects, but that which is predicated of these subjects—

[1] *Nat. Religion*, p. 159.

viz. God. Stones, bones, and trees are ready to hand everywhere; but what the student of the growth of the human mind wishes to know is, whence their higher predicate; or let us say at once, whence their predicate God?[1]

Again:

Fetishism, from its very nature, cannot be primitive, because it always presupposes the growth of the divine predicate.[2]

Again:

Most of the negro tribes, who are so glibly classed as fetish-worshippers, possess a name for God, quite apart from their fetishes; nay, their concept of God is often very pure, and simple, and true. But they would never apply that name to what we, not they, have called their fetish—gods.[3]

Again:

Does it never strike these theorisers that the whole secret of the origin of religion lies in that predicate, *their gods*? Whence did the human mind find that concept and that name? That is the problem to be solved; everything else is mere child's play.[4]

This strain runs through all Professor Max Müller's writings; in it, as already said, lies for him *in nuce* really the whole problem of religion. Let us try to ascertain, then, what his own theory of the origin of this all-important predicate is, and inquire how far it can be regarded as satisfactory.

Here, at the outset, I am bound to confess that while, I dare say, Professor Max Müller would have contended for a fundamental identity in his positions all through, it is by no means clear that his views on this subject in his earlier works are identical with those in his later. By his earlier works I have in mind chiefly his excellent *Chips from a German Worship* and *Lectures on the Science of Language*—

[1] *Origin and Growth of Religion*, p. 121.
[2] *Nat. Religion*, pp. 219, 220.
[3] *Physical Religion*, p. 116.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 115, 166.

works which in lucidity, interest, originality, and literary vigour he never surpassed. By his later writings I mean his Hibbert Lectures on *The Origin and Growth of Religion* (in which, however, his idea of faith resembles that of his earlier works), and the series of his Gifford Lectures on *Natural Religion*, *Psychological Religion*, *Physical Religion*, and *Anthropological Religion*. The root-conception of religion as having its origin in a "perception of the infinite" is, subject to an important qualification,[1] *in terms* the same through all his works; but it will, I think, become evident that this "perception of the infinite" is much more positively conceived at the beginning than at the end, and, particularly, that the manner in which it is related to the idea or predicate of the divine is quite differently apprehended; that whereas in the earlier works under this name "God" there is assumed to lie a direct, original intuition of the divine as presented in nature, in the later works the idea of the divine, or of divine beings, is represented as the result of a "long process of evolution,"[2] and this in a way which seems to rob the idea (though this is far from Professor Müller's intention) of much of its validity. What creates the change is partly the more complete working out of his (originally Kantian) doctrine of knowledge in an empirical direction; but specially his unconditional passing over to the evolutionary standpoint in explaining the genesis of what at first was regarded as original. His theory throughout has both a negative and a positive side. On the negative side, it is sufficient to say that, as above indicated, he makes a clean sweep of nearly all the theories now in favour—fetishist, animistic, totemistic, ghost-worship—as in any way throwing light upon his problem; though in his *Anthropological Religion* concession is made to ancestor-worship as at least one source of the idea of God. On the positive side, the fundamental question to be answered is—Is this predicate of the divine a simple, original, primary one, having its source in a direct, immediate perception or intuition of God by the

[1] See below. [2] *Physical Religion*, p. 120.

spirit of man? or is it a secondary and derivate idea, evolved from elements not in themselves religious? It is on this point, so far as appears, that Professor Müller's later views diverge materially from his earlier.

I give here, first, an extract or two in illustration of what I have called Professor Max Müller's earlier way of conceiving of the divine predicate—at least of the idea which lies behind it in speech. Readers of the *Chips* will remember the interesting discussion of the subject in the paper in criticism of Renan's theory of "Semitic Monotheism." There is no original "monotheistic instinct," Professor Müller holds, but there was an original intuition of God which as yet was neither monotheistic nor polytheistic, seeing that the contrast of one and many had not yet arisen.

It was this primitive intuition which supplied either the subject or the predicate in all the religions of the world, and without it no religion, whether true or false, whether natural or revealed, could have had even its first beginning. . . . The primitive intuition of the Godhead is neither monotheistic nor polytheistic, and it finds its most natural expression in the simplest and yet the most important article of faith—that God is God. This must have been the faith of the ancestors of mankind previously to any division of race or confusion of tongues.[1]

Perhaps the following passage in the *Lectures on the Science of Language* gives his view at this stage as clearly as could be wished. After remarking that a Greek of the time of Homer would have scouted the idea that in saying Zeus he meant no more than sky, and that with the Greeks the name Zeus was and remained, in spite of all mythological obscurations, the name of the Supreme Deity, he goes on to point out that the perception of God is one of those which, like the perception of the senses, is realised even without language (?). He proceeds:

As soon as man becomes conscious of himself, as soon as he perceives himself as distinct from all other things and persons, he at the same moment becomes conscious of a Higher Self, a

[1] *Chips*, Vol. I., pp. 351, 352.

higher power, without which he feels that neither he nor anything else would have any life or reality. We are so fashioned —and it is no merit of ours—that as soon as we awake we feel on all sides our dependence on something else, and all nations join in some way or other in the words of the psalmist, "It is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves." This is the first *sense* of the Godhead, the *sensus numinis* as it has been well called; for it is a *sensus*—an immediate perception, not the result of reasoning or generalising, but an intuition as irresistible as the impression of our senses. . . . This *sensus numinis*, or, as we may call it in more homely language, *faith*, is the source of all religion; it is that without which no religion, whether true or false, is possible.[1]

This is explicit enough as to the immediate intuition which man has (or in a more primitive state of consciousness had) of God; and I think the statement is substantially true, though there is something to do in explaining how such an intuition is possible—how man should be *capable* of it,—and especially in clearing up what is said in the context of the relation of "Faith" to "Reason." I go on to show what changes pass over Professor Müller's way of presenting the matter in his later volumes. Here I cannot do better than use in illustration what is advanced in his elaborate discussion of the development of the meaning of the term *Deva* (bright, god), and his elucidation of "the Biography of Agni" (the Vedic fire-god) in his lectures on *Physical Religion*. In this discussion, as before, the question is—How human beings came into possession of the predicate "god," and what this predicate meant when applied to the sky, or the sun, or the dawn, or the fire;[2] only now, instead of start being made, as before, with an immediate perception of the divine, we discover it is that perception itself which has to be accounted for by a "long process of evolution."[3] Let us attempt to follow this process as well as we can amidst the multifarious and confusing details and digressions in which the discussion abounds.

---

[1] *Science of Language*, Vol. II., pp. 479, 480.
[2] *Physical Religion*, p. 117. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

It will be convenient to begin with the development as illustrated in the case of the term *Deva*=the Greek Θεός= the Latin Deus. But, first, a reference should be made to a significant change which the author in these later (Gifford) lectures sees fit to make on his older definition of religion. Religion he describes, as before, as "the perception of the infinite," but with the important emendation that he now confines it to "the perception of the infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of men,"[1] or, as it is put earlier, "those perceptions of the unknown or infinite which influence man's actions, and his whole moral nature."[2] This, it may be remarked in passing, seems an undue narrowing down of the idea, unless an extremely wide and vague sense is given to the term "moral," making it, in fact, equivalent to the influence on actions. The change, however, is a recognition that the *mere* perception of the infinite is not enough to constitute religion—that, as he now expresses it, these perceptions "must be pervaded by a very peculiar spirit before [they] can rise to the level of what we mean by religion." The difference in the domains of religion and science is alleged to be that, while both deal with that which lies behind or beyond our knowledge, "science looks for causes of events," whereas "religion is satisfied with admitting agents for actions, who assume different aspects according to the poetical genius of every race."[3] It is evident that we are here moving considerably away from the positive "intuition" of the earlier works, and this will become plainer as we now come back to the word *Deva* to see how the matter works itself out in the concrete.

We gather, then, that *deva* had already come to mean "god" before the families of the Aryan stock separated.[4] The "long process of evolution," therefore, had taken place earlier. Originally, however, the term did not mean "god,"

[1] *Nat. Religion*, p. 188.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 168; cf. p. 193; *Psychol. Religion*, p. 294.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 168.
[4] *Physical Religion*, p. 99.

but simply "bright." "It did not mean divine," Professor Müller says, "for how should such a concept have been suddenly called into being? *Deva* is derived from DIV, and meant originally bright."[1] It naturally, therefore, was applied to the whole class of phenomena in nature representing light—to morning, dawn, sun, moon, sky, etc. These all shared in common the attribute bright. "The next step is that in this general concept of these bright ones all that was special and peculiar to each was dropped, and there remained only the epithet *deva* to embrace them all."[2] This general concept of bright one, however, is still, we are reminded, by no means the idea of God. We have yet to learn, our author says, "what a distance there is from *deva*-hood to god-hood."[3]

"It is," he says, "one of the most interesting cases of intellectual evolution, for it shows us *how* a word, having originally the purely material meaning of brightness, came in the end by the most natural process to mean divine."[4]

There was nothing intentional in this process, for this would imply that the mind was already in possession of the concept divine. "The process was one of the most natural evolution."[5] This is of value, for it shows that it is now not the mere evolution of the *name* that is in question (even in the *Chips* the *name* was held to be a later evolution), but the evolution of the *idea* or concept of God itself. We are still, as he says,

searching for the first germs of the idea of God. Guided by language, we can see as clearly as possible how, in the case of *deva*, the idea of God grew out of the idea of light, of active light, of an awakening, shining, illuminating, and warming light.[6]

We grow impatient, as we advance, to know the nature of this process of development, but are kept through many long pages waiting for it—perhaps to symbolise the length

---

[1] *Physical Religion*, p. 134. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 135. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 136.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 138. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 138. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

of the evolution. Only it is again impressed upon the inquirer, in contrast with earlier teaching, that "the idea of God is the result of an unbroken historical evolution, call it a development, an unveiling, or a purification, but not of a sudden revelation."[1] After all, this final step, on which so much depends, is left in the outcome in not a little obscurity. It does not help us much, *e.g.*, to be told, as we are in one place, that

> a *deva* is as yet no more than a bright agent, than a kind agent, than a powerful agent, a more than human agent, nay, if you like, a superhuman agent, and then only, by another step, by *what may be called a step in the dark*, a divine agent.[2]

Lucus a non lucendo. At most we have the declaration :

> It gradually rises to the highest concept of deity, to a belief in a God above all gods, a creator, a ruler of the world, a judge, and yet a compassionate father.[3]

This, however, is not explanation, but simply *naming*—the assertion that a thing happens without the least ray of light on *how* it happens. For further elucidation we must turn to the concrete example afforded in the case of the Vedic god Agni.

Nearly half of Professor Müller's volume on *Physical Religion* is filled with the story of this old god Agni, and with his comparative relations. His biography and mythological development are wrought out with great minuteness. He is treated as a typical example of the evolution of the idea of Godhead, and so may be expected to furnish us with the help we need in understanding how the divine predicate arose. What then was Agni, and how came he to attain the rank of deity he ultimately reached? Agni, to begin with, is *fire*—purely material fire; but fire perceived in many manifestations,—

> in the fire on the altar, in the spark produced by a powerful friction of fire-sticks, in the lightning that sprang from the sky

---

[1] *Physical Religion*, p. 140. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 136. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

and the clouds and consumed vast forests, like a horse champing his hay, and finally in the immortal light of the sun.[1]

And then we have sketched the true "theogonic process":

"If, then," says Professor Müller, "you remember the many things that we said of Agni, the various names by which he was called, the different phenomena of nature in which his presence was suspected, you will find it easy to understand how behind these various apparitions a more and more generalised character grew up, a being that was Agni, but was nevertheless distinct from all these individual manifestations. . . . Now it is clear," he goes on, "that Agni, who was all these things, could also be divested of everyone of these attributes, and yet remain Agni. This led to two trains of thought: Agni was either identified with other *devas* who likewise represented the sun, the sky, and the lightning, or he was more and more divested of his purely material attributes, and recognised as a supreme deity, in every sense of the word."[2]

Now I submit, with all respect, that at the end of this journey we are just about as far on as we were at the beginning in our apprehension of what precisely constitutes the predicate *god*. We are certainly a long way off from the primitive and immediate perception or intuition of the divine which we had in the *Science of Language*; I do not even see that this genealogy makes much use of the "perception of the infinite" at all. That comes in, perhaps, finally to divest Agni of his limitations, and expand him to his ultimate dimensions as one of the greater gods. But, according to the book, Agni was a *deva* before this final stage of deity was reached, and the problem of how this *deva*, or bright one, has become a "god," or what exactly a god means, is as obscure as ever. We have, no doubt, described to us a process of generalisation issuing in what the old Realists would call a "universal." But it surely does not make Agni a god simply to say that a conception of him has been formed general enough to embrace all his individual mani-

[1] *Physical Religion*, p. 178. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

festations. That might give us the idea of an agent greater, more Protean, more miraculous, than the individual forms would yield, but it is not proposed, as I understand it, to make that the test of godhead. What then is the test? We are not told.

There is, however, a much more radical criticism to be made on this evolutionary manufacture of deities. In Professor Max Müller's original view, God was reached by pure intuition, by pure perception of an Infinite Presence meeting us in our natural environment. At that stage Professor Müller would have scouted the idea of a time when human beings had *no* religion, but were waiting for one to grow. He even then held, indeed, what seemed a precarious speculation, that the pure intuition of deity long preceded the finding of a *name* for deity; but it is something more when even the *idea* of God is held to be a result of long development. It implies, to begin with, that the race of man was originally without religion. It took millenniums, apparently, to evolve the concept of the divine, and till that was accomplished, in germ at least, no religion could exist. Millenniums even are too short. The evolution was complete by the time that the branches of the Aryan race separated from one another;[1] but it seemingly had not begun when the Aryan race itself severed from the Semitic and other races of mankind. *Deva* still meant simply "bright" when the Aryans started on their independent career.[2] This would seem to be equivalent to saying—though I am not sure that Professor Müller would have allowed the inference—that mankind in the pre-Aryan ages were without religion. They were without the divine predicate, or the idea corresponding to it; how then should religion exist? This, on the face of it, is a great departure from the earlier "intuition" view, and is, I think, a declension from it. Certain it is that Professor Müller's own science gives no sanction to the

---

[1] *Physical Religion*, pp. 99, 120, 135.

[2] "Bright" was the "percept" from which the concept "god" was ultimately evolved. Cf. *Natural Religion*, p. 129.

supposition of a pre-religious period in the history of mankind. Science knows of no period, within the Aryan age or beyond it, when man was without religious ideas and practices.

Assume, notwithstanding, that it all happened just as Professor Müller describes, a new question arises—What are we to say of the validity of the idea of God thus at length attained? Our author assumes constantly that the mere fact of the gradual elevation of men's minds to the idea of a supreme deity by such processes as he expounds is a sufficient guarantee of the truth of the idea when reached. One could understand his assurance on this head when the belief in God was based on direct perception. But the question cannot be repressed—What security have we for the validity of an idea reached by such mythological steps as he indicates? Sky, sun, moon, fire are *devas*—bright ones,—this is the commencement. Then a generalising process begins, accompanied, apparently, by a personalising process. But does the personalising of abstractions prove that there are really such beings as Agni and the rest? When, to put the matter more concretely, a general concept is formed from the separate manifestations of fire, and this is hypostatised into a superhuman agent; when gradually physical attributes are allowed to drop off, and the pure notion of the *deva* Fire is obtained; when this finally is identified with the *deva* Sky, or Dawn, or Sun, and the idea of a Supreme Being is (hypothetically) evolved,—does this afford the least evidence of the reality of the object worshipped? What is the god thus constructed but an hypostatised abstraction of the mind's own? One wonders why all general notions do not attain to the same honours of apotheosis!

Possibly the answer which Professor Max Müller would make to such criticism is—that these empirical processes are not the real explanation of the mind's rising to the idea of a Supreme Being. The real source of the idea, he would perhaps say, is the "perception of the infinite" which interblends itself with all man's thoughts; the natural appearances only furnish the occasion for this perception coming

into consciousness; and behind the processes of thought and language which have been described, there is always to be postulated this inner transforming influence. This is a reasonable contention; it may be what Professor Müller really has in view. But if so, it accords ill with a theory of the origination of the idea of God by evolution from concepts such as "bright," which have nothing of the divine in them to start with. And it still leaves us with a period when this higher consciousness is yet undeveloped—when the religious sense is not yet born.

This, finally, raises the question whether in any case "perception of the infinite" is an adequate expression for what we mean when we speak of an intuition of the divine. I should take leave to doubt it. Professor Max Müller's account of the origin and nature of this idea of the infinite is itself open to much criticism. On the one hand, he will have it that the idea of the infinite is of purely sense-origin, for there is nothing in the intellect, he holds, but what was first in sense; no "concept" which was not first "percept." On the other hand, it is the perception of something which is *not* sensuous, which transcends sense, which is invisible, etc.[1] There is, in fact, no meaning we can attach to "infinite" which enables us to construe it as a sense-idea. If Professor Müller, instead of stopping with a sense, or intuition, or perception of the infinite, had, after the fashion of Kant, raised the question—How is such a perception of the infinite *possible*? What view of man's nature or constitution is implied in the capacity to *have* such an idea?—he would have seen how inadequate his general theory of religion was. For only as a being whose nature carries him beyond sense, a being rationally constituted, is man capable of rising above the particular in experience at all. The purely sensuous *is* the particular. So long as the mind possesses the sensuous alone, it is sunk in the here and now, and has no means of rising higher.

[1] See the discussion in *Natural Religion*, pp. 121–125. There it is affirmed that our sense-percepts are always finite, yet the infinite is held to be perceived! The reasoning is curiously contradictory.

It is through the power of rational thought only that it is able to negate limits and attain to the universal. That is to say, as a purely sensuous being man could have no idea of the infinite, or feeling or perception of it; therefore no religion. Professor Max Müller, of course, does not regard man as purely sensuous, but attributes to him the power of thought. But then he must concede that there is an element in the idea of the infinite which sense could never yield; that there is *more* in the intellect than was in sense. I do not dwell on this point, but would rather emphasise the fact that the idea of infinity in itself considered—however we may have come by it—has nothing necessarily divine about it. The truly divine is indeed infinite; but infinitude is not therefore necessarily divinity. We have, for example, infinity in space; but infinite space is not divine. We have infinity in time; but infinite duration is not divine. We have infinity in number; but there is nothing peculiarly divine in a mathematical infinite series. It is not abstract infinity, but an Infinite *One* who is the proper object of religion. The perception of the divine in religion is not the bare perception of infinity, but the intuition of a Power or Presence—a *Being*—in nature, to whom, at first implicitly, afterwards explicitly, we attribute this infinite character. We recall Professor Müller's words in the *Science of Language*:

> As soon as he (man) perceives himself as distinct from all other things and persons, he, at the same moment, becomes conscious of a *Higher Self*, a higher power, without which he feels that neither he nor anything else would have any life or reality.

And even this leaves the question open whether it is the attaching of the predicate of infinity to this being which peculiarly constitutes him God. I do not think it does, though the reconciliation with a deeper view may perhaps be found in the fact that infinity in such a connexion connotes, and is felt necessarily to imply, the existence of nearly all the attributes that meet in our idea of God. A

Being or Power that is infinite, *e.g.*, will *ipso facto* be eternal, uncaused, all powerful, free from defect and limitation—the Supreme, God, Lord.

The evolution theory of Professor Max Müller, therefore, seems to me to fail at the very point on which we wish light; *viz.* What is the precise meaning of this predicate "god," and how does the human mind arrive at this predicate? The whole discussion suggests—and it is the last remark I shall make—that we are perhaps on the wrong track in seeking to find a key to the meaning of this predicate by groping amidst what we may call the debased currency of religion in the ideas of lower races; or even by grubbing among the roots of words, or searching out the genealogies of such Vedic gods as Agni. If religion is something native to the spirit of man, if the idea of God is one which springs from the depths of human nature as rationally and morally constituted,—it will follow that to ascertain its real significance we must look, not at its lower and poorer expressions, but at what it is when its true character has most completely unfolded itself in religions of the higher order. It is not from *without*, but from *within*, that we must get the predicate "god." It seems a long distance from the dim gropings after the Supreme in a savage breast to the self-existent, the first cause, the uncreated, the absolute, the creative energy, of the theologian and the philosopher; but if it be true, as I believe it is, that there is in man, as rationally constituted, that which compels him to rise from the finite to the infinite, from the caused to the uncaused, from the contingent to the necessary, from reason in the structure of the universe to a universal and eternal reason, from moral law in conscience to a moral Law-giver and Judge, it is not unintelligible that even from the dawn of spiritual consciousness there should be the impulse in the soul to seek after a Highest or Supreme who should satisfy these conditions. It is in the light of the goal we must try to interpret the initial longings and strivings of men after God, and the names "flung out," as Matthew Arnold would say, to express a thought greater than the worshipper himself apprehends. Thus

regarded, we can see the inadequacy of fetish theories, ghost theories, animistic theories, and the like, and can apprehend how in using the predicate "god" it is really a Highest the worshipper is seeking after. If spirits, in a given religion, are viewed only as subordinate, created, derivative beings, or in so far as they are so, they will not be regarded as "gods." If a power be regarded as original, underived, independent, even if it be only in its own sphere —if it be thought of as cause, source, creator, principle of origination,—it will be a "god," or possibly a demi-god, if there is a higher on whom in turn it is dependent, or which has come to be placed above it. If the predicate "god," that is, is applied to an object of worship, it means that to the worshippers this being is the highest, the supreme, or one of a number, each supreme in its own sphere. He is a lord, a ruler, one of the immortals; relatively to him inferior spirits rank as emanations or creations, and their functions are subordinate, deputed, delegated. How behind all this there looms the idea of the Supreme *One* to which thought in its nobler exercises is always tending to rise, with which lower deities are gradually identified, which alone has claim to the full title "God"—"the only true God,"—it belongs to the philosophy of religion to expound. We have only tried to throw some light on the nature of that "divinity" (θειότης) which we have the highest authority for saying that even nature reveals (Rom. i. 20).

JAMES ORR.

A PURITAN'S WIFE.

A Breviate of the Life of Mrs. Margaret Baxter (1681).

IT is not so much the solid as the sentimental element in biography which keeps the graves of heroes green. Cicero's fond dwelling on the sweet wiles of "that most aristocratic child," his infant son; Wolfe's comment upon the *Elegy*, as the boats creep under the shadowed bank of the St. Lawrence; Swift's little language that he invents for Stella, Sir Walter's "My dear, be a good man,"—from every such trait of the heart we catch a thrill many a chapter stuffed with exploits denies us; and it is these touches which, across disintegrating centuries, make us see the great warm and alive.

Baxter, the author of *The Saint's Everlasting Rest* (and of a hundred and sixty-seven other books); Baxter, the persecuted preacher; Baxter, the trimmer, *i.e.* in his case, the moderate man and peace-seeker, misunderstood in an age of extremists; Macaulay's Baxter, the object of Jeffreys' blasphemies,—is a figure widely known after a fashion. The general reader imagines him, in so far as he imagines him at all, to have been a sombre Puritan in gown and bands, perpetually wrestling with sinners in hydra-headed sermons. Nor is such a sketch unauthentic. Beside it, however, there should be hung another less austere portrait, that of a man hourly leaning on the strong arm of a woman who loves him. For a knowledge of this softening gleam upon the hard life of Richard Baxter we are indebted to a singular document—which has been only once reprinted—*A Breviate* (written by himself) *of the Life of Margaret his Wife.* Simply as the analysis of a temperament this strangely intimate volume is no less remarkable than Thomas

Ellwood's autobiography. A "paper monument," Baxter himself calls it. He is thinking of the "very fair, rich, large marble stone" his wife had caused to be laid over her mother's grave, but which, five years later, in the falling of the church at the Fire of London, was broken to pieces. More durable than that marble stone he hopes this may prove, which he erects under the power of melting grief, but in sincerity of truth.

"The unsuitableness of our age," writes Baxter in commencing the Breviate, "and my former known purposes against marriage and against the conveniency of ministers' marriages, made our marriage the matter of much public talk and wonder." Somewhere else he says that even Charles II.'s marriage (which took place at about the same time) was less "rung about" than his. When it is remembered that he was well on towards fifty, and his bride less than half his age; that he was sickly, sharp, uncomely; and that he was, moreover, without maintenance, owing to the operation of the recent Act of Uniformity; while she came of one of the best families in his own county of Shropshire, and possessed two thousand pounds of her own,—it is not surprising that friends and onlookers should have shaken their heads and prepared for the worst.

There was only one justification for the conduct of Richard Baxter. Margaret Charlton had fallen violently in love with him, so violently that she nearly died from the effort of concealing her attachment. It began as the irresistible hero-worship to which sensitive feminine souls have always been prone in the presence of sacerdotal glamour. Margaret was a Héloise translated into the prose of Puritan England.

The record of her girlhood is curious and significant. She was not one of those favoured souls who grow up into godliness by undiscerned degrees. About four years before the Restoration, her mother, Mrs. Hanmer, a widow for the second time, left her old home, Apley Castle, Salop, upon her son's marriage, and settled at Kidderminster, where she made the humble, praying weavers her principal friends,

choosing them for their piety above all the vanities of the world. Her elder daughter was already married to a canon of Christchurch; and now the younger, aged eighteen, resolved to quit her brother's house, where Mrs. Hanmer had left her, to rejoin the mother who "deserved her dearest love."

So Margaret came to Kidderminster; but for a long time the religious atmosphere which the famed Mr. Baxter had created there failed to penetrate her. On the contrary, she was namelessly affronted by the strictness of the Kidderminster people. Their poverty and the meagre, mean lives they led were repugnant to her. She had been accustomed to see existence as an amusing spectacle; she liked costly, glittering clothes; she delighted in romances "and company suitable thereto." All this, so natural at nineteen that one would hesitate to call it pardonable, as implying criminality, her inflexible husband, reviewing it, sums up as *the pride of her vain youth.* Yet there was nothing out of nature in the "miracle" that transformed this debonair creature, delighting in her romances, into the gracious, understanding woman, Baxter's espoused saint. John Howe, who knew her before her marriage and stayed under the same roof with her, bore testimony long afterwards to Margaret Charlton's "strangely vivid and great wit"; and in certain directions she was overstrung throughout her life, on so *alto* a note, indeed, that her later years were darkened, however needlessly, by the constant dread of mental derangement. Quite early in the Breviate we catch glimpses beneath the mundane surface of a far more essential quality, self-analysis—the very material from which to carve a Puritan; and, "although worldly," we read, "at least she thought that she was not what she should be, but something better must be attained."

It would be interesting to know what were Margaret and her future husband's impressions of each other at the outset. Did she meet him first, as she may well have done, in her mother's quiet parlour, on some occasion when two or three of the Lord's peculiar were gathered together to be refreshed

by the dew of Hermon? It was not till 1663 that the Conventicle Act was passed, which forbade friends to assemble for prayers without book. In the absence of any record, fancy helps one to see, silhouetted against dark panelling, the profile of a slim girl who kneels perfunctorily among the tearful, groaning others, her bright dress looking like exotic plumage in that circle of sober habits. A faint smile good breeding suppresses flickers on her lips; in her mind is the half-angry question, Are these obscure precisians the only people to be saved? Margaret is a shade paler when she rises. In spite of her will she has been awed into good sadness; young maid though she is, her lively sense has grasped the difference between the heart-searching, pathetic simplicity of Mr. Baxter and the tumid jargon she had expected. This man, at least, Margaret Charlton will henceforward wrong by no flippant word. His absorbed sincerity has been a revelation to her.

And so, bit by bit, the work of grace was wrought. Whether a deepening personal interest in the evangelist came first, or whether a realisation of spiritual certainties gradually fastened upon her mind, is unchronicled. Either way, the process called conversion took place; and there could have been few weak places in the soul-armour that was forged, for it resisted through a score of years continuous dint of warfare in the way of persecution and harassment, privations many, prisons oft.

We are not told exactly when Margaret gave up *Amadis de Gaule* and the *Tales of Parismus* for the histories of saving truth; but we read of a sermon Baxter preached On Conversions which was the seal on the wax. The fact of her change only dawned upon her friends when they began *to hear her through the wall* at frequent prayers. What an authentic morsel of old life the words convey, of a time when, even in solitude, the sincerest people did not feel they had prayed unless they prayed aloud! It was at about this stage, one must suppose, that Margaret's veneration of Baxter as someone divine began "to mingle, to blend" with love of him as somewhat human. At any rate, just when

she seemed to be going on well with her religion, and all her mother's friends were rejoicing over her, she fell into a cough and seeming consumption. The ordinary doctor was called in, and so was Mr. Baxter, who, a semi-invalid himself, was a great medicine man, well accustomed to making up draughts and boluses for the ailing sheep among his flock. This time, however, he found the case too hard for him, so he brought—the zeal is not without significance—two extraordinarily clever physicians, Dr. Prujean and Dr. G. Bates. They looked grave, and ordered "change of air long and breast-milk." Margaret was very ill. Then unexpectedly, while the doctors were prescribing and everyone else praying, all at once an improvement set in. Failing a hint of any adequate cause for it, we are free to guess that the pastor had made the discovery of the straitened fire shut up and striving to break forth, and that the divine event of mutual insight had somehow dawned. All the memoir says is that on the first of January Margaret began to mend, after drinking a large quantity of syrup of violets. Rather a pretty piece of symbolism, were symbolism intended!

Various pious observances followed the deliverance. Mrs. Hanmer invited the "praying neighbours," who had previously fasted with her, to keep a day of thanksgiving. Mr. Baxter asked Margaret beforehand what she would particularly have them give thanks for, and, when they assembled next morning, she (in spite of her dread of being thought ostentatious and enthusiastic) had ready for them a paper giving under separate headings her various rills of gratitude for recovery. That same day, when she was alone, she wrote a second long paper, a kind of vow or covenant with God. Towards evening, however, fears and scruples clouding her soul, we have her writing a third and still longer paper of soul-workings, addressed to the Almighty, and signed "Thy unworthy, unthankful, hard-hearted creature, M. Charlton." She is almost a match for Clarissa Harlowe in her tendency to fly to the ink-bottle in a crisis. Well may Baxter conclude this chapter with the remark, "Is not here in all these papers (the most of which I saw not till she was dead) a

great deal of work for one day, besides all the public work of a Thanksgiving Day?"

It is noticeable in Margaret that though she always kept the two papers of self-dedication and self-judgment she never showed them even to so sympathetic a companion as her husband. Her relatives found her, as a young girl, of a most concealing temper, and it was this shy reticence which principally impeded her from giving herself frankly and fully at the commencement to the fellowship of those whose only enjoyment was to testify to their hidden life with Christ. To the end of her days, Puritan and preacher's wife though she was, she remained hamperingly sensitive about the expression of the deep things of the heart, so that years after her marriage, whenever her husband had to be away from home, she used to shrink from the supposed duty of keeping up "good talk" with the godly, poor neighbours that tabled with them, because she so much feared that without his fire-giving spirituality it might become unreal and stereotyped. The widower gives a *naïf* fragment relating to this early time when he was occupied with her conversion and she was quivering under his affluent inspiration. It forms part of a letter of counsel he had written her, which he found after her death, transcribed by herself. "I advise you to set more effectually to the means of your necessary consolation. Your strange silence keeping your case to yourself, from your mother and all your friends, is an exceeding injury to your peace." It is not difficult to imagine the slow, delightful blush that overspread Margaret's face as she copied out this letter from her monitor and master. She was neither the first nor the last woman who has derived an incomparable joy from being lectured.

On the very circumstantial evidence of *The Life and Death of Mr. Richard Baxter* (London, 1692), we learn that it was Margaret who made the decisive proposal. According to this work, she sent a friend to Baxter's chamber, bearing her declaration; and when the holy man, uttering the word "Madness," refused to listen, she herself, at the door, overhearing, came in behind her messenger, and flatly, though

in puritanical language, made the tender of herself to "dear Mr. Baxter." Whereat he, we read, was at a stand, convinced that he could not despise so zealous a proffer! The same vigorous nature that, in the maid, could woo and not be baffled, was to stand her, as a wife, in good stead during the harassing years in store.

It could not truthfully be said of Baxter's saint that she proved by any means a simple character. She was, on the contrary, a complicated and woman-like being, compounded of many opposites, and these and the entirely candid record of them her husband makes are what give the Breviate of her life a surviving and evergreen interest. She was an animated talker, and possessed "an extraordinary sharp and piercing wit"; but she was even more characteristically reserved and difficult. We have already seen that she was self-doubting and unassured even after her conversion had been wrought to the accompaniment of so much rejoicing on the part of the "praying neighbours." "Timorousness was her disease," writes her husband of her; and we shall see, as we follow her married story, how fear of many kinds increasingly marred her outlook upon life. On the other hand, if Margaret Baxter was not a brave woman it would be difficult to say who ever was, at least as regards the passive side of courage—endurance. No wife ever incited and sustained her husband more cheerfully along the path of the painful right; a path entailing not alone misinterpretation and social odium, but acute material loss, suffering, and peril. In girlhood she used to attribute her fits of melancholy to the fact that her mother's house stood at the churchyard side, so that she could not choose but see all the funerals. Yet it could only have been by her own desire that at this time she "kept a skull always beside her."

Baxter conformed to the rule that love drives men out of prose, and he gives for a volume of poetical fragments, published in the same year as the Breviate, this touching justification:

God having taken away the dear companion of the last nine-

teen years of my life, as her sorrows and sufferings long ago gave being to some of these poems, so my grief for her removal, and *the revived sense of former things*, have prevailed with me to be passionate in the open sight of all.

This belongs to the things that are eternal and undated. Unfortunately, nobody who looks into the "Fragments" will say of Baxter, as was said of Bishop Pearson, that the very dust of his writings is gold. The title alone of one of the longest, "A Prayer of the Sick, in a Case like Hezekiah's—for the Comfort and Encouragement of his Afflicted Friend," testifies how much deeper their author had drunk of Jordan than of Helicon. There is more of the poetic spirit in *The Saint's Rest* than in such exercises. Nevertheless, Baxter was tunefully inclined. He encouraged congregational music; when his nights were bad, he "then sang much"; and he quaintly records, "It was not the least comfort that I had in the converse of my late dear wife, that our first in the morning, and last in bed at night, was a psalm of praise, till the hearing of others interrupted it." Evidently unsympathetic neighbours, "that savoured not melody," had been rude enough to expostulate.

It was in the early part of Margaret Charlton's long and thorny engagement that an event occurred well calculated to try a girl's heroic temper. A bishopric was offered to Baxter, offered at such a juncture and in such a way that by accepting it he would have sacrificed nothing of the dignity of his character among the Presbyterians. What betrothed lady but would learn with a swelling heart that one of those glamorous seats was within the reach of the master and lover who had so lately been evicted from a humble pastoral charge, and whom her relatives told her she would debase herself by marrying? Much in Baxter's former history pointed towards his reconciliation with the Church of England as by law established. He had always openly deplored the sectarian, separating spirit; he had never condemned a moderate episcopacy; it was known he cherished the hereditary principle in monarchy; he was already one of the new king's chaplains. Yet now, without the slightest

blatancy or self-gratulation, he refused the see of Hereford on the score that it would take him off his more useful writing. He had only too clear an apprehension of the sort of work Charles and Clarendon would require from the swallowers of their bribes. And Margaret Charlton was as firm as he with her *nolo episcopari.* "I am persuaded," he writes, "that had I accepted the bishoprick, it would have alienated her from me." Evidently, these two were not ordinary people, but Christians, and their conversation was in heaven.

Much as Margaret revered the man so much her senior who was about to marry her, it does not appear that at this stage she entirely idealised him. He, at all events, faithfully sets down that his wife often said that before she married him she expected more sourness and unsuitableness than she found. For all his deep interior sweetness, there was something, no doubt, to be put up with in the author of *A Saint or a Brute.* Not only had his Margaret to sustain the trying rôle of a martyr's companion, but that martyr's temper was as irritable as, say, Jane Welsh's husband's, and his health far worse. Baxter took no pleasure in notable housekeeping; he could not endure interruptions when he was writing; he spent a great part of his time in a sick-night-cap; he was gaunt, and pale, and worn-looking. His tottering cottage, as he calls his body, was tormented by pleurisy, colic, the stone, and thirty-six doctors. "Oh, the weary nights and days!" he cries; "oh, the unserviceable, languishing weakness! oh, the restless, working vapours! oh, the tedious, nauseous medicines! oh, my head! oh, my stomach! oh, my sides! oh, my bowels!"

If Margaret found her husband gentler than she had expected, he, on his side, poignantly realised his failings towards her. "Though we never differed in point of interest, or any other matter, every cross, provoking word which I gave maketh me almost irreconcilable with myself, and tells me how repentance brought some of old to pray to the dead whom they had wronged."

By Baxter's urgent wish, it was settled in their marriage

contract that Margaret's property should remain exclusively hers. This was an unusual line of action, but Baxter meant to stop the calumnious mouths from which he had already suffered as much as any man who belonged to that rancorous age. For every faction equally found him, on one point or another, unmanageable. His religious contemporaries could not follow the subtleties of his acute, capacious intellect, and nicknamed him "Dubious" when he was outdoing them all in his strict obedience to the moving star of conscience. The Quakers, by the way, were particularly against him. When he went along London streets they used to call from their shops, "Alas! poor man, thou art yet in darkness." Others of them used to collect under his windows, and, when anyone passed in lace or neat clothing, they would cry, "These are the fruits of thy ministry." Considering these annoyances, it is scarcely surprising that Baxter (like Dr. Johnson) never could abide a Quaker, and that he dealt somewhat sweepingly with Quakerism in his tracts. Even when at their worst, *i.e.* most provoked, Baxter's controversial manners were infinitely milder than most of his contemporaries'. He never, for instance, like the poet Milton, calls an adversary "an unswilled hogshead."

After the date of Margaret Baxter's wedding we hear no more of her keeping a skull by her side. The sadness and melancholy vanished. "Counsel did something to it," says her counsellor, "and contentment something," adding, with his peculiar truthfulness, "and being taken up with our household affairs did somewhat." The Baxters' household affairs were sufficiently engrossing, thanks to their "oft necessitated removals." Each time the non-conforming preacher was hounded out of one place, in consequence of the local enforcement of some new and ever newer Act, they had to rehouse themselves, and, as Baxter very properly allows, "the women have most of that sort of trouble." Moorfields, Acton—where they made four moves, jail, Totteridge, —a fresh part of London: in a comparatively short space of time they had lived in all these places. At Totteridge, Baxter records that few poor people could be put to the

hardness his wife was put to. The only lodgings they could find were with a small farmer, where the chimneys smoked so badly that all day in their living-room, throughout a long, severe winter, they breathed in a dense coal-cloud, and were half suffocated with the smell. "And she had ever a great straitness of the lungs, that could not bear smoke or closeness. But her charity to her poor landlady set her son apprentice, who now liveth well." Not only were the "few mean rooms" so dreadfully smoky, but so cold that Baxter spent the winter in "much anguish" from sciatica.

Wherever they went, Mrs. Baxter carried the same fortitude, making nothing of the discomforts, throwing herself into the lives of the poorer folk around them, winning their goodwill and kindnesses, and (what she valued infinitely more) their souls for Christ, in each successive place she lived in, "unless in any street where she staid so short a time as not to be known."

Taking into account what jails were generally during the seventeenth century, it is an odd fact that Baxter seems to have found his sojourn in Clerkenwell Prison, in 1668, a pleasant interlude. It was, of course, his wife who did most to temper the wind, for she not only went with him into captivity most cheerfully, but took their best bed with her, and so many other necessaries that they were able to keep house as contentedly and comfortably as at home. They had, moreover, an honest jailer who gave Baxter the liberty of walking in a fair garden, while more friends called upon them in a day than they had at home in half a year. In view of the last item, it may perhaps be permitted to the writer of these light pages to wonder whether, in Clerkenwell, Baxter did not realise something, mortified saint though he was, of the "topmost, ineffablest" reward of him whose candle of martyrdom is burning — not under a bushel.

True to the promise of her wooing, Margaret took the initiative in all business transactions, playing the masculine part. She was always the woman of means, and never undervalued wealth or birth. Her husband had entire faith

in her ability, "not so much in the speculative as the prudential, practical." So completely did he leave their affairs in her hands that he feels it necessary to justify himself in the Breviate for having let her be his "governess." Her apprehension of matters of estate, he says, was both quicker and sounder than his. "Though I was naturally somewhat tenacious of my own conceptions, her reasons usually told me that she was in the right. She would at the first hearing understand the matter better than I could do by many and long thoughts." Mrs. Baxter was an extraordinarily open-handed woman. She thirsted to give, and she dressed more meanly than she ought, and ate far meaner food, so as to have money to bestow. In spite of her shrewdness, she seriously mortgaged her property in order to be charitable, and so indiscriminate were her alms that her husband sometimes remonstrated. "Her judgment was that we ought to give if we have it, and that *Neighbourhood*, and *notice*, and *asking* are marks by which to know to whom God would have us give." But Baxter gently adds, "I thought that besides these we must exercise prudence in discerning the degrees of need and worth."

The familiar outcry against a public-spirited woman was raised by Mrs. Baxter's acquaintances. They said it was a thousand pities "she was not content to live privately and quietly." Whereat her husband nobly comments, "He that knows what it is to give account of our stewardship will know how to answer this."

Richard Baxter, like many another husband with less good reasons, deprecates the cumber and trouble of household interests, and, in his opinion, cleanliness makes a very halting second to godliness. He is worth listening to on this theme, both for the consistency of character his attitude reveals and for the drollish element discernible.

"Her household affairs," he says of his more fastidious spouse, "she ordered with so great skill and decency, as that others much praised that which I was no fit judge of: I had been bred among plain, poor people, and I thought that so much washing of stairs and rooms, to keep them as clean as their trenchers and

dishes, and so much ado about *cleanliness and trifles*, was a sinful expense of servants' time, when they might have been reading some good book."

Baxter was so unspeakably taken up with weighty soul concerns that he could set only the minimum of value upon the ritual of a well ordered home. Possibly, too, his valetudinarian nerves, always on edge, kept him sensible of the inquietude of domestic "over-curiousness." No writings of equal bulk with his ever cast less light on the manners of a past age. Pepys and Baxter were at the antipodes. The latter condemns good living (in the worldly sense) as swinish pleasure; the mouth is "the hole where meat and drink go in"; present life is a wilderness way to a promised inheritance; in the life eternal, "we shall speed according to the preparations of *this little inch of time*." The sole design, scope, and tenor of Baxter's being was to save his brethren's souls, and he had no interest to spare for anything else. With characteristic poignancy, he somewhere defines holy life as "vivacity towards God." Yet, with all his detachment from common things, there is none of the chill of a mind monopolised by philosophical abstractions. With intense imagination and the deepest pity he saw men and women bent over their muckrakes while above their heads a crown was being held out, and he flung himself with splendid abandonment into the task of forcing them to look up.

Akin to Margaret Baxter's energy and impulsiveness was the presence of mind she showed in emergencies. Once when her husband was preaching to eight hundred people in a room above St. James's market-house, a fearful crack was heard in the floor boards. Panic began. The stairway was narrow. Some cried from the windows for ladders. Quick as thought, Mrs. Baxter had got out and called to a passing workman, "Can you suddenly put a prop under a beam?" The prop was put, and though at first the carpenter's knocking still further alarmed the assembly, all escaped unhurt.

Baxter found his wife abler at resolving cases of conscience than any divine he knew. "Abundance of differences were brought me, some about restitution, some about injuries, some about vows, some about marriage promises, which I always put to her, and she so resolved as to convince me of oversight in my own resolution." Unlike himself, his helpmeet rarely felt anger. Even when a servant lost ten pounds' worth of linen in carriage carelessly, and another ten pounds' worth of plate, she showed no wrath; nor would she ever ask who had committed any household offence, for fear of tempting someone to tell a lie. All the same, she was miserable when people she thought she could rely on failed her, and the faults and inadequacies of those she loved were anguish to her. Plainly, her husband was drawing from the model he knew best when he wrote of the "tender, passionate, impatient spirits of women." Margaret counted too hopefully on success in each good work she undertook, and was almost overturned with trouble when it fell short. Altogether, an eager, lovable, great-hearted lady. One remembers with gratitude that when Baxter decided that in the everlasting rest saints will not know each other "by stature, voice, complexion; nor by terms of affinity, nor benefits; nor, I think, by sex," he had not yet met Margaret Charlton.

In that way, too, a true woman, Mrs. Baxter possessed endurance enough for all trials, but lacked the active counterpart of endurance—courage. She was, indeed, morbidly timorous. "Timorousness was her disease," says Baxter unmistakably. It was only timorousness as regarded near risks and accidents, but it made much of her life weariful to her. Even in girlhood, she had not been able to bear a loud voice or a hasty manner, and, as years went on, she could not even endure the clapping of a door or anything that had suddenness, noise, or fierceness in it. Her dreams were of murderers and fires (especially after the Great Fire), and dreams worked on her like realities. Bad news or any prognostications of evil affected her horribly, and, though she hid it in conversation, she felt the trouble of her own

mind so acutely that she lived in perpetual fear of complete brainsickness, which Baxter thought tended to bring on her what she feared. His comment on this unhappy side of his wife's character must not be omitted :

I was apt to think it was but a passionate, fanciful fear, and was too apt to be impatient with her impatiency, and with even the trouble of her mind, not enough considering how great tenderness in all our discourse she needed. Yet was her understanding so far from overthrow, that it was higher and clearer than other people's ; but like the treble strings of a lute strained up to the highest, sweet, but in continual danger.

One of her few recorded remarks occurs at this time, and we may be certain it came from her heart. "It is a great mercy of God," she would say, "not to know what will befall us in this world, nor how we shall be sick, or suffer, or die, that our foreknowledge may not anticipate our sorrows."

So hyper-sensitive a temperament seldom sees old age. Margaret Baxter died at forty-two. Her illness was internal, but she was unaware of it, and imagined herself to be suffering from something else. Baxter tells the latter half of the story with pathetic realism.

She complained of a pain in one of her breasts, and her incurable timorousness settled her in a conceit that she should have a cancer (which I saw no great cause to fear) ; *but she could neither endure to hear that it was none, or that it was.* Several friends lately dying of cancer, increased her fear.

She entered into rest on June 14, 1681. Her mind had been wandering, and for some days she alternately suffered greatly and was unconscious. But the worst of her troubles —fear—now vanished utterly, and, looking at her husband as he stood by her bed a short time before her change, she cried out to him, "Thou and I shall be in heaven."

Thus was Richard Baxter left to the mournful solitude of the old, childless widower. In the same year as his loss he wrote his Breviate. He did not do what John Knox at sixty

did, but remained faithful to memory. The rest of his life belongs to the great story of the struggle in England for religious freedom and religious concord: the romance of his marriage is like the little space of green round a cairn. For it was a romance, a somewhat limited and unradiant one perhaps, but a romance none the less, since it was made out of the most essential element in romance, "love settling unawares."

FLORENCE MARY PARSONS.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The Ancient Stone Implements, Weapons, and Ornaments of Great Britain. By SIR JOHN EVANS, K.C.B., D.C.L., etc. Second Edition, Revised. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1897.)

THE Stone Age of Great Britain is a great fact. Long ago there was a time when man in our country knew nothing of metals, and used only stone and bone for his implements. Mighty beasts lived in England in the earliest part of the Stone Age; for at that time lions, tigers, elephants, and rhinoceroses swarmed in the woods of Britain; but at the dawn of the second portion of the Stone Era these animals mysteriously disappeared. Man lived in England during both Stone Ages, and Sir John Evans, in the magnificent work reviewed in this article, the first edition of which was published in 1872, and a second edition, containing seven hundred and forty-seven pages and more than four hundred figures, has now been issued, describes the stone implements used in those far-off days.

In his early chapters our author describes the uses of stone weapons in ancient times. They have been found on the surface of the ground in Egypt, but their age is uncertain. Maspero, however, tells us[1] that stone weapons were used by the poor in ancient Chaldæa, and in Rome and Greece religious rites were performed with stone knives. In Somaliland Mr. Seton Karr has recently found flint implements;[2]

---

[1] *The Dawn of Civilisation*, pp. 755, 756.

[2] *Anthropological Journal*, February, 1896; and *Britt. Assoc. Report*, 1895.

but as they are not mixed with the bones of any extinct animals, their age is very doubtful. The Bible seems to hint at a primitive Stone Age; for Tubal-cain, the sixth in descent from Cain, was the first artificer in brass and iron.[1]

Sir John Evans first describes the Later Stone Age, or Neolithic Period, during which time man's stone tools were chipped, ground, and polished. At this era the flora of Britain was the same as at the Roman conquest; but the forests were more extensive. All round our coasts are numerous *submarine forests*, which, beginning at low-water mark, extend under the sea to great distances.[2] Similar forests occur around the coasts of Scotland, and the peat deposits of the Hebrides, Orkneys, and Shetlands are full of trunks of trees, although these islands are bare of trees at present. In the Neolithic Age the climate of England must have been similar to that possessed by our islands during the Roman occupation, although perhaps somewhat more humid. The British wild animals of the Neolithic Age were the same as those living in the Roman and Celtic times; but there were three which the Romans do not seem to have met in Britain. The first is the great Irish elk, which was more than ten feet high at the shoulder, and the remains of which, while particularly abundant in Ireland, have been found in the Neolithic deposits of England and Scotland.[3] The reindeer also abounded at this era in all parts of Great Britain, as its bones have been found in Neolithic beds from Devonshire to Caithness, as well as in many parts of Ireland;[4] and yet the climate of the time was warm and humid. The true elk or moose was another inhabitant of England in those days, and with it were associated wolves, bears, beavers, boars, and wild oxen; but not a trace of any of the great animals of the Palæolithic

[1] Gen. iv. 22.

[2] In *Early Man in Britain*, pp. 248–257, Professor Boyd Dawkins gives a valuable account of these forests. Similar submarine forests occur around the Irish coasts.

[3] It was not a true elk, but a deer.

[4] It is abundant in the east and west of England beds of this age.

(or Early) Stone Age—such as the lion, elephant, rhinoceros, and hippopotamus—has ever been found in any deposits of the Neolithic Age.

The implements of the Neolithic Age were of *many* kinds of stone, such as flint, jade, greenstone, quartz, and serpentine, and ancient mines for flint have been found at Grimes' Graves, near Brandon, and at Cissbury. These flint-mines can be proved to be of Neolithic date from the associated fauna. Of all the stone tools used during this era, the *celt* or hatchet is the most important. It was sometimes merely chipped, sometimes polished on one side, and often polished on both faces. Some of these celts have been discovered fitted to a wooden handle; but Sir John Evans thinks[1] that many were not mounted, but were merely held in the hand. Stone arrow-heads, chiefly of flint, are met with everywhere in England; but they are much more abundant in Ireland. Some are barbed, some stemmed, and some merely triangular, but all are of the same age. The other implements described by our author are—scrapers (for scraping skins), picks, chisels, knives, hammers, javelin-heads, and spindle-whorls. From the existence of the last we conclude that clothes were worn and woven by the natives, though the rudest tribes doubtless dressed in skins. Bone was also fashioned by the natives into pins, awls,[2] and needles. As these weapons are found in *every* part of Great Britain and in islands round our coasts, it is plain that the population of our country at that era must have been considerable, and navigation must have been known, as the natives freely passed from island to island. The men of those days were also agriculturists, and possessed as domestic animals the horse, dog, sheep, ox, and goat.

Who were these ancient people? Professor Boyd Dawkins[3] thinks that they were not Aryans, but belonged to the Iberian race, and were allied to the Basques. Mr.

---

[1] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 136.

[2] Lubbock's *Prehistoric Times*, first edition, pp. 79, 80.

[3] *Early Man in Britain*, pp. 314, 315.

Charles Elton takes the same view, and considers that the Neolithic men of Britain were related to the Silures of Wales and to the Fir-bolgs of Ireland.[1] Druidism was a cult that prevailed amongst them, just as reverence is paid to the "Medicine Men" of the North American Indians, or to the Shahmans in Siberia. They were agriculturists, but, singularly enough, had no artistic ability. They raised many of the barrows on our moorlands, erected rude stone circles and monoliths, and constructed numerous hut circles. But when ages had passed, the invading Celts, armed with bronze weapons, entered Britain, and drove the Neolithic inhabitants to the woods and mountains; thus closed the Neolithic Age in Britain.

In passing from the Neolithic Period backwards into the immediately preceding Palæolithic Age we seem suddenly to enter another world. In the old Stone Age[2] in Britain lions, tigers, elephants, rhinoceroses, and hippopotamuses lived in England; but they had all disappeared before the beginning of the Newer Stone Age,[3] and this remarkable gap and difference between the two Stone Ages is found in every European country. Sir John Evans constantly refers to it,[4] and Sir Henry Howorth[5] and Sir Joseph Prestwich[6] maintain that it was caused by the Noachian Deluge. The *number* of the bones of these great animals in the Palæolithic beds of Great Britain is also most remarkable. The tusks of *fifty* mammoths were found in a gravel-pit at Yarnton;[7] from a small fissure at Windy Knoll, in Derbyshire, Mr. Pennington extracted 6,800 bones;[8] and such myriads of the bones of reindeer have been found near Windsor that great herds of these animals must have crossed the Thames at this spot. The earliest explorers of the caverns in England also speak of the innumerable quantities of the bones of the Palæolithic

---

[1] *Origins of English History*, p. 158. [2] Palæolithic Period.
[3] Neolithic Period. [4] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 704.
[5] *The Mammoth and the Flood.* [6] *The Tradition of the Flood.*
[7] *Geology*, by Sir Joseph Prestwich, Vol. II., p. 474.
[8] *The Barrows and Bone-Caves of Derbyshire*, pp. 74–85.

animals. The Rev. J. MacEnery, who first explored Kent's Cavern, was perfectly astounded at the enormous masses of bones which were everywhere accumulated, and he declares that at one point he and his helpers dug a passage through *piles* of bones into a chamber where the bones were also lying in countless myriads.[1] Dr. Buckland found that one of the openings in the Oreston Cave was blocked by bones, which lay in other parts of the cavern in irregular heaps.[2] The animals must have swarmed in Great Britain in Palæolithic times, as the buffaloes used to cover in millions the North American prairies. Even lately Mr. Thomson saw thousands of zebras on the shores of Lake Navaisha in eastern Africa;[3] and in the same region, near Lake Baringo, Lieutenant Höhnel saw such enormous herds of buffaloes, elands, zebras, and rhinoceroses as to defy enumeration.[4] Similar sights must have been witnessed by Palæolithic man in England; but it is very strange that in the Neolithic deposits of England the remains of animals are comparatively rare.

Sir John Evans begins his account of the Palæolithic Age in England by describing the bone-caves, the most important of which is Kent's Cavern at Torquay. This famous cave contains bones of the great animals just noticed, and with them have been found traces of ancient fires, a bone pin and bone harpoon, as well as fractured flints, some of which may have been formed by man. We cannot, however, agree with Sir John Evans that the rude flints from Brixham Cave are of human origin, as they are too small and insignificant to have been framed by man.[5] In the hyenas' den at Wookey Hole, near Wells, bone implements were found lying close to the remains of the

---

[1] *Cavern Researches*, pp. 31–34.

[2] *Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*, pp. 71, 72.

[3] *Through Masai Land*, p. 193.

[4] *The Exploration of Lakes Rudolf and Stefanie*, Vol. II., pp. 20, 21.

[5] Some of these flints are less than an inch in length! See a description of them in the *Transactions of the Victoria Institution* for 1877, by N. Whitley, Esq., C.E.

elephant and the lion; and the caves of Gower, Clywd, and Cresswell Crags have been held to furnish traces of human remains belonging to the Palæolithic Period.[1]

The valley gravels of England, which are full of flint implements, are next described by our author. These gravels are distributed over an area bounded by the English Channel on the south, and by a line drawn from the Wash to the mouth of the Severn on the north. The gravels occur in the valleys of the Thames, Ouse, Waveney, Medway, Itchen, Avon, and Stour, as well as on the banks of their tributaries, and they are sometimes found at an elevation of from one hundred and fifty to two hundred feet above the river. In the gravel-beds are found the bones of elephants,[2] rhinoceroses, lions, hyenas, and hippopotamuses in great numbers, mingled with numerous fractured flints which it is affirmed are the work of man. *Some* of these probably are of human origin, but not *all*, as their numbers are too great. If *all* were framed by man, then the men of those days must have been enormously numerous; but this cannot have been the case, for Sir John Evans admits that *not a single skeleton* of any Palæolithic man has yet been found.[3] There are many bones of man in the Neolithic Age; and if *all* the flints in the gravel-beds were made by man, some human bones would have been found long ago. The *age* of these gravels is very doubtful. Most geologists look upon them as Post-Glacial,[4] and consider that they were deposited by great floods, which devastated the valleys, after the Glacial Period had passed away. This, however, is denied by other able geologists, both in England and on the Continent, who hold

---

[1] A drawing of a horse found carved on a bit of horn from Cresswell Crags Caves shows that the Palæolithic men in England were skilful artists.

[2] Chiefly mammoths.

[3] He refers to the remains at Paviland, Galley Hill, and Westley, but thinks that they are all of very doubtful age.

[4] Such as Sir J. W. Dawson, Professor Hull, Sir Charles Lyell, Sir Joseph Prestwich, and Sir Andrew Ramsay.

that the gravels were formed during Inter-Glacial Periods. Dr. J. A. Geikie holds that the gravels, with the flints, were laid down by the rivers during violent floods, and that they were redistributed by great deluges occasioned by the melting of the ice-sheets, which caused tumultuous deluges of water to devastate the valleys.[1] There are grave difficulties, however, in the way of holding the Inter-Glacial origin of the gravels. The Palæolithic Period was too short for so many complicated changes of climate to have occurred in it; the vegetation shows a mild climate without any cold intervals; and the general state of geological opinion at present, in England and America, is strongly against these varying changes of climate in the Great Ice Age. The gravels were most probably deposited *after* the Glacial Period, and this is the opinion of both Sir John Evans[2] and Sir Joseph Prestwich.[3] The evidence in favour of this view is very strong in southern and eastern England; for in this region many of the gravels are found to rest on the great Glacial deposit known as the boulder clay, while other gravels contain materials which have been derived from the destruction of the beds formed during the Glacial Period. We may therefore safely consider that the gravel-beds in the valleys containing flint implements are of Post-Glacial Age, and that they were formed after the Great Ice Age had passed away.[4]

Sir John Evans considers that the antiquity of man is enormous. This is the opinion which prevails in many quarters in the present day; but it is surprising how very unsatisfactory are the arguments on which this conclusion rests. We used to be told that the great beds of stalagmite in the bone-caves were formed so slowly that they took long ages in formation. We hear very little of this argument

[1] See his two delightful works entitled *The Great Ice Age* and *Prehistoric Europe*.

[2] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 697.

Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society, Vol. XLIII., 1887; and *Geology*, Vol. II., pp. 6, 7.

[4] This is also the opinion of Sir J. W. Dawson.

now. Sir John Evans quickly dismisses it[1] by saying that the rate of the deposition of stalagmite varies so much that its thickness affords no true criterion of the length of time during which it accumulated. That this is the case is most evident. Let us take the stalagmites in Kent's Cave as an illustration. Mr. Ralph Richardson,[2] calculating that an inch of stalagmite is deposited in 1,000 years, considers that the two beds of stalagmite in the cavern took no less than 200,000 years in their formation! On the other hand, Professor Boyd Dawkins thinks that the stalagmites in Kent's Cavern might have been formed at the rate of a quarter of an inch per annum,[3] so that all the stalagmitic beds in this cave—which are about twenty feet thick—might have been deposited in only 1,000 years! Clearly, calculations based on the assumed rate of stalagmitic deposition have not the slightest value in determining the antiquity of the human relics found in the bone-caves of England.[4]

Again, it is affirmed that during the Palæolithic Age the land stood much higher, as at that time Britain was joined to France and Germany. This connexion was afterwards severed when the land sank, and it is assumed that a vast time was occupied in these changes in the condition of the country, owing to the slowness at which it is supposed the submergence took place. But what right have we to assume that these submergences took place slowly? None whatever. No evidence can be produced to show that these connexions of England were slowly severed; it is just as likely that these changes took place rapidly. Every geologist knows that land can sink, and has sunk, very rapidly. A large portion of the Runn of Cutch sank rapidly during the earthquake of 1819, so that the sea flowed in and in a few hours converted a tract of land 2,000 miles square into a

---

[1] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 480.

[2] *Transactions of the Edinburgh Geological Society*, Vol. VII., Part I., p. 23.

[3] *Cave Hunting*, pp. 40, 41.

[4] The rainfall of the Palæolithic Age, being excessive, would occasion stalagmite to be formed very quickly.

vast lake. In this case the land sank ten feet in a few days.[1] In Jamaica, in 1692, another great submergence of land occurred with such rapidity that portions of the town and neighbourhood of Port Royal were buried beneath twenty feet of water in a few hours.[2] The eruption at Krakatoa, in the Indian Ocean, in 1883, demonstrated that changes in the levels of land and sea often occur with startling rapidity, and the steady and imperceptible subsidence of land need not necessarily take place slowly. If England during the latter part of the Palæolithic Age had been depressed only at the rate of from one to two feet in a week—a rate which would be quite imperceptible to any human beings living at the time—in a few years the separation between England, France, and Germany would be as complete as it is in the present day, and no vast ages would be needed to accomplish such a result.

The disappearance of the great beasts of the Palæolithic Period—such as the lion, elephant, rhinoceros, and hippopotamus—is often brought forward in favour of the extreme antiquity of man. It is affirmed that as these animals were the companions of man during the Palæolithic Age a vast period of time was necessary to bring about their gradual disappearance. The argument, however, is of very little value. It cannot be urged too strongly that all the evidence we at present possess emphatically contradicts the idea that these animals died out slowly. The remains of the mammoth, lion, hyena, rhinoceros, and hippopotamus are as abundant at the close of the Palæolithic Period as they are at its commencement, and not the slightest trace of any of these creatures is found in the earliest beds of the Neolithic Era, either in England or on the Continent. If this does not prove that all these animals suddenly became extinct, then geological evidence is perfectly valueless. The advocates of the extreme antiquity of man have constantly been asked to explain how these great beasts became extinct, and their

---

[1] Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, Vol. II., pp. 97–102.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 160, 161.

answers are very extraordinary. Some say that the animals were exterminated by man; but a moment's reflection will show that this idea is quite untenable. That Palæolithic man, armed with a rude flint spear and hatchet, could have exterminated such huge beasts as the mighty mammoth and the woolly rhinoceros is ridiculous, especially as these animals swarmed in prodigious numbers. In Africa no wild animals could be exterminated by the natives (although armed with iron weapons) until the introduction of fire-arms. Again, it has been maintained by some theorists that the great Palæolithic mammalia were overwhelmed by local floods occasioned by the melting of glaciers. This notion is absurd. There are constant and violent floods in western Africa; but they cause no diminution in the number of wild animals, for they are too wary to be caught by the waters, and the few that are occasionally drowned make no appreciable difference in the abundance of animal life in this particular region. It has been thought that the great Palæolithic beasts succumbed to a change of climate; but this is contradicted by geological evidence which shows that no change of climate occurred at the time of their disappearance. All these theories, invented to account for the extinction of these great animals, take for granted that they slowly died out—an idea which is entirely opposed to the facts of the case. The truth is, that they must have been overwhelmed at the end of the Palæolithic Age by a great catastrophe, as has been maintained by Sir Henry Howorth[1] and Sir William Dawson,[2] and which these eminent geologists have declared to have been part of that great invasion of the waters which occurred at the time of Noah's Flood. Professor Jamieson has also stated that at this era (*i.e.* the end of the Palæolithic Age) Great Britain was submerged beneath the sea to such a depth that not only were the great mammalia destroyed, but that all life was annihilated in our islands by the overwhelming invasion of the waters.[3]

[1] *The Mammoth and The Flood.*

[2] *The Meeting-place of Geology and History.*

[3] *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, Vol. XVI., pp. 369, 370.

It is further argued that considerable change in climate occurred between the Palæolithic Age and the Neolithic Period, and as this change is assumed to have taken place very slowly the time necessary for this climatic revolution is supposed to have been enormous. Hence the great antiquity of Palæolithic man. But this argument has utterly broken down, for there is no proof that the climates of the two Stone Ages were very considerably different. The flora of the Palæolithic Age shows that the climate was mild and temperate, and the same conclusion is reached from a study of the Neolithic vegetation.[1] Sir Joseph Prestwich has also shown that there is no material difference between the mollusca, taken as a whole, of the Palæolithic and Neolithic Periods. It has been affirmed that the Palæolithic Age was cold because of the presence of the reindeer and lemming; but as the former animal existed in Scotland in the twelfth century of our era, and the latter now lives in the mild climate of southern Alaska, the statement is without value. Besides, as the hippopotamus lived in England right down to the close of the Palæolithic Period, we may be quite sure that no cold climate could then have prevailed in Britain. In fact, no argument whatever can be drawn, either from the faunas or floras of the two Stone Ages, to show that in the Palæolithic Period the climate of Great Britain was in any way different from that which prevailed in England at the dawn of history. Moreover, it is a pure assumption to affirm that climates must always change very slowly.[2] Large tracts of land might rise or sink beneath the sea very rapidly, and these changes might bring about corresponding alterations of climate, which climatical variations would take place quickly over extensive regions of the terrestrial surface. Any attempt, therefore, to calculate the antiquity

[1] Some Arctic plants have lately been found at Hoxne, but in the company of a *temperate* flora. See *Proc. of the Brit. Assoc.*, 1896, p. 400.

[2] The climates of Siberia, northern Alaska, and of Arizona can all be proved to have changed *very rapidly*.

of man from assumed slow changes of climate in the course of Prehistoric Ages must be absolutely valueless.

Another argument for the antiquity of man which Sir John Evans elaborately describes is derived from the excavation of valleys. Beds of gravel with flint implements frequently occur on the hillsides of many valleys, these beds being often one hundred and fifty feet above the bottom of the valley. It is argued that the rivers deposited these gravels with flints, and that the streams have excavated their beds to a depth of nearly two hundred feet since that time; and as such an operation must have taken a vast period, the antiquity of the men who made the flint implements contained in the gravels must be enormous. It will be observed that those who advance this opinion take for granted that the valleys did not exist before the appearance of man; but if this were so, where are the valleys which were excavated in still earlier ages? If so many of the valleys in the south-east of England have been almost entirely excavated since man's advent, what kind of drainage system had the region before man's appearance? This portion of England had been dry land for vast ages before man entered it, and it must in those enormously remote times have been furrowed by valleys: where are they? As many valleys in the region must necessarily have been formed before man's advent, it is possible that the valleys which contain gravel-beds were amongst those which were excavated before man appeared.[1] The present streams are far too small to do the work of erosion, and are not excavating their beds, they are merely filling them up. The rainfall also of the district is quite insufficient to provide water enough for such extraordinary erosion, for as the gravels are rough and coarse the water which deposited them must have rushed with overwhelming force and in tremendous volume.

In some of these gravels are large boulders of at least a

[1] Many geologists, such as Sir J. W. Dawson, Professor Tylor, and M. Dupont, hold that the valleys were formed long before the gravels were deposited.

ton weight, which are sometimes said to have been floated along on blocks of ice. As, however, the bones of the hippopotamus are often found in these gravels, it is certain that no ice could have formed in these rivers at a time when this animal lived in their waters. Let us imagine a valley a mile broad at the bottom, and more than two miles wide between the tops of its enclosing hills. A stream twenty feet wide and two feet deep flows with a sluggish current through the middle of the valley, and beds of gravel occur on the hillsides, one hundred feet above the stream. Could such a tiny rivulet have excavated so vast a valley? It is not possible to believe it, even if a million of years were allowed for the process of excavation. If the river were spread over a width of a mile, its depth would be hardly more than an inch, and its work of excavation would be practically nil. Moreover, the beds of gravel must have been deposited by vast bodies of water moving with tremendous rapidity; this must have occurred, because of the large size of the stones and pebbles they contain. The present rivers, however, as a rule do not deposit gravel, but merely lay down fine mud. Again, how can a river excavate its bed, and lay down great deposits of gravel at the same time? The two operations cannot go on simultaneously. The fact is, the valleys must have existed, almost in their present form, long before the gravel was deposited, and these beds of gravel owe their formation to sudden and tumultuous waters which poured rapidly through the valleys. Such is the opinion of many of our leading geologists, as Sir Roderick Murchison,[1] Sir Henry Howorth,[2] Sir William Dawson,[3] Professor Belgrand,[4] and Dr. Southall.[5]

The gravels of the Somme are constantly referred to as proving the antiquity of man, because they contain flint implements; but the argument drawn from them to support

---

[1] *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, Vol. VII., pp. 349–398.
[2] *Geological Magazine*, Vols. IX., X.
[3] *The Chain of Life*, pp. 244, 245.
[4] *Le Bassin Parisien.*
[5] *The Epoch of the Mammoth*, pp. 127, 128.

man's antiquity has broken down. In an admirable paper, read before the Geological Society of London,[1] Mr. Alfred Tylor showed that the valley of the Somme was excavated exactly to its present form prior to the deposition of any gravel now lying in it. He maintains that the gravels in this valley and in the neighbouring parts of France, as well as those in the south of England, were formed during an era of enormous rainfall, which he designates the Pluvial Period. This would cause the gravels to be deposited very rapidly, and the argument drawn from their gradual formation in favour of the extreme antiquity of man completely collapses. Mr. Tylor states his conclusions, as to the formation of these gravels, as follows :

> The surface of the chalk in the valley of the Somme has assumed its present form prior to the deposition of any of the gravel or loess, and in this respect corresponds with all other valleys in which Quaternary deposits of this character are met with. . . . Many of the Quaternary deposits in all countries, clearly posterior to the formation of the valleys in which they lie, are of such great dimensions and elevation that they must have been formed under physical conditions very different from our own. They indicate a Pluvial Period, just as clearly as the northern drift indicates a Glacial Period. This Pluvial Period must have immediately preceded the true Historical Period.[2]

The great gap between the two Stone Ages is frequently mentioned by Sir John Evans,[3] and he thinks that it indicates the lapse of a long period of time. Others have maintained that many missing deposits must exist somewhere, so that this chasm may be filled. This, however, is a pure assumption, as not the slightest trace of any of these transitional beds can anywhere be found. The supposition seems merely to be made because the theory requires that it should be made, and so its discussion at present is perfectly unnecessary.

---

[1] *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, Vol. XXIV., pp. 103–125.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. XXIV., pp. 104, 105.
[3] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 704.

Patches of gravel are found on the slopes of the hills and cliffs near Bournemouth, facing the sea, and they occur along for some distance farther eastwards. From their position Sir John Evans considers[1] that when they were deposited a great river occupied the present bed of the Solent, and by the waters of this river the gravels were deposited. The southern boundary of the valley of this ancient river was formed by a range of hills, which in those days reached from Ballard Down, near Poole, to The Needles. The whole of this chain of hills has been washed away by the sea since the Palæolithic Age; and as this must necessarily have taken a vast period of time, the antiquity of the men who left their flint implements in the gravels near Bournemouth must be enormous. The existence of this great Palæolithic river which occupied the bed of the Solent has been strongly denied. Sir Henry Howorth,[2] who has carefully examined the whole ground, has powerfully controverted the idea that the gravels are of fluviatile origin. He maintains that the heights at which the gravel-beds are found, and the character of the gravel deposits, are utterly opposed to the idea that they were formed by any river action whatever. When we remember also the amount of marine denudation that this theory requires, and consider the limited time in which it would have to be effected, we are compelled to conclude that the theory of an ancient Solent river depositing the Bournemouth beds of gravels is quite untenable.

That the Palæolithic Period in Great Britain was of exceedingly short duration is clearly proved by the paucity of human bones which are found in the deposits of that era. So few and so doubtful are they, that Sir John Evans declares that men in England in those days must have been very few in number.[3] This demonstrates the shortness of the Palæolithic Age in Britain. If this epoch had been long, a vigorous and active race of men would have so increased

---

[1] *Ancient Stone Implements*, pp. 690–696.
[2] *Geological Magazine*, Vol. IX.
[3] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 702.

and multiplied in numbers that England would have been densely populated with human beings, and as a natural result we should discover great numbers of their skulls and bones. As this is not the case, and as human remains in the Palæolithic Age are so very few, we are compelled to believe that the Palæolithic Period was remarkably short. Sir John Evans thinks that the men of those days buried their dead,[1] so that few human beings could be entombed in the gravels. But all the dead could not have been carefully buried; and even if this had been the case, why cannot we find their places of sepulture? We have found many burial-places belonging to the Neolithic Period; but why have we not as yet discovered one burial-place in England belonging to the Palæolithic Era? Sir John Lubbock has stated[2] that no remains of any animal so small as man have up to the present time been found in the gravels; but how this accounts for the absence of human bones from all the Palæolithic deposits, and also from the bone-caves of that era, we are quite unable to comprehend. Mr. Edward Clodd[3] says that among other causes for the paucity of human remains we may suppose that hyenas devoured the bones. There must, however, have been numbers of men who died, and who were buried in places which no hyenas could reach, especially if, as we are constantly told, the settlements of Palæolithic man were frequently washed away by devastating floods.

A strong argument against the extreme antiquity of man may be drawn from the latest discoveries which show the recent close of the Glacial Period. It is admitted by most of our ablest geological authorities that man did not live in Great Britain until after the Glacial Period—properly called—had passed away. It is true that some geologists contend that man lived in England before the Glacial Period. Dr. H. Hicks maintains that some fragments of flint found in

---

[1] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 702.
[2] *Prehistoric Times*, fourth edition, p. 365.
[3] *The Story of Primitive Man*, p. 60.

the caves of Ffynnon Beunos and Cae Gwyn were made by man, and that the deposits in which they were discovered were formed before the Glacial Period.[1] It is, however, impossible to prove that these rude pieces of shattered flint were fashioned by man, and Sir John Evans emphatically denies that they are of Pre-Glacial age.[2] Sir Joseph Prestwich has affirmed that many flints found in the neighbourhood of Ightham, in Kent, were discovered in Pre-Glacial deposits. Much difference of opinion, however, prevails on this point.[3] Professor Boyd Dawkins cannot accept the Pre-Glacial age of these flints, and Sir John Evans has declared that nearly all these flints were formed by nature and not by man.[4] In the Pre-Glacial "Forest Bed" at Cromer, Mr. Lewis Abbot testifies that he has found flint implements made by man; but Sir John Evans can see no distinct marks of human workmanship upon these specimens.[5] When talented geologists differ so much among themselves as to whether many of these so-called "implements" are of human origin, we see how easily serious errors may arise, and we may safely conclude that the mere finding of shattered and chipped flints alone can never be accepted as satisfactory proof of the former presence of man.

If man did not live in Britain until after the Glacial Period, how long ago is it since the Glacial Period came to an end? Sir Joseph Prestwich has concluded that it closed from 15,000 to 20,000 years ago.[6] Estimates from America still further reduce this period, and Professor G. F. Wright, in his delightful works on American geology,[7] presents a formidable array of proofs of the recent close of the Glacial Period. He shows that the marks made by old glaciers are as fresh as if made yesterday; that lakes formed in

---

[1] *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, Vols. XLII., XLIII.
[2] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 521.
[3] *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, Vol. XLV., 1889.
[4] *Anthropological Journal*, Vol. XXI., 1892.
[5] *Ancient Stone Implements*, p. 572.
[6] *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, Vol. XLIII., 1887.
[7] *The Ice Age in North America*, and *Man and the Glacial Period.*

glacial clays are but slightly filled by inflowing streams; and that rivers have cut only shallow channels in glacial deposits. From all this he concludes that the Glacial Period closed from 7,000 to 10,000 years ago; an opinion in which Sir William Dawson and Dr. Andrews agree, while Mr. Mac-Kintosh, in England, has expressed similar views. As man is Post-Glacial, it will be seen how these calculations reduce his antiquity.

It is sometimes said that the Palæolithic deposits in the bone-caves which contain flint implements took a long time to form, but the proof of this is most defective. As these deposits contain great beds of stalagmite it is clear that they were formed at intermittent intervals, as the stalagmites could not form when the water was rushing into the caves, and depositing mud and gravel. Many of the cavern-beds are full of large pebbles and angular stones, which proves that the waters which deposited them rushed into the cavern with great violence, otherwise they could not have carried along such large stones and pebbles. It is certain, therefore, that these deposits were formed very quickly. The fine mud also, which often in the caves lies over the rough and coarse deposits, was laid down when the waters were flowing more slowly, and when the violent floods were subsiding. The earthy deposits in the caverns, from their containing so many large stones, were evidently laid down either by river-floods, or by violent torrents which rushed down into the caves through cracks in their roofs or sides, owing to deluges of rain. In either way, the cavern-beds must have been formed very rapidly. Many of the thick stalagmites in caves must also have been quickly formed. They contain no bones of animals, which are abundant in the earthy beds above and below. The reason for this is probably that when the stalagmites were forming the cave was so wet, owing to the drip of water from the roof, that the animals could not live in it; and if it were so wet, the drip and the deposition of stalagmite must have been very rapid. The animals' bones tell the same tale. These creatures could not have lived in the caves when torrents of water

were rushing into them. Many of the bones in the caverns are those of elephants, rhinoceroses, horses, and hippopotamuses; and as these animals do not live in caves, they must have been overwhelmed by great floods, and their bodies washed into the caverns.[1] This of course implies violent torrents of water, and extremely rapid deposition of the beds of gravel and earth which the caverns contain.

The problem relating to the antiquity of man is extremely complicated, and presents extraordinary difficulties. It is impossible to estimate the rate at which past geological changes occurred, for while some may have been slow others probably took place with great rapidity. We have therefore little certainty, and as conflicting theories and opinions prevail, much caution is absolutely necessary. But these considerations do not in any way detract from our high appreciation of the work of Sir John Evans. His book is a perfect treasure-house of information, and a monument of patient research. The talented author is to be heartily congratulated on the completion of his arduous labours; he has produced one of the most important works in existence on Prehistoric Archæology.

D. GATH WHITLEY.

---

[1] In many caves *whole skeletons* of beasts are found, and in others such piles of bones of *different animals* occur as to prove that *many bodies* were washed in by great floods, and heaped one upon another.

THE RENAISSANCE OF CALVINISM.

A REPLY.

A WRITER in the October number of this REVIEW tells us that "the star of Calvinism" which "for several generations has been in hiding . . . must surely emerge again. It has not set. In many minds the prescient sense is quickening that the time of its reappearance draws near." The only reason given for this expectation, so far as I understand the article, is the large place which Calvinism has had in the thoughts of the past, and indeed still has. The writer says, on page 224, "A creed which is to-day the accepted confession of all the Presbyterian order of Churches, of many Independent and Baptist congregations, which finds still a place in that theological puzzle—the Thirty-nine Articles—cannot be dead." But he admits that "For a while Calvinism has gone into exile." He quotes from an essay by Froude that Calvinism "has appeared and reappeared, and in due time will reappear again, unless God be a delusion and man be as the beasts that perish." The reviewer adds: "We venture to think there is a subtle energy of persistence in Calvinism that marks its inherent vitality. Its keenest critics admit it has been the most dominant creed of Christendom."

Unfortunately the writer does not say definitely what he means by Calvinism. But the meaning he gives to this term may in some measure be inferred from sundry questions and remarks which he makes and asks. So on page 220:

> What is the value of the fact that the mother-principle of Calvinism, the absolute supremacy of God in human life and in the affairs of the world, is finding a restatement, and this largely in teachings which decline to receive its logically elaborated

system? . . . Can we detect indications that the cry of our generation "Back to Christ" is being succeeded by the cry "Back to God," back to the sovereignty of the divine Love and the absolute will of the Eternal of which Jesus was the manifestation and exponent in time?

He adds:

It is necessary, perhaps, that we should at the outset indicate the quality of the Calvinism likely to find a fresh ascendency of influence in our generation. It is certainly not that falsetto of Calvinism known as "high" or "hyper." . . . We accept, as we believe the theologians who hold the creed would wish us to accept, in any honourable statement of their position, the Calvinism of the centre rather than of the circumference, that which revolves round the central sun of the system, the sovereignty of God, and that finds its ruling ideas in the omnipotence of God and the impotence of man apart from God in every sphere and correspondence of their mutual relationship.

The only fair meaning to give to the word *Calvinism* is *the teaching of Calvin*, or at least the formulated teaching of those who, when the term arose, called themselves Calvinists. And, inasmuch as Arminius protested against certain conspicuous elements in the teaching of Calvin, and many who joined in this protest were commonly known as Arminians, we may not unfairly limit the word *Calvinism* in the present discussion to those elements of the teaching of Calvin against which Arminius and the earliest Arminians protested. What these points of difference between the teaching of Calvin and that of Arminius are, and in what points these teachers were in agreement, I shall now endeavour to show.

Calvin taught correctly and earnestly that salvation, from the first good desire until victory over death, is entirely a work of God and an accomplishment of His eternal purpose; that we should never have begun to seek Him if He had not first sought us, and that our seeking Him was a result of His drawing us to Himself; that our faith is wrought in us by the word of God and by influences leading us to believe it, and that every victory over sin and self is God's gift to us and work in us. But from this correct teaching Calvin

incorrectly inferred that God brings to bear, in pursuance of an eternal and secret purpose, upon some of those who hear the gospel and not on others, influences which invariably lead to repentance, faith, justification, and eternal life; and that the reason why these influences (without which, owing to the completeness of the Fall, none are or can be saved) are not exerted upon some men while they are upon others is entirely in God and not at all in man. So Calvin's *Institutes*, book iii., chap. 23, sec. 1:

> Whom God passes by He reprobates; and from no other cause than His determination to exclude them from the inheritance which He predestines for His children. . . . The obstinate are not converted, because God exerts not that mightier grace of which He is not destitute if He chose to display it.

Also sec. 7:

> I inquire again how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, but because such was the will of God. It is an awful decree I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future fall of man before He created him, and that He foreknew it because it was appointed by His own decree.

Also chap. 24, sec. 12:

> The same sermon is addressed to a hundred persons: twenty receive it with obedience and faith; the others despise, or ridicule, or reject, or condemn it. If it be replied that the difference proceeds from their wickedness and perverseness, that will afford no satisfaction; because the minds of others would have been influenced by the same wickedness but for the correction of the divine justice.

And sec. 13:

> Let us not refuse to say with Augustine, "God could change the will of the wicked into good, because He is omnipotent. Why then does He not do it? Because He is unwilling. Why He is unwilling, remains with Himself."

Evidently the "falsetto of high or hyper Calvinism" is the teaching of Calvin himself.

This teaching was derived apparently, as the last quotation suggests, from the much earlier teaching of Augustine. But he differs from Calvin in supposing that all infants who die without baptism will perish, whereas baptized infants will be saved; and that from some of the regenerate God withholds the gift of perseverance, and thus permits them to perish finally. So *Reproof and Grace*, chap. 18:

It is indeed to be wondered at, and wondered at much, that to some of His sons whom He has regenerated in Christ, to whom He has given faith, hope, love, He does not give perseverance; while to children of strangers He forgives so great crimes, and by imparted grace makes them His sons. Who does not wonder at this? Who is not utterly amazed at it? But also this is not less wonderful, and nevertheless true, and so evident that not even the very enemies of the grace of God are able to find out how to deny it, *viz.* that God makes to be strangers to His kingdom, whither He sends their parents, some of the sons of His friends, *i.e.* of regenerated and good believers, who go forth hence in childhood without baptism; for whom He, in whose power are all things, might if He would, procure the grace of this font; and brings some of the sons of His enemies into the hands of Christians, and through this font introduces them into the kingdom from which their parents are strangers; while neither the one nor the other, being children, have merit or demerit of their own will.

The same argument is found in *Grace and Free-will*, chap. 44; *Predestination of the Saints*, chap. 24; *The Gift of Perseverance*, chap. 21.

That the same argument is used by Augustine four times in as many different treatises, reveals its great value in his eyes; and suggests that his teaching that from some men God withholds influences which save others was an inference from his teaching that, whereas baptized infants dying in infancy are saved, the unbaptized perish. If this be so, the distinctive features of Calvin's teaching about the divine decrees are derived ultimately from the ecclesiastical doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, a doctrine rejected by most Calvinists.

A strong protest against Calvin's teaching was raised by James Arminius, who was born near Utrecht in 1560, and died in 1609. In "My own Sentiments on Predestination"[1] he writes:

I. The FIRST absolute decree of God concerning the salvation of sinful man is that by which He decreed to appoint His Son, Jesus Christ, for a Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour, Priest, and King, who might destroy sin by His own death, might by His obedience obtain the salvation which had been lost, and might communicate it by His own virtue.

II. The SECOND precise and absolute decree of God is that in which He decreed to receive into favour *those who repent and believe*, and, in Christ, for His sake and through HIM, to effect the salvation of such penitents and believers as persevered to the end; but to leave in sin, and under wrath, *all impenitent persons and unbelievers*, and to damn them as aliens from Christ.

III. The THIRD divine decree is that by which God decreed to administer *in a sufficient and efficacious manner* the MEANS which were necessary for repentance and faith; and to have such administration instituted (1) according to the *Divine Wisdom*, by which God knows what is proper and becoming both to His mercy and His severity, and (2) according to *Divine Justice*, by which He is prepared to adopt whatever His wisdom may prescribe and put it in execution.

IV. To these succeeds the FOURTH decree, by which God decreed to save and damn certain particular persons. This decree has its foundation in the foreknowledge of God, by which He knew from all eternity those individuals who *would*, through His preventing grace, *believe*, and, through His subsequent grace, *would persevere*, according to the before-described administration of those means which are suitable and proper for conversion and faith; and, by which foreknowledge, He likewise knew those who *would not believe and persevere*.

This last article does not imply that God was moved to save men by His foreknowledge that they would accept salvation. Arminius merely asserts that from eternity God resolved to save or to destroy those who, as He foresaw,

[1] See his *Works*, translated by Nichols, vol. i., p. 247.

will accept or reject salvation. In other words, he traces the distinction between the saved and lost, not to God as Calvin does, but to themselves only.

The same teaching finds more careful expression in the five articles of the *Remonstrants*, presented to the States of Holland in the year following the death of Arminius, and in complete harmony with his teaching. Three of these five articles I now reprint.

Art. I. God, by an eternal, unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ His Son before the foundation of the world, has determined, out of the fallen sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ's sake, and through Christ, those who, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, shall believe in His Son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith and obedience of faith, through the grace even to the end; and, on the other hand, to leave the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath and to condemn them as alien from Christ, according to the word of the gospel in John iii. 36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him"; and according to other passages also of Scripture.

Art. III. Man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his own free will, inasmuch as he, in the state of apostasy and sin, can of and by himself neither think, will, nor do anything that is truly good (such as saving faith eminently is); but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ, through His Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding, inclination, or will, with all his powers, in order that he may rightly understand, think, will, and effect what is truly good, according to the word of Christ, John xv. 5, "Without Me, you can do nothing."

Art. IV. This grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of all good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without prevenient or assisting, awakening, following, and co-operative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good, nor withstand any temptations to evil; so that all good deeds or movements that can be conceived must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But, as respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many that they "have resisted the Holy Spirit": Acts vii., and elsewhere in many places.

The Dutch followers of Arminius soon developed a tendency to rationalism. This somewhat discredited them; and is a warning to all who share their protest against Calvin's doctrine of unconditional election and predestination. But it is unfair to use the term *Arminianism* for this later phase of belief. It should, to avoid endless confusion, be reserved for the actual teaching of Arminius.

The Synod of Dort condemned, in 1619, the tenets of the Remonstrants, and formulated five *Heads of Doctrine* in opposition to them, and in general, though not complete, agreement with the teaching of Calvin. From these I quote, under the first head of "Predestination," Art. 1:

As all men have sinned in Adam, lie under the curse, and are obnoxious to eternal death, God would have done no injustice by leaving them all to perish, and delivering them over to condemnation on account of sin.

Also Art. 6:

That some receive the gift of faith from God, and others do not receive it, proceeds from God's eternal decree: "for known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world:" Acts xv. 18, Eph. i. 11. According to which decree He graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however obstinate, and inclines them to believe; while He leaves the non-elect, in His just judgment, to their own wickedness and obduracy.

Yet with happy inconsistency, under the second head Art. 6 reads:

Whereas many who are called by the gospel do not repent nor believe in Christ but perish in unbelief; this is not owing to any defect or insufficiency in the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, but is wholly to be imputed to themselves.

The same teaching is found in *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, completed in November, 1646, the present standard of doctrine in all Presbyterian Churches. So in chap. iii. "Of God's Eternal Decree."

1. God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatever comes to pass: yet so, as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is

the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established. 2. Although God knows whatever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions ; yet hath He not decreed anything because He foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions. 3. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. 4. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed ; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished. 5. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving Him thereunto ; and all to the praise of His glorious grace. 6. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ ; are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season ; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only. 7. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice.

We now ask, What are the points common to Arminius and the Remonstrants on the one hand, and to Calvin, the Synod of Dort, and the Westminster Confession on the other ? Both parties agree to assert, and with equal emphasis, that salvation and every good in man are, from beginning to completion, a work of the grace of God and an accomplishment of His eternal purpose. This truth cannot be stated more clearly and forcefully than it is in the articles of the Remonstrants. The two parties differ in that Arminius

taught that the ultimate distinction between the saved and lost is in themselves only and not in God, *i.e.* that it lies hidden in the mystery of human personality. Calvin and the documents quoted above teach that the distinction lies hidden in the secret counsel of God and not in man.

It is worthy of note that of such *secret* counsel we never read in the New Testament. The mystery hidden for long ages in the silence of God has been manifested in Christ: Rom. xvi. 25, 26; 1 Cor. ii. 7, 10; Eph. iii. 2–6, 9, 10.

In view of the above, how shall we interpret the phrase *Renaissance of Calvinism*? Not in the sense of a reassertion of the great truth that salvation from beginning to completion is a work of the undeserved favour of God. For this was asserted as emphatically by Arminius as by Calvin. The only meaning we can attach to the phrase, especially in view of the common contrast of Calvinism and Arminianism, is that it denotes that element in the teaching of Calvin against which Arminius protested, *viz.* that the fate of everyone will be determined, not ultimately by anything he has done or thought or left undone, but simply and only by the secret purpose of God.

If there were any serious prospect of such revival of teaching which the rising moral sense of nearly all Christians has, during the latter half of the nineteenth century, utterly repudiated, we should need to gird on again the weapons which were so effective in our fathers' day and to sharpen them with the skill of modern devout scholarship. We should not fear the encounter. But of such conflict I see no signs whatever. Certainly no signs are to be found in the article before us. The only argument I find there is the influence of Calvinism in the past. But, as I have shown, the elements of Calvinism to which the writer points as the secret of its power, are equally conspicuous in the teaching of Arminius and his earliest followers. Whatever force there is in the article goes to show the need for a renaissance, not of Calvinism, but of Arminianism.

Our reviewer quotes Mark Pattison as saying that "in the sixteenth century Calvinism saved Europe." This

statement is not true. For the teaching which more than any other inspired the Reformation was Luther's loud proclamation of Justification and a New Life through faith, this being the kernel of the Epistle to the Romans and an echo of Christ's words in John iii. 16, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, in order that everyone who believes in Him may not perish but may have eternal life." To this great doctrine of salvation by faith, the distinctive teaching of Calvin was altogether subordinate. To a similar proclamation of the same doctrine was due the Methodist Revival, which has quickened and raised the whole English race on both sides of the Atlantic. But about this revival, so much nearer to us than is the Reformation, the reviewer is strangely silent. As a recognition of the great service thus rendered to the entire Church of Christ, I may quote a scholarly Anglican, Canon Perry. In a most interesting and useful volume, *The Student's English Church History*, Third Period, page 88, he writes:

> It is hardly possible to exaggerate the debt which the Church of England owes to John Wesley in respect of his teaching on absolute decrees, particular redemption, final perseverance, and the other doctrines involved in the Calvinistic controversy. Had it not been for the consistent opposition which he maintained to these views, and the strenuous battle fought by him and his assistants against them, the cause of spiritual religion in the Church of England might have been inseparably connected with an antinomian system, which impeaches the moral attributes of the deity as much as it excludes the proper place of righteousness in man.

That in this controversy, at a time when many godly men were found on each side, John Wesley ranged himself unhesitatingly on the side of Arminius, is to all Wesleyans and to many others a matter of deep gratitude to God. By so doing, he has directly or indirectly made the teaching of Arminius the belief of the progressive thought of nearly the whole English race on both sides of the Atlantic. In the more thoughtful and scholarly literature of our day, Calvinism now, in spite of its place in the Westminster Confession, rarely ventures to open its mouth. And not a

few who call themselves Calvinists are found, when examined, to be unconsciously Arminians. Unfortunately very few of them have read either Calvin or Arminius, the articles of the Remonstrants, or the canons of the Synod of Dort. But their enlightened moral sense forbids them to believe that, by withholding from men born in sin the grace which alone can save them, God has, by His own arbitrary will, doomed some of His intelligent creatures to destruction.

Some fifty to thirty years ago, in certain philosophical and scientific circles, there was a revival of a fatalism worse than any teaching of Calvin, and yet a logical inference from it. In the *Westminster Confession* we read that "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatever comes to pass." Fortunately, it contradicts itself by adding, "yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is . . . . the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away." How these statements can be harmonized the Confession does not say. Some modern thinkers have gone much farther than this, and have asserted that whatever takes place in the material world and in the outer and inner life of man is an inevitable outworking of forces operating before the earliest man lived on earth. See Mill's *Logic*, book vi., chap. 2; Herbert Spencer's *Principles of Psychology*, vol. i., pages 495–503; Huxley's *Lay Sermons*, page 142.

This teaching differs infinitely from that of Calvin in that it excludes all thought of supernatural influences rescuing man from the dominion of the material world and of sin. It leaves him helpless in face of temptation to sin, and of irrational forces carrying him to the grave. Calvin taught that God saves man by personal intervention. But unfortunately he also taught that these saving influences are limited by an arbitrary choice of God to a portion of our race, and that all others are left to perish. Moreover, the destruction awaiting these last is, in the teaching of Calvin, infinitely worse than anything involved in the teaching of Mill and Spencer. And for this terrible destruction, which contradicts our most elementary sense of justice, he makes God alone responsible.

A conspicuous feature of the article before us is the writer's apparent unconsciousness of the position taken by Arminius and by Wesley. On page 238 he asks:

> Will the next Evangelical revival be expressed in the Calvinistic symbols? When the wind of God blows again, as blow it will, which harp will be most responsive to its breath, that of Calvinism with its full tones of the doctrines of grace and the divine supremacy, or the less high-strung notes of appeal to human volition and effort?

Evidently the reviewer knows no other alternative. On page 241 he writes:

> If the only remedy for this false perspective is to be found in a restatement of the Calvinistic principle, we venture to think there are distinct indications of a renaissance of Calvinism already with us.

He adds doubtfully:

> If, however, Arminianism can state with equal or even sufficient stress this element in the Evangelical faith that "it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy," there is urgent need that it should do so.

Evidently he does not know that this was done by the Remonstrants in their articles presented to the States of Holland. The teaching of Wesley and the Methodist Revival he altogether ignores. On the other hand, on page 240 he repudiates high Calvinism with "its despotic and irresponsible decrees."

A more serious omission is the absence of any discussion of the truth or falsehood of the doctrines in question. For the only sure ground of confidence in the persistence of any belief is its truth. This is not proved by its prevalence or by the confidence with which it is held. For many beliefs now justly discarded have been widely and firmly accepted for a long time. The reviewer admits that the doctrine he hopes to see revived "has gone into exile." The only sufficient reason for expecting its return is that, even in exile, it is true. But this he has done nothing to prove.

To give a new name to an old and well known belief and

to call the teaching of Arminius *Calvinism*, is no doubt welcome to many who have abandoned the belief of their fathers and have, perhaps unconsciously, accepted the teaching of Arminius. It helps to conceal from others and indeed from themselves the change they have made. But it is both misleading and unfair.

The one element of good which I find in the article before us is that it calls attention to an important truth conspicuous in the teaching of Calvin which, though expressly and emphatically recognised by Arminius and by Wesley and the best modern evangelical theologians, has been somewhat overlooked in the popular theology of our day. But this defect must be supplied, not by reasserting Calvin's mixture of important truth and dangerous error, but by reasserting the full teaching of Arminius and of Wesley. Such renaissance of genuine Arminianism we shall heartily welcome.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

A REJOINDER.

BY the courtesy of the Editor the writer of the article in the October number of this REVIEW is allowed a brief Rejoinder to the foregoing Reply by Dr. Beet.

He ventures to sound once more the gentle iterance of those who fall into the hands of the critics—that his position has been imperfectly understood. Dr. Beet has not caught or not sufficiently considered the *motif* of the article and the distinctly defined position of the writer as stated on page 221 of the REVIEW:

> The writer has no intention of appearing as either the apologist or the exponent of Calvinism; he desires simply to offer a slight survey of certain conditions of life and thought that seem to warrant the assumption, whether we personally enjoy the prospect or not, of a probable and early renaissance of Calvinism. The attitude of this article, therefore, might fitly be described as an elongated note of interrogation. It is a balancing of proba-

bilities, a method no doubt proverbially elusive and illusive, but intensely interesting nevertheless, together with a suggestion as to the way the balance may turn.

This is the temper of the article. It is interrogatory throughout. Except in the statement of historical results the writer is not categorical; and these statements, made on the authority of recognised historical writers, Dr. Beet does not appear to impugn.

If the writer may make a further reference to the attitude of the article of a personal character before commenting upon Dr. Beet's strictures, he is free to confess that the article may be a partial illustration of Augustine's dictum, *Pectus theologum facit.* For some time past he has felt the intense, and as he thinks, the excessive human temper of much that passes current for Evangelical thought and teaching, and the consequent need for placing a fresh and insistent emphasis upon the will and energy of the grace of God as the initial and supreme principle in religion and life. With this in mind, though himself a conscious and convinced Arminian, so far as the original contents of that term state its position, and not an *unconscious* one as Dr. Beet assumes, he ventured upon an appreciation of what appear still to him as fairly definite tendencies of present-day thought upon the probable re-statement and quickened activities of the principle of the divine supremacy. This survey, much more historic than dogmatic, required a title, and for reasons he will presently seek to justify as against Dr. Beet's contentions, he chose "The Renaissance of Calvinism." The contrast of the article, however, is between the glory of God and the glory of human nature, and not at all between the systems of Calvin and Arminius as such. For as the REVIEW states on page 241:

> We have abstained from the use of the term Arminian in this article because we doubt whether for our own time Calvinism and Arminianism state precise and correct antitheses. If it should be urged against the survey here attempted that, as Matthew Arnold affirms, Arminianism also "gives the first and almost sole place to what God does, with disregard of what man

does," the reply is simple. In contending with the extreme demands of the Calvinistic development its opponents have so over-emphasised the authority of the appeal to the human in the economy of salvation, that the original, insistent, and persistent purpose of the will of God therein has been sensibly and seriously depreciated.

In view of Dr. Beet's criticism the ground of this opinion may be more fully expressed. Although theological terminology has necessarily an academic reference to the original and unmodified theses of its earliest exponents, it cannot live through generations of theological thought and controversy without receiving eventually a modified statement and usage more consonant with the current thought of its living teachers and advocates than with the strict terms of its original definitions. Probably few theological terms more fully illustrate this process than Calvinism and Arminianism. Each of these systems has produced as a resultant from constant modification a developed type which is fairly distinct and generally acknowledged. The working and present-day distinction between these two types the writer of the review thinks may be stated as a question of emphasis. Calvinism stands for the emphasis on the divine; Arminianism for its incidence upon the human. This position is stated at length in the REVIEW, pages 221–224, and this of itself might be regarded by some readers as rendering the burthen of Dr. Beet's criticism superfluous. The writer's contention is briefly stated thus:

Modern Calvinism we consider is mainly a question of emphasis. . . . The heart of its orthodoxy is the contention for the glory of God as against the glory of human nature. . . . It is an error in historical perspective to place predestination as the essential and first principle of Calvinism. Predestination was Augustinism, and as Augustinism it is as much an element in the faith of Catholicism as of Calvinism. . . . This (*viz.* the Calvinism of the decrees) we regard as an extreme, even if a logical, exaggeration of its true note. This has been the Nemesis of Calvinism, and would be such again. Its positions are far outposts of the system which its noblest defenders have

nobly abandoned, even at the risk of failing always to save their logic. The really strategic position is still persistently held by those who, as they think, have consistently surrendered its far-pushed points of defence.

As a typical statement of this position, and as indicating the present attitude of the dominant Calvinism of our day, some recent utterances of Principal Salmond are quoted.

With the writer's position so fully stated before him, it is singular that Dr. Beet should have intruded as the substance of his reply the valuable, but somewhat familiar exposition of the points of agreement and difference between the Calvinism and Arminianism of the original sources; and particularly that he should declare himself ready with martial eagerness to "gird on again the weapons which were so effective in our fathers' day, and to sharpen them with the skill of modern devout scholarship." That "of such conflict I see no sign whatever. Certainly no signs are to be found in the article before us" is not a fact to be wondered at, seeing that on page 240 of the REVIEW the writer says:

> It is natural to ask what form the Calvinistic principle redivivus will assume in the intellectual conditions of our time. We venture to think it will be practical rather than philosophical. The ancient and exasperating controversy regarding the freedom of the will in its relation to the divine sovereignty may be fairly considered a drawn battle. The compromise may be logically inconsistent; but Scripture and the practical reason, and probably the truest psychology, admit the mystery of the co-existence of these as operative forces.

Thus defined and guarded by the writer the terms involved no necessary reference to such ancient subjects of controversy whatever. The contrast of the article was between the Calvinistic principle as it is now stated and defended by its more influential exponents, and the present habits of thought and teaching of many who would doubtless claim to hold the Arminian position. In the opinion of the writer, whilst the modern modifications of Calvinism have approached more closely to the balance of the scriptural position, even perhaps at the expense of logical consistency, Arminianism in its

current forms has depreciated and lost very largely the marvellously fine discrimination of the Remonstrant articles, and drifted perilously near the semi-Pelagianism that has always been its danger on the theological side, and the excessive liberalism that quickly marks a depreciation of the strength of its ethical ideal in personal and national character. That neither of these positions could be regarded as the Calvinism of Calvin or as the Arminianism of Arminius and the Remonstrants goes without saying. Yet what are we to call them? If not Calvinism and Arminianism—what? The type surely persists even if the species is modified. The Methodism of the Wesleyans of to-day differs greatly from the historic and ecclesiastical position of Wesley, yet only the hyper-critical challenge their title to call themselves Wesleyan-Methodists.

Dr. Beet further complains, "a more serious omission is the absence of any discussion of the truth or falsehood of the doctrines in question." It has been already stated, as it was distinctly stated in the article, that the writer attempted no discussion of the doctrinal system of Calvin. Such a discussion was entirely outside the scope of the article. It is quite immaterial to the main contention of the article —the possible or probable renaissance of Calvinism—whether the system is true or false. Dr. Beet would not surely hold to his statement that "the only sufficient reason for expecting the return of a doctrine that has gone into exile is that it is true." Has error no vitality, no power of persistence, and no hope of revival? Cannot heresy know a renaissance as well as truth? Has not Dr. Beet given in the pages of this Reply a contradiction to his dictum here when he proves by a lengthy quotation from Augustine that even that which he attacks as the falsehood of Calvinism is itself a renaissance of error—a revival of Augustine's doctrine of predestination? For speaking of "the teaching of Calvin himself" Dr. Beet remarks, "this teaching was derived apparently from the much earlier teaching of Augustine." It is no sufficient ground, therefore, of objection to the renaissance of a doctrine that it is false. Whether

Calvinism is true or false the article makes no attempt to show; the only suggestion it makes is that whether true or false it may revive.

Dr. Beet's regret, expressed in his Reply, that unfortunately very few of those who call themselves Calvinists in the modern sense have read Arminius or the Remonstrant articles may be sincere, but it is a somewhat sweeping assertion. So far as the writer knows, Principal Salmond, Dr. Kuyper, and Dr. John Watson, the only modern exponents of Calvinism directly referred to in the article, have probably read at some time or other these well known standards.

Dr. Beet further remarks, "a conspicuous feature of the article before us is the writer's apparent unconsciousness of the position taken by Arminius and Wesley." The writer gravely assures Dr. Beet that he has considered these positions, but he does not forget how considerable a factor in the Evangelical revival in the eighteenth century and since has been the labours of those who have distinctly held the Calvinistic position, from the days of Whitefield to Moody; so that, historically at least, there is no *a priori* reason why the next great spiritual quickening may not find a vehicle in a renaissance of this principle. But Dr. Beet is scarcely correct in saying, "evidently the reviewer knows no other alternative."

The main point, however, of the relevant criticism of Dr. Beet's Reply is directed, as the writer understands it, chiefly against the title of the article. Dr. Beet thinks that what the writer anticipates would have been more accurately expressed, theologically, if he had spoken of the renaissance of Arminianism. "Whatever force there is in the article goes to show the need for a renaissance, not of Calvinism, but of Arminianism." The writer is in general agreement with Dr. Beet's statement respecting the Calvinistic and Arminian position as originally expressed: "Both parties agree to assert, and with equal emphasis, that salvation and every good in man are, from beginning to completion, a work of the grace of God, and an accomplishment of His eternal

purpose," with the exception of the qualification and "with equal emphasis." For is it not the difference of emphasis put upon this common statement that becomes historically the principle of differentiation between the developed systems of Calvin and Arminius? Arminius let the emphasis of his system as distinct from Calvin's find its incidence upon the human modification of God's purpose of grace; Calvinism kept it upon the absoluteness of the grace. Arminianism has always stood for the modification in the processes of salvation of the purpose of grace by human freedom and co-operation. Now, if when the writer was making a survey of the possible conditions in present-day life and thought of a return of the emphasis to the supreme authority of the sovereign grace of God in human life, he had called his survey a renaissance of Arminianism, Dr. Beet would probably have been swift to note the technical error in the writer's terminology. For after all, Arminianism stands historically and practically for the recognition of the human as an essential factor in the processes of spiritual restoration and achievement, and it is precisely this recognition, grown out of due proportion to the place assigned it in the original protest of Arminius and the Remonstrants, that constitutes in the writer's judgment the excess that may easily result for our own day, in a fresh insistence upon the Calvinistic emphasis—*Deo soli gloria*, God first and God last. For assuredly it is Calvinism, and not Arminianism, that has stood both in the popular and in the academic mind for this distinct contention. Moreover, the history of Calvinism, as the article points out, has supported this claim, as that of Arminianism has failed to do. For these reasons, therefore, the writer is disposed to plead that the heading, "The Renaissance of Calvinism," is not altogether misplaced. For when the pendulum swings away from any exaggeration on one side of the even balance of truth, it is usually the opposite extreme that for a time is brought into prominence.

FREDERIC PLATT.

THE PRESENT CONDITION OF JUDAISM IN ENGLAND.

1. *Pride of Race.* A Novel. By B. L. FARJEON.
2. *Children of the Ghetto.* By I. ZANGWILL.
3. *The Exodus of Naomi.* By LILY H. MONTAGU.
4. *The Jewish Quarterly Review.* Various Articles in recent Numbers.
5. *The Jewish World.* Discussion: "Has the Synagogue Failed?"
6. *The Jewish Chronicle.* Letters and Contributions of Mr. J. H. LEVY and Others on "Jewish Reform," etc.
7. *Archæology and Authority.* Chapter by Canon DRIVER, D.D.
8. *A Rabbi's Impressions of the Oberammergau Passion-Play.* By Rabbi JOSEPH KRAUSKOPF, D.D. (Philadelphia: Edward Stern & Co.)

I.

EVER since I wrote a memoir of Moses Mendelssohn, which appeared in a volume entitled *German Life and Literature*, published in 1881, I have taken a keen interest in Jewish development and the endeavours made to reform Judaism. I have closely followed the discussions about changes effected or proposed; the divisions that have arisen, and the splits resulting; and have attempted to estimate the prospects of Zionism and its influence on Judaism broadly. And, above all, I have tried to get a satisfactory explanation of the fact that the descendants of some of the most devoted Jews of the last century are now

detached, have abandoned Judaism, and are not reckoned of the "faithful." I well remember that both the *Jewish Chronicle* and *The Jewish World* in this country, and various Jewish journals abroad, with a note of deep regret, and with honest undisguised concern, raised the question why it was that almost all the descendants of Moses Mendelssohn had, properly speaking, deserted the religion of their fathers. Both the English journals returned again and again to the subject. In my view now, after much further thought about it, I believe that Moses Mendelssohn himself unwittingly prepared the way. He was fain to reconcile modern culture, the *Aufklärung*, with devout Jewish orthodoxy and observance, though in the process of effecting this he made an end of the Talmudic tradition, as Heine put it. What sufficed for him hardly sufficed for minds less acute and genially adaptive; less ingenious and less apt at finding a happy *via media*.

When, therefore, I am told by some faithful and unyielding Jews that "in the Talmud only does the Hebrew spirit fully live"; that the "deathless reality of a national life is here fitly enshrined,"—then I am compelled to see that in such work as that of Moses Mendelssohn, noble and well meant though it was, there lies the seed of endless division and contest. Whatever may be said of the Talmud in itself, it is historically a part of Judaism—its wide influence, its force, its keen-wrought myths, and its poetry, no less than the wonderful and touching incidents of actual life worked round it, make it nothing short of perilous to try to banish it from practical effect in Jewish life. If Moses Mendelssohn made an end of Talmudic tradition, he at the same time made an end of a good deal else—the old-fashioned faith and power of the Jew; for he would be a modern, and in effect a Gentile by culture, learning, and sympathy, and yet remain a Jew. He got rid of Talmudic tradition because he could write a Phædon; but to few is such gift allotted. He too had obtained a glimpse of "the joyous revelation of humanity in Hellenism." But only to exceptional natures is it given to reconcile in their

own conception such contradictions, such opposites; and, this being so, Mendelssohn's descendants took their part with "the joyous revelation of humanity in Hellenism," and relinquished Judaism altogether. For them there was no temptation in Moses' *via media*. It was too narrow for them to travel on, and too strait. When answering Lavater, Goetze, and others, Mendelssohn used a striking illustration. He told them that he lived in the lower story of the house, while they lived in the upper one; and would they, if fire broke out, have him to try to escape into the upper story, which would first tumble down? It was ingenious, but it was not sound. He should have told them that no upper story could ever be erected on the one-flat house he dwelt in. But Plato and Hellenism made him try for new combinations, new and hitherto unheard of associations; and hence a new sort of platonised Christianity, as upper story of the house in which Judaism was the ground floor or the basement.

In a certain broad sense, Jewish reformers ever since have been following Moses Mendelssohn in attempting the impossible;—so to translate Judaism that it could live not only alongside Christianity and modern culture, but in the same house with them, on a kind of equal terms—reciprocity, if you like,—and without differences or strained relations, not to speak of intolerances or hatreds. Let us look at some of the later deliverances of distinguished English Jews in this light, and try to see how far they repeat Moses Mendelssohn's experiment and mistake, and how far they avoid this. Mr. Montefiore has been prominent in this cause, and has drawn many others into the arena—the very contests that have arisen even among his own party attesting all that I have said about the impossibility of unity on this line or on these lines.

II.

Mr. Montefiore, when reviewing and extolling Dr. Wiener's rather sulky and ungracious attack upon the Jewish dietary laws, cries out with unmistakable emphasis and fervour:

Is Judaism always to be regarded as an antiquarian, obsolete, Oriental religion, made up of, and constituted by, strange and funny customs, which even its own adherents as soon as they are Europeanised begin gradually to throw aside and disregard? Who will believe in a God who reveals rules about slaughtering cattle, and solemnly ordains that milk must not be eaten with meat? The whole thing seems to us now, at the best, childlike and strange, at the worst, unworthy and degrading.

All that may be very true; but surely it is odd to hear it from a Jew, who is fain to conserve what he thinks essential; as odd as it would be to hear from a Gentile that the Jewish faith is now one and indivisible. If all this had reference merely to some detail or details about which rational doubt might be entertained, it would have an element of feasibility and hope in it; but it goes clean to the centre—to the very character and being of the Hebrew God—His ethics and His claim; and if, being Jews, you hope to retain what you hold is a religion, and actually aim at uplifting, clarifying, and improving it by getting rid of the central and dominating traits of its God, which must ultimately affect belief even in His existence, then I must tell you that I cannot but regard you as working for something else than reform—for destruction complete and final, though you may not see it. Just as well might a Mohammedan preach against Allah, because of a certain expression of the prophet in the 54th Sura of the Koran, and declaim against praying to him, and yet hold that he was working for a purer and loftier Islam!

One of two things: (1) Either the Jews, as Mr. Montefiore holds, are consciously or unconsciously Europeanised and their religion cannot then be held in strictness or celebrated in reality as it was of old; or (2) the Jews do maintain this, and show still, under all coatings of culture, traces, clear and assertive, of the rock whence they were hewn; and are consequently still out of sympathy with and alien utterly from the aspirations, the hopes, and aims of those among whom they live and whose suffrages they now share. If the Jews are still one in race and one in faith in this

sense, awkward questions arise on various points as regards their possibilities of true citizenship.

Mr. J. H. Levy's concluding words in a paper entitled "The Three Paths" in the *Jewish Chronicle* for November 11, 1898, are logically final on this point:

> Either we English and French Jews are citizens of England and France respectively, with the feelings of citizens, or we regard ourselves as mere guests, who would rather have a hut in Jericho than a palace in Kensington or the Champs Elysées. If the latter, we are aliens in spirit; and I know not on what ground we can ask the peoples of England and France to regard us and treat us as full citizens. We cannot have it both ways.

III.

Again, Mrs. M. Joseph, whom Mr. Montefiore, surely in a moment of effusion and over-gallantry, if not even of unconscious irony of self-sacrifice, enlisted to follow him on the dietary laws in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, maintains that "the separateness of Israel must be assured,—the kingdom of priests must be preserved among the congregation of humanity—by observances that differentiate it sharply from the rest of the world."

Wonderful! The congregation is humanity, and the priests are to be absolutely separated from it! Judaism here again, as with Maimonides and Moses Mendelssohn, was to be "legislated only for Jews"; but the congregation is humanity, and *it* is not and cannot be proselytising.

> "If Judaism," Mrs. Joseph proceeds, "is to perform its errand it must live, and to live it must be Judaism, and not vague theism. How it is to be anything else without these distinctive laws I know not, nor do I believe that anyone can tell me."[1]

Mrs. Joseph quotes appropriately and writes nervously. She finds all these scrupulous separations of milk and butter and meat, and purging the house of leaven at Passover time, and most painfully working at once four quite different sets of cooking-pots and keeping them separate,

[1] "The Ideal of Judaism," p. 54.

do most wonderfully "make for holiness." Only one thing must be admitted: the scrupulosity and painful care took time, and there were lots of immigrant Jews down Whitechapel way that much wanted to be taught separation and how to keep separate milk and meat when they had them; and some will say that holiness might have been gained by a portion of the time Mrs. Joseph then gave to the four sets of cooking-pots being bestowed on them. One bit of strict Judaism is thus, surely, too involved in ceremonialism, and another is not enough involved in it. Some efficient link between the two might aid the holiness of both. And yet, according to Mrs. Joseph, it is among the poorest and most struggling that the highest self-sacrifice and devotion to rabbinical rule are to be found. That, indeed, is one of the later miracles of Judaism; and so lofty the results that it would be a pity to get rid of it—to raise such people to the height of culture which tends so directly to cause a loss of their devotion.

"I know of starving men and women," she cries, "who will not eat at the tables of the rich, because the food is not *kosher*; of others who refuse the most tempting dainty because to partake of it would be an infringement of the enactments about butter and meat"

—which Mr. Montefiore, for his part, thinks is nothing but Orientalised rabbinical humbug!

In opposition to this, a thoughtful Jew like Mr. J. H. Levy, whose whole force is directed to celebrating and conserving the ethical elements of Judaism, against even "Maimonides' baker's dozen of dogmas," in a letter to the *Jewish Chronicle* (October 6, 1899), writes:

They (the mass of Jews) have been too absorbed in such momentous questions as whether a mutton chop can be eaten off a plate which has once held a piece of cheese, to give adequate attention to the most vital problems of ethics.

Ceremonial observance and ethics are at odds with each other, and very directly, in Jewish experience—a matter which does not seem to have occurred to certain Jews—

even reforming Jews who, alas! give the ethical aspect the go-by.

Mrs. M. Joseph may be just a little overflowing in her celebrations of her poor co-religionists; but there can be no doubt that she very neatly hits Mr. Montefiore when she says Judaism is and must remain something different from mere theism, if it is to live at all, and that it cannot properly live without that which makes it differ. In one word, Is a Judaism without that which has, in the eyes of its wisest men and upholders, been most essential to it, in any way really possible? Mr. Montefiore and his allies do not help us. English deism and rationalistic Unitarianism are not and cannot be transmogrified into Judaism, any more than it can be transmogrified into them, at the touch of an eclectic modern philosophy and so-called humanistic culture.

Miss Lily Montagu, in her article on "The Spiritual Possibilities of Judaism To-day," dwells much on the presence and the conflict of "East-end Jews" and "West-end Jews"; though, it should be noted, this does not mean a hard-and-fast topographical distinction, but only, broadly, a mood of mind, a way of looking at things. The East End, she says in effect, is too Talmudic, too much given to ritual, and a fixed belief in its necessity and efficacy; the West End is too easy, indifferent, accommodating, rationalistic,—conforming, as far as it does conform, merely for convenience or for benefit: the very synagogue a meeting-place for merchants and traffickers. There is, somehow, a great want of a "happy medium"—a bond between the two, which are as distant from each other as Jew is from Christian at many points. Miss Lily Montagu mourns, and thinks she has good ground for mourning, over "the condition of modern Judaism" from every point of view, for it presents a grievous aspect to honest observers. She wishes

> a place for progressive religious thought, even if Jacob, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah must be faced. . . . We can only combat our tendency to self-indulgence and to spiritual sloth by having fasts and holidays reserved for communion with God. To us English

Jews the call is clear and unmistakable; there can be no excuse for indifference or awaiting.

And she has no fear of the future of Judaism, if "*ignorance and devotion* do not contend with enlightenment. To answer the challenge of the East-end Jew, we must prove that our faith is no longer comatose, and that we are really striving after an ideal," etc., etc.

But one great question is, Which ideal? The ideal of the older Jews or of the modern cultured Jews? Does the ideal really look behind or before, and does it carry ethical reform in the individual life with it as well as improvement and attractiveness in the synagogue services? "Ignorance and devotion," are they fated by their very nature to contend with "enlightenment," or can the two be reconciled? The one prescription of the older Jews was to set anathema on all enlightenment—heathen culture was to them accursed; they could not see any means of reconciliation between their tenets and the science and learning of the outer world; for them the old ark and the refuge of their old book, —which, as Heinrich Heine says, actually became their country,—and their old temple or synagogue were enough. Were they right, or are the modern enlightenment men right? That is the question that recurs and insists on being answered, and answered straight.[1]

IV.

In truth, the enfranchisement of the Jews, which has opened wide to them the gates of culture and scientific knowledge, has, in a yet deeper if narrower sense, disenfranchised or disenchanted them with their religion and

[1] I do not forget Miss Montagu's extensive and successful social work. The Jewish Working Girls' Club and the Clerks' Industrial Association, which she has founded and organised, are her great witnesses; she has by them made effective links between weak and struggling workers and those who not only can aid them directly, but indirectly by seeking modifications in the law in their favour. She has thus practically done her part to "answer the challenge of the East-end Jew."

its services, if not even with their traditions and their very language. Their religion and their traditions were truly a solace to them while yet they were proscribed, and hunted, and suffered; their faith was an ark of safety; a city of refuge while they were isolated, disliked, robbed, and cruelly entreated. The very prominence of Israel and Jahveh, which now too often repels, was then the one upbearing support —it was a source of comfort in recalling a long past of trial as well as of glory. But, as Mr. Montefiore has pointed out, nowadays a Jew is touched and drawn by a thousand influences. He must regard himself as a free member of a far larger community than his old Judaism. He goes into society; he has passed through universities, English and foreign; he dines out; he desires to exercise power in imperial and municipal politics. If he has lost his old country and has not yet truly found a new one, he may yet make the pseudo new one tributary so far to his own power and self-importance. He must not then be too singular, nor assert his Judaism too much. He is a member of clubs, and clubland is a wonderful wearer-down of angles—"ground in yonder social mill, we rub each other's angles down." The triumph of the Gentile is also his defeat, as in a deeper sense it is "too with the Jew." The Jew has been made a citizen—if not, indeed, a citizen of the world; and the Jew is de-nationalised, and comes, alas, also to crave a de-nationalised faith that will be accommodating—a religion not for a proscribed and suffering race, but for a gentleman, and what is more for a "hilely eddicated," cultured gentleman. And so Jewry, if it is modernised, is bound and paralysed, and the Jew, if much alive, looks back only on his bound and half-dead Jewry, and does not even seek to galvanise it into life. Mr. Montefiore writes thus of baptism and circumcision:

> Some rites are unæsthetic altogether—contrast, for example, the initiatory rites of baptism and circumcision. The dogmas and narratives which underlie both may be equally untrue; but the one is capable of spiritualisation, the other is not. Circumcision, connected as it is with primordial ideas and practices of

a highly superstitious and barbarous kind, is a great stumbling-block to modern minds, whether from the æsthetic, the spiritual, or the critical point of view.

All that may be very true; but fancy Judaism without circumcision because it is *unæsthetic*! Circumcision was absolutely the outward token or symbol of entrance into the covenant of Jahveh. Is there, indeed, anything in this covenant of Jahveh, or is there not? When it ceases to be so recognised as anything effectual or essential, then Judaism has indeed lost at once its crown and its corner-stone, and become unhistorical, lopped, and utterly evacuated of symbolic meaning as well as of reality—detached from its root, like a cut flower stuck in the earth. It will then be only an "ism" among other "isms."

And there is yet more than this. Mr. Montefiore is fain to make his case clear, even if he will make an end of Judaism. Listen to him as he sets out the causes that work to the destruction of Judaic worship and service. Other causes, he writes, are—

(1) That the services are uninteresting;

(2) That they are Oriental, and neither modern nor Western;

(3) That the singing has no instrumental accompaniment, and is often very, very poor;

(4) That the sexes are separated, so that the wife cannot sit by the side of her husband;

(5) That Saturday's services are an additional inconvenience and difficulty.

Even the language itself has become a bugbear and a drawback—a drawback alone! Yes; with regard to the very simple matter of Hebrew in the Jewish service in England, Mr. Montefiore would change all that. It has grown to be a point of the greatest significance.

"Many desert the synagogue," he writes, "for this among other reasons. What of Hebrew they have learnt as children they have now completely forgotten, and other calls press too hard upon them to permit of their re-learning it. *It is in no way available for use or profit in other ways.*"

And so the cat is out of the bag. We know where we are, and to what a simulacrum or *caput mortuum* Mr. Montefiore, in his pursuit of æsthetic worship and a cult purified of excess on either side, would reduce Judaism in trying to save it from itself, and to make it something else than it really is. Services uninteresting! and they are mainly reminiscent of, or commemorative of, the greatest deliverances recorded of any people—the very language itself a witness and a token of wonders in a long past!

But what then, on Mr. Montefiore's plan, of the solidarity of Judaism? Is it to be one thing in the East, and quite another thing in the West, and yet another thing—a strange *tertium quid* indeed—in all the latitudes that lie between? Is it, instead of a grand consolidated system, demanding unity on certain essentials between those professing it wherever placed, to be a something determined absolutely by geographical lines or by latitude? Some future adventurer, fulfilled of the passion of research, will set out on a world-journey to find the true form of Judaism, and, returning, will declare that it does not exist, never has existed, and never will exist! That traveller, in his strange divagations, will surpass even Lord Macaulay's New Zealander soliloquising on the ruins of London Bridge!

At the same time, the Rev. Isidore Harris, in opening a debate at the Maccabeans, got an identical result by an exactly reverse method. A Jew, according to him, was a man who observed these four things: Circumcision, the Sabbath, the Passover, and the Day of Atonement. The Sabbath observance, in modern conditions in the West, was not, at length, found to be strictly workable; in some circumstances of isolation, it would be hard to tell whether the Passover and Day of Atonement were, in strictness, kept; and therefore two of the tests were inefficient and could not be applied. And if these have so gone, what of the integrity of the others which were bound up with and stood or fell with them?

But would Judaism indeed be Judaism with an English service, the singing drowned by modern instruments, and the

name of Humanity, say, put in place of Israel and Jahveh, and circumcision gone wholly too? Judaism then, rather too like the Irishman's gun, wants a new stock, lock, and barrel. Judaism, according to Mr. Montefiore, is to suffer a sea-change into "something rich and strange"; and be transmuted into quite modern and philosophic guise, to surprise the world, and maybe bring in "The Golden Year"! We cannot conceive it; to transform it so were but to destroy it; if it survives it must be because of that which is permanent in it and essential to it, and cannot be wiped out or modified and refined away. It ceases to be Judaism the moment you have made it, in Mr. Montefiore's sense, Western and European and English! Ethicism, Ethnicism, what you like to call it—it does not matter much: you have introduced a new religion, if you have not confessedly and honestly buried an old one!

To such straits are the modern Jewish reformers put—the men that would fain stand between the new ways and the old; they would cut away the foundation, the very corner-stone, and say the building is unaltered, and still as safe as ever; they would be mere Anglo-Hebrew Deists or Unitarians, and yet would hold that they have saved, regenerated, and purified Judaism. Mr. I. Abrahams says in his *Jewish Mediæval Life*: "It is not impossible that men and women prayed together [in the synagogue] in Talmudic times" (page 25). But if they did it was one of the most wonderful interludes of reform we have ever heard of, and Mr. Montefiore should really have founded far more upon it!

Thus the problem at last becomes a paradox. Judaism, which was legislated only for Jews, as Maimonides suggested and Moses Mendelssohn unqualifiedly affirmed, is now to be transformed and transmogrified for the convenience and satisfaction of those who are tired of it, and just in the measure that they are tired of it have ceased to be Jews in everything save mere physical traits or other outward tokens of race. Judaism, if it is a witness for anything great and specific in the past, cannot merely, at the desire of certain "enfranchised" spirits, put off its clothes, not to say its skin,

and assume new clothes or skin and remain the same as it was before. No; and because it cannot, it will not bear being made modern and wholly occidentalised, as Mr. Montefiore would fain have it. If it was a mere accident that Abraham went out of Ur of the Chaldees, and yet more an accident that he settled where he did—an accident that Moses led the "chosen people" through the desert and worked the works he did, then it may be so; but if not, evolution itself will protest against the simulacra to which Mr. Montefiore would fain reduce Judaism.

Mr. Levy, who in *The Jewish Chronicle* for February 8, 1901, demonstrated that the Dispersion had acted as a chemical reagent, and precipitated separately each of the three great elements in Judaism, so that now Hebrew nationalism and the destinies of Israel are not, as they were, identified, goes on to exclaim:

> Fancy a religion being saved from sterility and disappearance, not by kindling an emotion which shall focus our lives on that which we regard as the highest end, not by putting aside dogmas which are beyond the reach of verification, and have become a source of demoralisation even to the religious teachers themselves, but by being divested of its historical elements. . . . The reason why "Jewish religious reform" has hitherto been so sterile is because it has been made to "pivot on this change from Orientalism to Occidentalism." If any practice is discarded, it should not be because it is Oriental or specifically Jewish, but because it is noxious or at least valueless. I do not believe that our non-Jewish neighbours will prove more than usually intolerant to Jewish customs and symbolism, provided that Jewish religion and the men and women who profess it are worthy of respect.

V.

One very peculiar cross-current we have found powerfully running, with which Mr. Montefiore finds himself so far carried along, and will at last find himself probably carried farther along than he desires. It lies in the inevitable reconstructions which disinterested criticism finds itself more and more compelled to insist upon with regard to the Hebrew

sacred book itself and Mosaism, pressing home questions regarding the reliability of report about facts, dates, etc., etc., and raising doubts about Moses and much else. In view of this we may seek to fortify ourselves here by quoting a great Christian authority:

As Professor Kautzsch some years ago truly said, in a survey of the present state of the study of theology, a large amount of reconstruction is necessary. No good work can fail to help forward the desired end; in spite of ourselves, we are now all radical reformers. Kuenen was by nature and temperament a conservative; circumstances and obedience to conscience made him a reformer. Our grammars and lexicons will but slowly adopt new critical results; but they cannot fail to do so, sooner or later, when these results have been tested and assimilated by a sufficient number of scholars. We shall yet understand the Old Testament Scriptures much better than we do at present.[1]

But the fuller understanding will not, in our idea, go to favour the notion of a reformed rationalised Jewish Church such as Mr. Montefiore favours.

VI.

The manner in which the Jews and their friends and apologists possess themselves of newspapers and every avenue of publicity to ride their hobbies and to celebrate themselves, to snatch, as it were, a fearful joy from boldly ignoring or defying all this, is only one among many proofs that they are not now anything like what their religion and their rabbis of old would have had them to be. They are fully in the swim. They are to the fore in all Gentile escapades, adventures, and speculations. They are up to all ways of working oracles or "pulling the ropes."

Mr. Levy, in *The Jewish World*, unhesitatingly said:

Let the truth be told. The average Jew cares nothing about religion. What he calls his religion is only a specious sort of social pastime, *which naturally loses its hold on him as he becomes immersed in the social life of the nation of which he forms a part.*

[1] Professor Cheyne on the word יְהוָה in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. II., p. 402.

And on another occasion, dealing with the deplorable condition of modern English Judaism, he said, "It was as full of shams as a Wardour Street shop"; and while he deprecated the idea of creating a new life under the ribs of death by endowing the Jewish clergy with more power, forming them into a more compact rabbinate, and doing away with the Parnassim, he ridiculed the idea of the synagogue being to blame—that it was exactly what the people themselves had made it.

But if their religion is so consolidated and so secure in its own strength and amenities, why do they so transgress its demands and concern themselves with the Gentile culture, complexity, politics, literature? The rabbis of the Middle Ages, nay, the rabbis of a century and a half ago, discouraged all this; to render their Hebrew attractive to the Jews, and in so far to keep Hebrew a living language, they declared against the use of any foreign tongue for purposes of ordinary converse or communication among themselves, and that they might remain a community separate and pure, in the sense they meant. But now is there not ground enough for Mr. Montefiore's rather piteous representation that to more than one half the English Jews by race the use of Hebrew in the synagogue services is a bugbear and a grievance and an irritation, because they cannot in the least understand it, having forgotten the little they had learned in their youth? Why, it is all too clear the Jewish faith so-called is already divided between the few who can follow Hebrew in the synagogue with ease and comfort and the many who cannot. And yet now and then we come across bold and unqualified statements like this:

> The faith and race of the Jew are one, and the death of the one means death to both. Jews cannot surrender their racial separation without going over to one or other of the dominant creeds. And, on the other hand, mankind would think less, and not more, of the Jew if merely for the *beaux yeux* of unreasonable critics he sacrificed the faith that was in him, and for which he has suffered the martyrdom of more than a thousand years.

In this deliverance we have no hint of the inevitable

process of which we have spoken, of which Mr. Montefiore makes so much. The Jew, in joining the marching army of culture and of science, cannot possibly stand exactly where his forebears did, simply because he is in the march of culture and of science. Look at Mr. Zangwill: he succeeds, greatly succeeds, by making his race amusing; he shifts the scenes, and the tragedy at his sweet will becomes a comedy, that the more surely he may be read; the Ghetto is no more self-enclosed or proscribed; he makes it but, as it were, the mimic scene in a theatre. No matter how artistically and cleverly he does it; our case is proved by the fact that it is done by a Jew, with no increase of the sense that something has been lost when a Jew can turn his Jewry into a subject for the European theatre, or into material for the circulating library. If Nathaniel Hawthorne used to figure his stern, grim, forbidding, steeple-hatted Puritan ancestors as looking down on him with scorn and rebuke as a frivolous and fantastic writer of story-books, is it too severe or too preposterous to think of the select yet grim Sephardim forefathers of Mr. Zangwill looking down on him, revealing them so and turning them into laughing-stocks for the Gentile crowd, with eyes of reprobation, and of grief and anger, if not of despair?

Yet Mr. Zangwill foregoes nothing of his lofty ideal of Jewry. If it has mixed itself with the Gentile world, getting subdued to what it works on like the dyer's hand, Mr. Zangwill, in spite of disgust felt often at debased Viennese Jews and others, will not have the Jew absorbed or levelled down. He is a high point to which the whole world must rise. Not very long ago, in an American message, Mr. Zangwill expressed the belief that the world was daily coming round to the Jewish conception of life. The Christian nations, he said, were warring against one another, like savages. The battle of the future, he thought, was between the old Judaism and the new Paganism. A sense of justice was what the world needed to-day—such justice as was preached and *foretold* by the great Jewish prophets, and if Mr. Zangwill read the signs aright it would be left to the

Jewish race—whether as a model community in Palestine or as a spiritual army scattered over the world—to supply this need, and to make justice supreme in the hearts of men.

Mr. Zangwill does not distinguish here. He himself has mourned—how often has he mourned?—over the decadent and unworthy Jews, lost to all reverence, to all high ideals. Is this new race to be drawn from them in part, or wholly withdrawn from them? Is it to be, as Mr. M. Arnold was fond of saying, "a remnant," or what? Or is all Jewry to be once more and suddenly transformed to meet his demand? And what of the old Judaism really survives to-day? What of it is now operative and effective? Mr. Zangwill has a heavy balance of what distresses him—humbles him, as he admits—to meet and to dispose of before the Jews, who are almost everywhere interested in wars, etc., join the remnant effectively to preach justice to the nations, and, what is more, to show it effectively in practice.

But there is truly a strange twist or turn in Mr. Zangwill's mind. He is not logical; he is not consistent; he even forgets wholly what he has said before. On New Year's Day, 1901, he was tempted by the editor of *The Morning Leader* to say something to the young generation of Jews; he did not think many of them would be fasting on that day—the first day of the twentieth century, which, by a significant coincidence, was the eighteen hundred and thirty-first anniversary of the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans. Possibly not 1 per cent., he lays it down. He thinks it probably denotes a mere indifference to nineteen centuries of tragic history; *a vulgar degeneration*! And yet out of these degenerated Jews is to come the power that is to teach justice and lofty ideals and aspirations to the world—to the nations now like savages! He goes on to write: "The older generation at least sacrificed something to an imaginative ideal." Yet they were mere muddlers. "The Jew of the twentieth century must not be content to muddle on like the Jews of the preceding nineteen centuries of exile, uniting breadth of vision in business with short-sightedness in religion and politics." And yet they sacrificed

to an imaginative ideal, which the younger generation does not do. "The younger Jew must take his deliberate choice between a national centre in Palestine or elsewhere, and a purely spiritual Church, *free* from racial exclusiveness and national hopes."

"A purely spiritual Church" is thus directly opposed to "racial exclusiveness and national hopes," and *vice versâ*. The final choice of Israel is between the two. He speaks of "*evolution—conscious* evolution—to a more spiritual, less nationalistic Judaism." Now, if this is the way of "evolution—conscious evolution"—what will the mere national localised Church in Palestine or elsewhere be? An "evolution—conscious evolution"—too? There is not much definiteness about evolution here any more than is often found elsewhere. But what really means "a more spiritual, less nationalistic Judaism"? Judaism is so expressly national—as Mendelssohn, following Maimonides, said, it was legislated only for Jews—that I for one cannot conceive it denationalised and practically to remain Judaism. Nationalism strictly is the one true and sufficing basis it has. With Mr. Zangwill here it is to be "non-national, non-traditional, and spiritual," which makes it by inference to have been originally national, traditional, and non-spiritual. And yet the degenerate Jew of the nineteenth century is to guard at least one "traditional trait" in his efforts towards a purely spiritual Church "free from racial exclusiveness and national hopes." If words mean anything, Mr. Zangwill really wants a non-Jewish Church purely spiritual, free from racial exclusiveness and national hopes. This, to my mind, would want a true binding and sufficing motive. It would have no reason for existing apart from other Churches like unto it. Circumcision, the symbol of entrance into the covenant of Jahveh, of membership of the Jewish congregation or synagogue, would Mr. Zangwill maintain that, or would he make an end of it? That is but one of a score of testing questions which might be put to him. Another might be this: Are Jews to maintain "a purely spiritual Church, free from racial exclusiveness and national hopes," apart wholly from other

Churches? Then it cannot in the strict sense be spiritual. Or is it to be still strictly a *Jewish* Church in any sense whatever, or is it not?

A Jewish Church, however spiritual and however elevated, must regard itself as something separate from other Churches. If it does not oppose, it must ignore them. If it does not pose because of its antiquity, it must at least implicitly act on the idea, if it is to be indeed, in any sense, Jewish. The rules or laws under which only as a Jewish Church it can place itself, are rules or laws which directly touch customs which have distinctly a social and even a political reference. The legislation which they regard, and must regard, as final and inspired, at once affects proceedings that are physiological or physical. The more a Church tries, in the only sense Mr. Zangwill can mean, to be spiritual and acting on higher ideals, the less must it be, in strictness, a *Jewish* Church; it can only gain in spirituality by losing in nationality and in tradition; it cannot be built up on mere negations either—no Church that has persisted and exercised any influence ever was—and where are the new motives or inducements to spirituality and elevation to come from? Not from the Mosaic legislation truly, which, as Maimonides and Moses Mendelssohn said, was legislated only for Jews; and as long as it remains in the least so in effect, is logically and really dead against all such modifications as would bring it into line with other religions, however lofty and however beautiful elsewhere. Would Mr. Zangwill, like Mr. Montefiore, get rid of circumcision? Would he get rid of such observances as those of Tabernacles? How far would he go, and where would he stop? And to what point would he go in holding association or communion with other Churches?

Zionism itself—in which lies the hope of some of the most active and earnest Jews—seems destined more and more to split Jewry into fiery and contending factions. One set go for an absolute restoration of a national centre, by which new life shall be given to the strictest ideal of traditional Jewish observance. Not only that. It must be an *imperium in imperio*—an isolated, self-dependent organism—in

everything sufficient in itself. The other is eager only to plant out colonies of Jews at separate though favourable points, utterly disregarding what may be called the national and traditional views. There is no solidarity or contact possible between these two as permanent dominating influences. Mr. Zangwill and those who circle round him, with their somewhat attenuated ideals and wholly academic notions of Jewish unity, are not likely for a very long time to overcome the decided practical views of the richer and more authoritative Jews both in England and elsewhere, who, after all, though it may be inconsistently from the highest ground, hark back on something like nationality, tradition, and continuity, historical and other.

Later events and deliberations seem quite to confirm this position. At the recent Zionist Congress at Basle (December 27–31, 1901), when Sir H. Montefiore one day presided, "the obstacles in the way of the Zionist movement were severely condemned, mention being made of the high Jewish financial circles and the German rabbis; and it was held that the abstinence of these sections from the movement constituted one of its chief difficulties." On a later day (December 30), Mr. Zangwill made a spirited attack on the Jewish Colonisation Association, and moved a resolution condemning the conduct of the Trustees of the Hirsch Legacies; but the President (Dr. Herzl) refused to allow the motion to be put to the vote.

> The little pitted speck in garnered fruit—
> The little rift within the lover's lute.

VII.

See how it works and can only work in the individual instance, in the case of a man who would fain, from the side of culture, commend Judaism, and within certain limits still hold himself a faithful Jew, keeping well abreast of the ever-unfolding miscellany of revelations which go, as Canon Driver says, to take away from Judaism its splendid isolation, its high and unique claims, its glories, and level it down even

beneath the highest points of the line of other religious civilisations. Look at Emanuel Deutsch—what a tragedy his life was—his high aspirations for Jewry all defeated, his later years of illness and frustrated hopes but one half-stifled, long-drawn sigh! And it lay in the necessity of the case that it should be so. Deutsch confesses that he had awakened to "the joyous revelation of humanity in Hellenism." That awakening is the shock which first makes the Jew of genius a divided man. His aspirations are then touched with all the glamour of the modern world—the light that now lies behind him is as though lost in an intenser searchlight from before him, beckoning him on and ever on. Much may he thereafter try to re-engage himself on his great task. He is, alas, like Thomas the Rhymer of Ercildoune, when he was tempted before his full time to return to the land he had left when still he should be "dreeing his weird" in fairyland. From both worlds had gone the most peculiar charm. Ah me! and so it was with Deutsch, whom once I knew and often saw and talked with. He had to "dree his weird" in a disenchanted world, —a disenchanted world of Judaism behind him, and with a more fully enchanted world before him, but a world so far prohibited to him by the very claim on him of that other—claim of blood, claim of education, claim of long descent, claim of tradition and of belief. Oh, the sad and fateful irony of it all! This Deutsch, with eyes fully opened to the "joyous revelation of humanity in Hellenism," to the wonder and the glory of science and the modern world, yet would fain, at call of duty and of pledges, hark back and try to persuade himself that these "Jewish old clothes," as Carlyle grimly called them, were the best and fittest habiliments for us to wear, and that Mosaism and the Talmud furnish us with at once the best philosophy, art, mythology, and poetry we could have. For, after all, Deutsch became a doubter, and a doubter in his own mission, which no Jew ever should be. He should be firm and constant in the faith of his fathers. He must not waver; he must not purpose even great works if it wars with that. The moment he

does so, he ceases to be a true Jew, and is a divided man. Like Mohammed looking down on the world-famous view of Damascus, he must turn away, without regret as without fear, saying, "There is but one paradise, and mine is fixed elsewhere." A Jew, when he looks out on the wide and romantic field of modern culture, must not be tempted to sacrifice for it. If he does, his peace is gone; there is but one paradise, and his is fixed elsewhere! Deutsch would fain have remained a Jew, yet the great outer world laid hold on him, and he sees the futility of his own self-sacrifice in his labours on "my metaphysical Talmud." As he dreams and for a time draws easier breath in Egypt nigh the close, his "life becomes a prey to all kinds of haunting things," and the question ever recurs to him of the Reason why. This is one of his last fiery outbursts against himself, against fate, against the world:

Yet all this while my brain is teeming with work—work that seems cut out as by special primeval [? primordial] arrangement for me and me only. The tragical irony of my life cuts me to pieces. A whole flood of thoughts old and new—of suggestions, facts, and conceits, storm in upon me with every breath I draw here, at every stone I stumble over, at every single sign and token of this boundless tomb-world wherein lie hidden how many civilisations. The very door of my house is formed out of a mummy-case inscribed with part of the "Ritual of the Dead" in fading hieroglyphics! Oh, the vast accumulation that has come into my brain from all I see around me; alas, they are but day-dreams now—golden visions wherewith my too vivid imagination beguiles the long drawn out days and nights of keen distress.

Yes, but why should the Jew not abide firm, composed, and serene in the sufficing grandeurs of his own Judaism as he should conceive it? Why should the wonders, the signs, and tokens of life long derived, and civilisation long matured and maintained, excite distress and land him in complete despair in Mizraim? That is not the voice of the Jew, but of the humanist, the modern scholar and seeker, and the true Jew can never be here the true humanist; like a wave

of the sea, if he seems to advance, what he gains on the one side is but lost on the other; what he sees in Egypt inevitably makes him sigh for what he cannot see in Jewry, and yet answers to deeper, if obscure and not fully realised, depths in himself than Jewry in any phase ever reached; and so his language at last becomes but a sigh—a sigh as of one who has lost his country, and yet cannot fully enter into the new one he has found because the old one still lies behind him.

Nationality and love against humanity and deeper, wider love—there it is, and the problem cannot else be stated. Mr. Zangwill's crowd of indifferentists, without true ideal, and with no red-letter-days in history for them; and scholars, leaders, earnest and true, but inevitably caught up in a *human* ideal—between the two, what hope for Judaism now in either guise? Read again:

> The general result of the archæological and anthropological researches of the past half-century has been to take the Hebrews out of the isolated position which, as a nation, they seemed previously to hold, and to demonstrate not only their affinities with, but often their dependence upon, the civilisations by which they were surrounded. Tribes, more or less closely akin to themselves in both language and race, were their neighbours alike on the north, on the east, and on the south; in addition to this, on each side there towered above them an ancient and imposing civilisation, that of Babylonia, from the earliest times, active, enterprising, and full of life; and that of Egypt, hardly, if at all, less remarkable than that of Babylonia, though more self-contained and less expansive. The civilisation which, in spite of the long residence of the Israelites in Egypt, left its mark most distinctly upon the culture and literature of the Hebrews was that of Babylonia.[1]

If then the Jew is to enter into modern culture, if he is to aspire after science, knowledge—even to become familiar with the circle of history and antiquity as the most ordinary higher education requires he should do, what then remains to him of the hope of still standing there untouched

[1] *Archæology and Authority*, pp. 6, 7.

by the disillusioning charm of that inevitable revelation of which Canon Driver has here spoken? The experience of Deutsch is, in measure, inevitable with every honest inquiring and educated Jew. This is the penalty demanded of modern Jews by exploration, research, and the disentombment of buried nationalities of the ancient world. It is a great penalty, and one which cannot be escaped, however much some may try to ignore it.

Precisely as the march of research and science discloses the utterly false position of height and isolation which the Hebrews had been assumed to occupy in early days, so the results of modern culture, truly appropriated, can only be to carry forward the inevitable effect first produced by the revelations of explorers and investigators in Egypt, and in Mesopotamia, and elsewhere. You have then a Jewry, honeycombed with rationalism and doubt, if not here and there with bold and cynical unbelief; instead of being an *imperium in imperio*, it is a state divided against itself—a force from within, corresponding to a strong force without, urging the out-of-placeness, if not even the absurdity, of ritual observance, and even belief about its God, and a large section looking back, without hope and with much disgust, even at what it regards as the toils it has escaped from—piquing itself on being enfranchised and detached; and if in any way it conforms, it conforms merely from ill-disguised self-interest and for profit. Such, it is much to be feared, is all too largely the English Judaism of to-day, if not indeed a considerable section of Continental Judaism (of which certain of Mr. Zangwill's Viennese Jews, "without ideal," as he says, may stand as specimens). And, alas! there is no apparent possibility of really harmonizing the conflicting sections. Like quicksilver, which on the slightest motion separates into drops that run apart from each other, if for temporary purposes, it may be that, at the next movement, they run back and combine again, yet 'tis but for a moment; so here. Such is the fate of a religious community when faith in the essentials has been largely whittled away, and no adequate substitute been either seriously sought for or

found. Reform from within is all very well, but destruction from within may effect what no outward opposition could compass.

Yet surely there is something to conserve, and that for the whole world, and on grounds of true evolution. Mythology may fall; Jewish ethics still may rise. This is the burden of a voice from America in full sympathy with Mr. Levy's views. Rabbi Krauskopf's book is a remarkable one—frank, sincere, generous. He sees so much of ethical beauty in Jesus; is so alive to the spiritual drift of His teachings. Of course, as a Jew, he has to combat many of the misrepresentations and errors about Judaism in the Oberammergau play. He holds supernaturalism is dead (page 101). He goes for the ethic; for conduct. Most significant is the practical confession with which he closes, that when both Judaism and Christianity have got rid of their mythological incubus then reconciliation will be near:

> Each of us may draw from Paul's epoch-making life and deeds the inspiration of independent thought and courageous daring, fearless of consequences that may ensue. Each of us may dread from the results of his labours that the compromise, that could not be effected eighteen centuries ago, may yet be brought about. The spirit of our age greatly favours such a compromise. What the Christian world needs is another Jew, to complete the trinity of Jewish reformers, one who shall combine within himself the moral and religious purity of Jesus and the zeal and energy of Paul. He will be the long-expected Messiah. His coming will constitute the second advent of the Nazarene Master. The time for his coming is drawing nigh. Obsolete forms and meaningless rites are crumbling away. Offensive doctrines are disappearing. The Judaic Jesus is slowly regaining His lost ground. The ethics of Judaism are gradually supplanting the gnosticism of Paul. When the Jew shall have completely cast away his obstructive exclusiveness and ceremonialism, and the Christian his Christology, Jew and Gentile will be one.

Here, if not without points reserved, is the suggestion of a new and a great eirenicon. It remains to be seen how far this tendency in America will come to help us now in

England. The difficulties in store are suggested again when we read as we do in the English *Jewish Year-Book* for 1901–2 (page 32) an entry recording that a certain minister was inhibited by the Chief Rabbi "because of his having expressed his disbelief in the restoration of sacrifices." If the belief in the efficacy of sacrifices is to be made an article in the creed of certain Jewish Churches, how then are they to be reconciled with those of the Montefiore type, or those which go for the ethical mainly and for conduct, and are to boast being undogmatic, as Rabbi Krauskopf's apparently would be?

ALEXANDER H. JAPP.

WHAT IS MORAL UTILITY?

A STUDY IN ETHICS.

1. *Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft.* Von G. SIMMEL. Two Volumes. (Berlin. 1893.)
2. *Geschichte der Ethik in der neuern Philosophie.* Von F. JODL. Two Volumes. (Stuttgart.)
3. *Phänomentologie des sittlichen Bewusstseins.* Von E. VON HARTMANN. 8vo. (Leipzig.)
4. *Moralphilosophie gemeinverständlich dargestellt.* Von Professor VON GIZICKI.
5. *Ueber die Entstehung des Gewissens.* Von PAUL REÉ.

IN attempting to solve the problem of moral sanction many philosophers and divines have asserted that the utility of virtuous conduct solely or chiefly consists in its serviceableness to man's personal happiness. This doctrine, however, is only an inference correctly drawn from a much wider theory, namely, that the universe exists solely for the sake of man, and hence that all the laws and conditions—natural, moral, and spiritual—through which or in which man lives, moves, and has his being are there simply for his benefit. With the profane vaunting Baccalaureus in *Faust*, the upholder of such a doctrine might well exclaim :

> The sun in pomp I led up from the sea,
> The moon in all her changes followed me ;
> For me in beauty walks the glorious day,
> The green earth blossoms to adorn my way ;
> 'Twas at my beck, upon that primal night,
> The proud stars shed through heaven their spreading light.

It requires but little reflection, however, to see the ridiculous fallacy of such an attitude, for this egoistic conception of the universe is neither supported by facts nor sanctioned by the uncorrupted moral feelings.

As regards the physical world, it must be evident to every impartial mind that the course of nature is not contrived with any particular view to human interests, for man shares just like other creatures in the ills wrought by the struggle for existence, and by the destructive or unfriendly conditions incident to earthly life; and even when he seems to flourish most, he does so not because any special provision appears to have been made for him, but because his lot happens to coincide with circumstances more or less favourable to the genial development of his nature; and besides, in conditions which make for the general well-being, no less than in those that make against it, the individual is liable to pain, inconvenience, and premature extinction, through the operation of natural laws which are never suspended for his benefit.

As regards the moral economy, matters stand on the same footing. The complaint, heard in all ages and in all climes, regarding the sorrows of the good and the triumphs of the wicked, is only a distorted testimony to the fact that the moral law exacts conduct which under given circumstances must bring misery to those who pursue it.

The circumstance that by far the greater proportion of moral acts demand self-sacrifice on the part of the agent shows conclusively that human happiness is not the end designed in the institution of the moral economy and the arrangement of the conditions bringing that economy into operation. The feeling of the supremacy of duty over self-interest experienced by the individual moral agent when performing an act prejudicial to his personal well-being affords the strongest evidence against the supposition that moral law exists solely for man's benefit, since what is not true of each individual cannot be true of the genus. Even the well founded doctrine of a future state of retribution cannot be regarded as invalidating the inferences just drawn.

For, judged from the standard of equity, such a state could only be regarded as affording the wicked an amount of misery equal to the happiness they had previously derived from their wickedness and the pain they had inflicted upon others by their crimes, and as providing for the righteous joys equivalent to those sacrificed by them in the performance of their duty and to the undeserved sufferings they had formerly endured. This state of retribution, however, which simply amounts to a righting of all wrongs, cannot for a moment be supposed to favour the theory that the subjection of man to the moral economy has been made with a view to his interests, for in the end he is plainly not a gainer thereby, since he is only as well off as he would have been if he had never had to suffer the inconveniences to which he was previously exposed owing to being under the economy in question. If, however, it be said that at the retribution the good will get something more than just compensation for their past sufferings, it may be correctly replied that neither our reason nor our moral feelings warrant such a belief; and even were the theory sound, this extra undeserved measure of happiness could have been communicated to man quite as well had he never been placed under our present moral economy, and therefore does not and cannot afford any clue to the reason why he was made subject to that economy.

If from the economies natural and moral we pass to that which is spiritual, our previous inferences receive further confirmation. Here, indeed, as in the former cases, we find views representing man and man's interests as the sole object of the laws and conditions to which he has been subjected, and here as well as there the views in question are equally untenable. As regards the great doctrine of redemption unfolded in the Christian scheme, the natural impulse of religious feeling led many of the Fathers, schoolmen, and even later theologians to realise that although the atonement undoubtedly evinces the love of God to usward, yet it is nothing short of presumption to say that the benefit of man was the sole or even principal end proposed to be

accomplished by the scheme of redemption. For without in any way espousing the supralapsarian theory it must be admitted by every candid and thoughtful mind that the Fall of man with all the appalling consequences thereof could have been ensured against by divine omnipotence, and that it was unquestionably the will of God that not only redemption, but also the events leading up to and affording the opportunity of redemption should likewise transpire, for the distinction drawn by St. Chrysostom between antecedent and consequent volition on the part of God is an absurdity verging on blasphemy.

If, however, we admit that the need for redemption could have been prevented and yet was permitted to transpire, then, on the assumption that the well-being of man was the determining factor in the divine conduct, we must suppose that through redemption man obtains a greater blessing than could have been his lot had he remained in a state of innocence. This conclusion has the support of more than one eminent theologian, and it was the cause why St. Augustine called sin *felix culpa*; but it is nevertheless open to grave objections. For, waiving the fact that it makes sin the condition of our obtaining supereminent blessedness, and the fact that it seems to impose a limit to divine power, it must be evident to everyone that as union with God through the incarnation of Christ is the special blessing procured for the Christian, that blessing could have been just as effectually imparted had man never fallen, in which case the vicarious righteousness, suffering, and death of Christ, now necessary to make the benefits of the Incarnation ours, need never have transpired. These reasons seem sufficiently fatal to the theory that sin and death were permitted for the sake of their being the conditions of man's enjoying a blessing in which he could not have participated without them; but a still more fatal objection lies in the fact that if some of the children of men have by this means attained unto a special and supereminent blessedness, their happiness has cost the unspeakable misery of countless multitudes of their fellow beings.

Taking all these facts into account, and remembering that had the welfare of man been the sole purpose of redemption, that redemption would most assuredly have been brought home to every human soul, we can only say that God hath redeemed unto Himself a peculiar people, a little flock to whom it is His good pleasure to vouchsafe a kingdom; we cannot pretend to say what has been His principal end or motive in so doing, and certainly our reason no less than our humility ought to prevent us from supposing that we or our interests constituted the determining principle of the divine activity in that mysterious transaction. The foregoing investigation of the facts in connexion with man's physical, moral, and spiritual relationships shows plainly enough that so far from the universe being designed specially for his benefit, he exists only as an integral part, helping to complete an economy the aims of which on all sides outreach his personal interests. Before, however, proceeding to show the special reference which this state of affairs has to the question of moral utility, it is needful for the sake of completeness to see how our conclusions would be affected by withdrawing the belief that the universe is the result of design, and substituting the assumption that it exists merely as matter of fact. It is not here our business to attempt a disproof of the latter assumption or to adduce the reasons on behalf of the former belief, but simply to state how the denial of final causes would affect the doctrine that the utility of virtue consists solely or chiefly in its ministry to human happiness.

Now, if we deny the theory of design, we cannot say of any given law that it is there to effect a purpose; we can only say that when a given effect is produced a law underlies that effect. But although under these circumstances we cannot, in reference to a law, speak of its final end in a teleological sense, there yet remains another signification in which this term is applicable, namely, when taken to mean the result accomplished by the activity of a law or principle working according to its own nature or constitution, as distinct from all collateral and indirect effects brought about

through the instrumentality of the circumstances or conditions under which the principle at any given time may have to operate, and which are therefore purely contingent.

Thus the attraction of bodies towards a centre of gravity is, in the above sense, the final end of the law of gravitation; whereas the collapse of buildings or the descent of avalanches, though a result of the prevalency of that law, are phenomena caused by its co-operation with other natural principles under specific conditions, and must therefore be regarded as contingent and not ultimate effects of the law in question. The fact of finality or of being able to produce a given effect by reason of its own nature or constitution, is what makes the autonomy of a law and renders it independent of all other laws, except in so far as the effects of these laws may become conditions interfering with the result of its own activity. If we apply this general definition to moral law in particular, we are logically compelled to own that, setting aside all teleology, the final end of this law is not as the Eudæmonian would have us believe, private happiness, or as the Utilitarian asserts, collective happiness, but solely and simply the production of moral conduct, or rather, as in this case the subjects of the law are not things but persons, the production of moral character. This view alone scientifically explains moral law, gives autonomy to ethics, and differentiates morality from all schemes of doctrines which have the production of happiness as their final end. Nor is this all, for as the will of man is the subject of moral law by which all his various actions are dictated, sanctioned, or prohibited, as the case may be, and as this law is itself autonomic, the relative position of ethical and hedonistic principles is at once discovered, and we see that morality ought not to be subservient to the pursuit of happiness, but that happiness should only be pursued in conformity with moral law.

The foregoing analysis, which would seem to have exhausted all the possibilities of the case, furnishes a disproof of the contention that utility to human happiness is the sanction of moral conduct. For, as we have seen, moral law like other laws bears no mark of being a scheme framed with

a view to promote human welfare, or an undesigned reality naturally possessing that inevitable tendency. This seems so evident that the contrary view can only have arisen either from mere egoism, or from a mistaken inference arising out of the fact that as a regard to the happiness of others forms one of our most important duties, man's actions must be considered as morally good or bad in so far as they increase or lessen human happiness. To conclude, however, that since some actions are moral solely because they are useful to produce happiness, therefore the sanction of moral conduct *per se* can be nothing else than its utility to the same end, violates logic no less than experience.

The question, therefore, What constitutes the utility of moral action? cannot be answered by saying, its conduciveness to human happiness. Nor is it possible, in accordance with the principles of human reason, to discover an absolute sanction for moral law *per se*; a sanction which, so to say, would justify the existence of that law, and from which as starting-point one could set out to determine the utility of the conduct prescribed by the law, as compared with the sanction of the law itself. In virtue of this essential limitation, the problem regarding the nature of moral utility can never be capable of anything but hypothetical solution, though it is a matter in which we may arrive at negative conclusions.

Thus, taking our clue from the results of the preceding investigation, we find that when speaking of the utility of moral action we must, in order to be logically consistent, mean its designed or native adaptability to produce under certain conditions a good distinct from, though not always necessarily inconsistent with and often contributory to, the happiness of man considered as a natural and social being. Whatever be the nature of the good thus designed in or accomplished by moral action, one is justified in terming it the transcendent sanction of moral conduct.[1]

[1] Since writing the above the author was pleased to meet with the following: "Lotze's System gipselt in seiner Ethik. Die sittlichen Maximen welche unbedingt verpflichtend sind, hängen nicht von der Erfahrung ab,

Again, the transcendental character of the good in question prevents our certainly knowing whether it be a reality somehow participated in by man; or whether it have respect to some world order of which man as a moral agent forms a part, though the order does not exist primarily for his benefit, as is the case respectively to his position in the physical universe; or whether the order be the main thing, but the blessedness of man, as forming part thereof, one of its secondary aims or incidental effects.

All that in such a case can be done is to search whether there be any distinct and peculiar good in which man actually does participate through moral action, and whether this is capable of being regarded as forming part of a real though invisible cosmic order.

The hypothesis which a consideration of various facts leads us to assume is a twofold one: firstly, that the faculty of moral action, as developed through the laws by which it is governed and the conditions to which it is subjected, produces in man a certain character, the specific forms of which constitute the distinguishing excellence of his nature, and are therefore the particular good in which he participates through the moral faculty thus ruled and conditioned; and secondly, that the harmony of the various characters so developed constitutes the perfection of a higher and invisible universe, whilst the anomalies, the failures, and futilities manifest therein serve either by contrast to make the other parts more imposing or actually assist the evolution and conservation of the whole, even as in nature the processes of decay and destruction tend to the equilibrium of forces and the renewal of life.

---

wiewohl sie von derselben veranlasst sind, vielmehr entspringen sie aus dem Bewusstsein unbedingt verpflichtender Ideale. Zwar stehen die Begriffe des Guten und der Lust in engen Zusammenhang, doch kann die Idee der Verpflichtung nicht als pyschologische Tauschung erklärt werden. Die Entscheidung hängt vom dem Gewissen ab, durch welches sich im Gefühl Wohlgefallen und Missbilligung ankündigt. Das Bewusstsein der moralischen Verpflichtung beruht auf der Gewissheit, dass wir durch Erfüllung der moralischen Maximen an der Erreichung des Weltzwecks mithelfen."—SCHWEGLER, Reclam's Edit., p. 497.

This hypothesis explains and is in turn supported by many facts of our moral consciousness.

Thus, although we value acts that contribute to our happiness, yet we value with a different and higher feeling an agent who has acted nobly even when a beneficial effect is not traceable to his action; and if such be traceable thereto, then we approve the act rather as being the expression of something good in the agent than for its own utility. On hearing of or witnessing a good deed done by a person whom we did not think virtuous enough to do such an act, our feeling testifies that we are more delighted by the disposition thus unexpectedly manifested than by the beneficial effects of the act manifesting it. *Per contra*, an evil deed done by a person we thought good shocks us more, as destroying our faith in his valued goodness, than because of the bad effects resulting from it.

Again, although in a person whose circumstances permit him to do a kind deed we value active beneficence more than unrelieving sympathy, yet this is not so much because the former produces better effects than the latter, as because it evinces on the part of the agent a more practical and irrefragable proof of inward goodness, and likewise calls into play the natural feeling which leads us to take a pleasure in whatever makes our fellow-creatures happier, thus gratifying simultaneously two of our moral instincts, the approval of virtue and the sense of kindliness.

Again, although we justly approve a certain kind of prudence for self, and as justly disapprove culpable folly or a man's throwing away his opportunities and imperilling his happiness, yet there is hardly any kind of character more felt to be contemptible than that of a self-centred being, or one which sooner wins our regard than that of an altruist who is ready to sacrifice self to benefit others or to fulfil what he regards as a dictate of conscience. This unique feeling of the mean and unworthy nature of selfishness, even where the acts manifesting it do not seriously injure others, evinces itself in the contempt for a selfish disposition when seen in someone else, and therefore viewed without the

screening and blinding influence of self-partiality; and also in the sense of personal condemnation felt by one who though noble and unspoilt has, through passion or some other cause, been guilty of sacrificing the interests of another or the dictates of his own conscience to an egoistic impulse.

Again, it is a suggestive fact that the feeling of compunction when examined is found to be caused more by the sense of having taken a wrong line of action than by the disastrous nature of the consequences proceeding therefrom, the perception of the latter serving indeed to expound and bring home the former, but not constituting the peculiar sorrow thus experienced; a phenomenon which proves the difference between remorse and regret, and which has frequently led men to feel that besides the duty of recompensing the injured party, they ought to do expiatory or atoning acts for the wrong *per se*. This the Penitent in the Psalms, who naturally conceived the moral law under the form of a divine law-giver, felt so strongly that although he had grievously wronged a fellow-creature, he nevertheless exclaimed, "Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned." Nor can it justly be said that such a feeling is the result of an impulse to escape an imaginary punishment. For however it may have originally sprung up, yet when fully developed it is a fact that, so far from being prompted by the desire to escape punishment, this feeling leads men to experience a certain satisfaction in being punished, because their sense of justice is thus appeased. Lastly, our moral consciousness testifies that virtue is essentially an inward subjective thing. We recognise it as a quality which even when ascribed to an act can only be ascribed respectively to the agent. Hence we attribute no virtue to the man who does a good deed from an improper motive, even though the outward benefits flowing from the act are just as great as if it had been done by the impulse of a holy will.

Hence likewise arises the yearning after purity of heart, an inner completeness of character, a right state of the habits, dispositions, and desires; and the conviction that it is not enough merely to live up to the standard of conduct

which law and society set forth, but that the conformity of the moral being, the spirit within us, to something intrinsically good and holy is the thing most urgently required; and that apart from their vital origin in such a source, all good works, be they acts of benevolence, of self-sacrifice or what they may be, are morally speaking lifeless and mechanical. Hence, too, arises that sorrow over shortcomings which in many cases are hidden from the world, and which, perhaps though not hidden, the world would neither condemn nor understand, but which unspeakably distress the conscience of one for whom a righteousness exceeding that of Scribes and Pharisees is an inner necessity. To the existence of these deep-rooted convictions and beliefs the history of religion, and particularly that of Christianity, affords living and irrefragable evidence. Gibbon in his analysis of the causes promoting the spread of the gospel has omitted the one most efficacious. It was no narrative increasing the already superfluous stock of miracles, no proffering of a fuller assurance of a future life, that enabled Christianity to appeal successfully to the heart of man, but the fact that it claimed to have and was willing to offer a remedy for his deepest need, a means whereby the evil of his nature might be removed, and he could receive an increase of spiritual strength and purity. Now, all the foregoing facts are just as much derived from experience as any of those gathered by the senses whose business it is to deal with outward phenomena. The only difference is that as the senses in touch with the outer world have been more evenly and universally developed, the evidence supplied by them is more generally and distinctly known, and can therefore be appealed to with greater certainty of obtaining a favourable response than is the case where the evidence, no matter how correct, is derived from and must be tested by inner and more subtle faculties, whose development in many cases has been impeded or perverted by a variety of causes. For in this case there is always a chance that such evidence may be submitted for verification to some in whom the faculties requisite to verify it are either

absent or insufficient. Hence the most that can be done is to proceed at a venture, and appeal from the actual to the latent; from the phenomena of the moral consciousness as manifested in its highest historical forms to the varying degrees of that consciousness as existing in the lower stages of its development; from the conduct of a Marcus Aurelius to the dimly felt sanction, the half-despairing aspiration excited by that conduct, in a soul as yet but faintly divining the possibilities of its nature.

Taken with this reservation, I submit that the facts above cited go to prove the point for which I am contending, for they show that the moral consciousness attributes supreme and ultimate worth only to inward goodness, which in turn explains why we approve virtuous actions less for their effect upon man's external circumstances than for the tendency which the performance of such actions has to produce or bring out a certain type of character; and why, conversely, we disapprove not merely deeds which, like theft, etc., entail objectively disastrous consequences, but also a host of minor actions, the outward effects of which are slight and negligible, but the subjective influence of which upon the character is apprehensible; and finally why, even in the case of great crimes, our abhorrence of the criminal is intenser than our detestation of his offence.

Reason likewise confirms the inference thus drawn from experience. For if the value of moral conduct consisted merely in its effects upon man's social well-being, in the outward benefits ensured by justice, benevolence, and sobriety to the community in general, then a very different arrangement of the moral economy might have been expected.

Indeed, had such been the purpose designed in the institution of moral law, a great number of what are at present recognised as virtues could very well have been dispensed with. Had there been no sorrow, there need have been no sympathy; no poverty, no benevolence; no evil or excessive passions, no effort to overcome or restrain them; no misfortunes, no fortitude; no struggle for existence, no

justice and fairness. It is certain, then, that matters could have been so arranged that man, though incapable of all these respectable virtues, would, as far as the outward effects now derived therefrom are concerned, have been far more happily circumstanced than he is at present even with their assistance, just as a healthy person is better off than a sick one whose disorder is ably counteracted by a powerful medicine.

The conclusion therefore seems obvious, that if the moral economy is a reasonable one, then the virtues in question must be intrinsically more valuable than the happiness sacrificed as the necessary condition of their production, and, hence, that their real worth consists in themselves rather than in the outward well-being they effect, since this could have been better effected without them. This, again, explains one of the most curious facts of the moral economy, namely, that although on the part of the beings under that economy there is a marked impulse to realise certain aims, yet these aims are continually getting frustrated. For whilst it is true of such that they form a part of the moral economy, yet were they ever fully realised that economy must cease to exist, and, like the tropical plant, would blossom only to perish.

The fact is that the visionaries who rail against the moral order, and who would like to see an entirely different adjustment of moral relationships framed upon what they regard as the standard of utility, are merely playing Alphonso of Castile. The laws and conditions through which the universe subsists are so closely interwoven that they could not be modified without destroying the perfections of the universe as a whole; and although Alphonso, or a cleverer than he, were to construct a world on the principle of avoiding what now appear defective or inconvenient phenomena, that world would certainly never present the harmonious variety, the rich and manifold beauty of the one we now perceive.

Again, although he would be a bold man who should say that evil is the necessary condition of good, yet judging

from the general course of nature, it is certain that as the world is constituted we owe to conditions or directions of energy in some respects mischievous much of what strikes our sensibilities as noble, lovely, and sublime; the ocean, for instance, would never, in its infinite possibilities of glory and majesty, have been known to us had we only seen it brooded by an eternal calm. Is it, then, an arbitrary surmise that the moral economy may have other ends or accomplish other effects than the outward happiness of the race, and if so why make its contribution to that happiness the standard of its utility?

May not the moral law and the conditions which, by shaping the development of the moral faculty, serve to produce the varied kinds of excellence displayed in individual character, find their ultimate sanction in the nature of the effects so produced, and not in the relation of those effects to human happiness? We entertain a disapproval for the man who pursues his own interest alone, and who values merely what contributes to his happiness; should we not extend our disapproval to that mental attitude which regards virtue as estimable solely because of its beneficial effect upon human well-being, and assumes utility to this as the essence of sanction?

If the development of character be the transcendental sanction of moral conduct, these remarks apply, even though character have no further development beyond the grave, just as it is better that the violet should bloom to perish than not bloom at all; but they apply with still greater force, if character be a good capable of fuller development in other and unending states of consciousness, if it contribute to the perfection of a higher and invisible universe, a possibility which to the moral being, purified more and more from self-regarding sympathies, will appear desirable in and for itself rather than for the reflex happiness that it draws along with it.

CHRISTOPHER C. DOVE.

THE CHALLENGE OF ANTHROPOLOGY.

1. *The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic and Religion.* By J. G. FRAZER, D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Three Volumes. (Macmillan & Co. 1900.)
2. *Magic and Religion.* By ANDREW LANG. (Longmans, Green, & Co. 1901.)
3. *Anthropology and Christianity.* By ALEXANDER MACALISTER, M.D., F.R.S., Professor of Anatomy in Cambridge University. ("London Quarterly Review," July, 1899.)

THE Golden Bough is a book which not many men living would care to review under their own name, if they had anything above the meanest conception of what reviewing ought to be. Its amazing learning takes it at once out of the range of criticism by any but expert anthropologists, although its lucid style and clearness of thought may tempt the mere layman to imagine himself capable of weighing or even challenging its conclusions. After ten years' publicity in its original form, it reappeared at the end of 1900 in a second edition more than doubled in size, and has been more widely read than ever. It comes to us as one of the most important scientific works ever written in the university of Newton and Darwin and Adams, and as such demands the serious attention of all who mark the progress of thought.

The reader will not expect a review, after what has been already said, from an amateur such as the present writer admits himself to be. Nor is it possible to give here even an adequate table of contents for a book containing over

fourteen hundred pages, which the slightest diffuseness would have made into a much bigger book still. The object of this article is to press once more on the attention of the Christian apologist the importance of a new challenge which he cannot possibly ignore, and which might easily be taken up in a spirit most disastrous for the future of the faith among thinking men of the next generation.[1]

It will be necessary, before we turn to the momentous question here raised, to say a few words to explain the general character of this great work. The relation of the title to the subject makes one think of *The Ring and the Book*. Just as Browning tells a brief story and builds his four volumes of thought and song upon the several aspects of the simple tale, so Dr. Frazer tells in six vivid pages the weird old Roman use from which he starts, and then builds upon its sundry elements a series of theories which seek to probe the depths of man's religious history, each of them illustrated with a wealth of evidence drawn from the rites and superstitions and folk customs of civilised and uncivilised people in every age since history began. The story of his title is that of the grove at Aricia, seen in Turner's famous picture, where Diana's shrine was served by the "King of the Wood," the runaway slave who held his priesthood till another could slay him, after plucking from the tree the "Golden Bough." To explain this grim survival, Dr. Frazer develops the theory, which may thus be stated in a few words before we pass on to certain matters of great moment incidental to the proof. The oak-tree, which the "ghastly priest" of Macaulay's *Lake Regillus* had to guard, was the tree worshipped by Indo-Germanic (so-called "Aryan") tribes from the days of their original unity. Its life was probably supposed to reside in a "golden bough,"

[1] From a notice in the March *Expository Times* it appears that a book has just been published by the "Rationalist Press" which attacks the supernatural basis of Christianity by popularising anthropological facts such as those to be described below. It will be seen that Dr. Frazer presents facts, but draws no conclusions in this matter. It seems obvious that we should not allow the rationalists the monopoly of such material.

the mistletoe, which grew from it. The tree-spirit was conceived as incarnate in a man, whose physical powers must never be allowed to fail, lest the powers of the tree should fail with them. In the earliest times, therefore, the human representative of the divinity was slain after a brief period, and his functions transformed to another doomed man; but afterwards the milder custom arose of letting him live while he was strong enough to defend his title against all comers. Since the man represented the tree, the challenger must first pluck the bough in which the tree's life resided, and then slay the tree's incarnation if he could, to reign in his stead as

> The priest who slew the slayer,
> And shall himself be slain.

It is not our present purpose to discuss the validity of the thesis just sketched. Each step of it is defended by Dr. Frazer with an immense mass of evidence collected from all quarters of the world; and even were the explanation of the Arician cult to be sacrificed as unproven, the value of the book as a delineation of primitive superstitions would be very little affected. Mr. Andrew Lang demolishes the whole theory to his own satisfaction in a chapter of the new book whose title appears at the head of this article. Whether Mr. Lang is to be treated seriously as an anthropologist we must leave it to the anthropologists to say. He has translated Homer extremely well, and has easily slain the higher critics who for a century past have been wickedly disintegrating the poet into his constituent atoms. With equal ease he has vanquished the critics of the Society for Psychical Research. Now he brings into the arena the same keen debating power, the same smartness and brilliancy of style, and after a brush with Professor E. B. Tylor settles down to combat *à outrance* with Dr. Frazer. How far these incisive thrusts penetrate his antagonist's armour the experts must decide. But it is hardly unnecessary to warn theologians against too suddenly assuming that a Daniel has come to judgment in the person of this versatile and amusing writer. They welcomed many a

now forgotten Daniel when the *Origin of Species* was a novelty. They still hold out their hands to some rather dubious Daniels who have their "lines of defence of the biblical revelation," which will certainly not be defended *tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis.* It is earnestly to be hoped that the mistake will not be repeated now. The novelty of Dr. Frazer's position, and the hints he gives that he is not himself a believer in orthodox Christianity, may easily alarm reverent men. Our object in this article will be to show that the alarm is needless, that the faith has nothing to fear whichever school of anthropology wins the day, and that if the great majority of Dr. Frazer's propositions—expressed or suggested—ultimately hold the field, we have only a fresh evidence of the unity of revelation and a grander exhibition of the divine programme of human history.

Let us begin with the most important matter, and set forth the challenge of anthropology in a form which will at once raise the central issue. Suppose we state the creed of Christendom as a belief in a Son of God who was miraculously born into the world as man, who was slain as man's atoning substitute, and rose again from the dead: let us add that He warned His followers of evil powers which strove unseen to seduce them from goodness, and that He instituted a memorial service in which they were to eat His flesh and drink His blood under the similitude of bread and wine. What are we prepared to reply when we find that *everyone* of these cardinal points in our faith can be directly paralleled in the doctrines and practices of various heathen races, some of them mere savages? There are sundry courses open to us. We may whittle away the facts, denying here, explaining away there, pronouncing others to be mere superficial resemblances. In this kind of process Mr. Lang, if we read him fairly, would probably be an excellent guide. But it must be felt that this is a very insecure method of defending the faith: there must always be the uneasy consciousness that two hydra-heads are likely to grow in the place of the one which we have triumphantly

clubbed. Assuming the facts, then, there are, according to the authorities, three stages of opinion upon them. We may go on the lines of the first missionaries to Mexico, who found a heathen eucharist among the ordinary rites of the country, and declared that the devil was parodying Christian verities. It is not necessary to argue against this view nowadays. Or we may believe that God ordained the course of development of heathen superstition, so that it might supply types and figures of the perfect revelation when it came. We cannot accept this view with any pleasure,—least of all after reading the *Golden Bough*,—for it makes God the deliberate author of a series of horrors and cruelties which haunt the reader's memory with a shudder. *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum* is writ large all over the pages of this book, and it would go hard with our faith if we were forced to find here the work of a heavenly Father. Are we then shut up to the third course, which frankly eliminates the supernatural and makes St. Paul and the savage of central Australia merely two ends of a great evolutionary process, brought about by "natural" causes alone?

It seems to us that the leap from the second to the third of these attitudes of mind has been too violent, and that the truth lies somewhere between them. Let us review the relations of theology and natural science during the last half of the nineteenth century. We all remember how the great hypothesis of Darwin was first received—by the materialist as the charter of triumphant atheism, by the Christian theologian as a doctrine subversive of all religion. How do we stand now? Whether the hypothesis is right or wrong, it is sufficiently obvious that the hopes of materialism and the panic of theology were alike utterly unjustified, however natural they may have been. The materialist has found evolution helpless without *something outside* to give at least the first impulse to the wheels of cosmic processes. The theologian has found that evolution affects no more than the *method* of God's working, the *fact* of that working remaining untouched. God's works were not turned out like the products of a modern factory, a

hundred at a time, and all exactly alike. The eye of an insect, the brain of a Shakespeare, equally took countless ages to develop; and we have learnt to marvel at such a creative process as infinitely more wonderful than a separate creation could have been. Is there any ground then for alarm if it is suggested that the same principle may perhaps be recognised in the process by which God dowered man with His richest gift, the power of union with Himself? What will the evolutionary hypothesis mean as applied to religion? We start, of course, with the stupendous postulate—the presence in the universe of a living God. A *postulate* we call it, for necessarily it does not admit of proof by ordinary reasoning. But the materialist has only a blank of nescience in the place where we see God. Our "postulate" explains the facts; his blank explains nothing. It will be time enough to consider a purely naturalistic theory of the origin of religion when we have before us a companion theory of the origin of life, or of the primary impulse which started the evolution of worlds.

Putting aside then, as too wide a question for our present limits, the discussion of the evidences of degeneration as a basal element in man's religious history—a subject acutely argued by Mr. Lang against Dr. Tylor in one of the papers in the above-named book,—let us ask how analogy would lead us to expect that God would teach religion to savages like those now found in Australia, in an age wherein He still "suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways," though not "leaving Himself without witness." Would it not be by laying hold of man's own childish ideas and causing them to develop under the action of laws laid deep in the very constitution of the race? The fact that God works through law does not mean, either in physical or moral evolution, that He sets the process going and then leaves His work till the next impulse is needed, as a man first starts his watch and then winds it up when it is running down. By what means the germ of religion is thus divinely planted in the savage mind does not matter to our argument. Dreams, ghosts, reverence for dead

ancestors, the "despair of magic" which led men to conceive that where man has failed to influence the processes of nature there must be powers somewhere that can succeed[1]—anyone of these channels may have served, and perhaps one in one place and another in another. St. Paul declares that "rains and fruitful seasons" were sent from heaven expressly to witness for the Creator. Could such witness by itself enable the savage to leap to the heights of a pure monotheism? Surely he would first infer from what he saw that the heaven which sent the rain and the tree which produced the fruit were themselves divine. Linguistic science has proved that this very faith, the cult of the Sky and the Oak, was the religion of the dwellers in the primeval forests of mid-Europe, ancestors alike of the Brahmin and the German, the Greek to whom St. Paul pleaded from his own poets, and the Roman whose civilisation paved the way for the gospel. Such a religion is very far indeed below the faith of a Socrates, but that does not prevent our believing that the fair flower grew by natural development out of the shapeless germ, under the sunlight of the All-Father's presence. Nor is the religious development of Israel itself essentially different, in spite of the uniqueness which on any conceivable theory must mark it from first to last. The gradual development of doctrine throughout the period of the Old Testament is a commonplace of all modern scholarship. The men whose teaching lifted Israel to so great a height above the nations were inspired of God indeed, but they were not sent with a lesson too hard for the people to take in. "When Israel was a child," he was taught as a child, and his religious training progressed as education always does. The teacher who took his children to Aristotle before the alphabet would not be certificated as efficient; and the fact that Israel's Teacher was divine does not set aside the necessary rule of "line upon line, precept upon precept; here a little and there a little."

---

[1] *Golden Bough*, iii., p. 458 ff.

And how will the same principle show itself in the crowning act of divine revelation? There were an infinite number of possible ways in which God might have manifested Himself among men and purged them of their sin. We may be antecedently certain that the way which was chosen was chosen because, man being what he is, there was no other way possible. The plan of the Incarnation and the Atonement grew necessarily out of human needs and human nature; and out of that same nature of man grew also the beliefs and ideas which prepared the way for the plan of redemption. All the world over men have told stories of marvellous births, whereby a child of more than human power has been born of a mortal mother by a father who is divine. It matters not what the origin of such stories may be. The fable prepares the way for the fact, and helps men to take it in. Even more abundantly true is this of the Atonement. That the idea of incarnations of a divinity is common everywhere among men we have long known. It is the distinguishing feature of the *Golden Bough* that it brings before us a vast number of incarnations of a kind we have hardly known before. In nearly all cases the man-god is doomed, by the very fact of his assumed divinity, to die for the good of men; and if the sacrifice is not actually carried out, there are clear traces in the ritual of a time when it was. The victim either takes to himself the ills of others, or he gives his body to be devoured by worshippers who believe that divine qualities thus flow into themselves; sometimes the idea of the sacramental food and that of the scapegoat are combined. It is not easy to master the repulsion which comes over us when we bring a revolting cannibalism thus into connexion with the sacred parable of the Lord's Supper. But did not our Lord Himself deliberately shock the Jews in this very way, in order to force on them the vital truth that man has no life in himself save by taking into his deepest self the very life of the Divine Man? And when we are able to look at the anthropological facts thus, we find that they supply us with a most valuable hint as to the profound connexion of the Atone-

ment with the very elements of human nature. Few features of that great doctrine are more startling than the extent to which it is "hid from the wise and understanding, and revealed unto babes." The little child takes it in easily: it is only when his intellect has thoroughly developed that difficulties suggest themselves. The simple savage in every part of the world drinks in the evangel with delight, and were the missionary to describe to him its problems he would be utterly perplexed. Meanwhile the acute and highly trained theologian can rarely frame a theory of his gospel which will fully satisfy himself, and still more rarely one which will satisfy other thinkers. It is a strange paradox indeed, this "foolish thing of God" which is "wiser than men." Are we not helped towards understanding it by the new evidence which shows how the *fact* of the Atonement corresponds with a primitive instinct of humanity, so that by satisfying that instinct it wins at once the hearts of all who feel their need?

We may leave to the reader to supply the precisely similar argument for the complementary doctrine of the Resurrection. Neither in this nor in the other case must we expect to satisfy those who cannot believe in the Christian faith. They will insist on using the anthropological evidence to discredit the supernatural in Christianity. Be it so. Only let us point out that the sole difference between our position and theirs lies in our accepting the postulate of theism. Once granted the presence of God in the world, our view of the facts proposes no difficulty which the most rigidly scientific could stumble at. On the reasonableness of such a postulate, as the only doctrine yet propounded which can pretend to explain the facts, we have already spoken. It seems to us therefore that Christians are on absolutely unassailable ground when they refuse to lay down any *a priori* objections to the evolutionary account of human development, leaving the question to be settled without prejudice by inquiries which the "orthodox" and the sceptic can prosecute together.

We must defer to another article the statement of a

number of very interesting examples of the anthropological method in dealing with details of biblical lore, as well as some not less interesting evidence showing up the true origin and history of the superstitions which infect the Roman—and, alas! other "Catholic"—branches of Christianity. There is one section, however, of this great work which must be taken up at this point, as closely connected with the subject we have been discussing. It may be safely assumed that the attitude of very many Christians towards the *Golden Bough* will be determined by the long passage in the third volume which develops Dr. Frazer's theory of the Crucifixion. The section is, perhaps, the most notable novelty of the second edition, and it has naturally been fastened upon to an extent which has probably made many people greatly overestimate its importance in the scheme of the book. Mr. Lang is largely responsible for the sensation that has been got up on this subject. He has opened fire on Dr. Frazer's theory in about half a dozen newspapers and reviews, and he gathers together the essence of his criticism in *Magic and Religion*, where this one subject accounts for no less than one hundred and thirty-six pages out of three hundred and five. Moreover, the impression has been created that Dr. Frazer has been deliberately wounding Christian feeling by a repulsive theory as to the death of the Lord Jesus. As a matter of fact, such an impression is the very reverse of the truth. Were the theory, as a whole, conclusively proved, it would have no effect but to enhance our adoring wonder at the Saviour's self-abasement. There are two details, relating to the triumphal entry and the purging of the temple,[1] which we could not accept without admitting that our evangelists had seriously misreported the events they describe. All the rest of the theory might have been propounded by the soundest of divines without risking any severer criticism than that the Gospels might have been expected not to ignore so telling a feature in the Passion story. Put very

[1] *Golden Bough*, iii., p. 194.

briefly, the theory amounts to this. During the Exile the Jews borrowed from the Persians the Feast of Purim, which is traced back to a Babylonian feast called the Sacæa :

It was customary, we may suppose, with the Jews at Purim, or perhaps occasionally at Passover, to employ two prisoners to act the parts respectively of Haman and Mordecai in the passion-play which formed a central feature of the festival. Both men paraded for a short time in the insignia of royalty, but their fates were different ; for while at the end of the performance the one who played Haman was hanged or crucified, the one who personated Mordecai and bore in popular parlance the title of Barabbas was allowed to go free. Pilate, perceiving the trumpery nature of the charges brought against Jesus, tried to persuade the Jews to let Him play the part of Barabbas, which would have saved His life ; but the merciful attempt failed, and Jesus perished on the cross in the character of Haman.

"In the character of Haman"! Could the words of the prophet, "He was numbered with the transgressors," receive a more impressive emphasis than such an idea as this? Strange that any Christian sentiment should have been shocked by a theory the proof of which would so powerfully illustrate the central thought of the Atonement, the Redeemer's mysterious identification with sin. Dr. Frazer calls attention to one or two incidental advantages of the theory, including the fact that it interprets the release of one prisoner at the feast. He then concludes with an eloquent and suggestive passage which we must quote, premising that the distant original of the Haman of this annual celebration has been traced back in the theory to an incarnation of the spirit of vegetation, seen in so well known a figure as Tammuz, and extremely common in western Asia, which accordingly became a soil well prepared for the new doctrine of Christianity :

A chain of causes which, because we cannot follow them, might in the loose language of daily life be called an accident, determined that the part of the dying god in this annual play should be thrust upon Jesus of Nazareth, whom the enemies he had made in high places by His outspoken strictures were resolved

to put out of the way. They succeeded in ridding themselves of the popular and troublesome preacher; but the very step by which they fancied they had simultaneously stamped out His revolutionary doctrines contributed more than anything else they could have done to scatter them broadcast, not only over Judæa, but over Asia; for it impressed upon what had been hitherto mainly an ethical mission the character of a divine revelation, culminating in the passion and death of the incarnate Son of a heavenly Father. In this form the story of the life and death of Jesus exerted an influence which it could never have had if the great Teacher had died the death of a vulgar malefactor. It shed around the cross on Calvary a halo of divinity which multitudes saw and worshipped afar off; the blow struck on Golgotha set a thousand expectant strings vibrating in unison wherever men had heard the old, old story of the dying and risen God. Every year, as another spring bloomed and another autumn faded across the earth, the field had been ploughed and sown and borne fruit of a kind, till it received that seed which was destined to spring up and overshadow the world. In the great army of martyrs, who in many ages and in many lands, not in Asia only, have died a cruel death in the character of gods, the devout Christian will doubtless discern types and forerunners of the coming Saviour—stars that heralded in the morning sky the advent of the Sun of Righteousness—earthen vessels wherein it pleased the divine wisdom to set before hungering souls the bread of heaven. The sceptic, on the other hand, with equal confidence, will reduce Jesus of Nazareth to the level of a multitude of other victims of a barbarous superstition, and will see in Him no more than a moral teacher, whom the fortunate accident of his execution invested with the crown, not merely of a martyr, but of a god. The divergence between these views is wide and deep. Which of them is the truer and will in the end prevail? Time will decide the question of prevalence, if not of truth. Yet we would fain believe that in this and in all things the old maxim will hold good—*Magna est veritas et prævalebit.*[1]

The great advantage of letting Dr. Frazer sum up in his own words curtails the space available for discussing his startling hypothesis. We have said enough to show that

[1] *Golden Bough*, iii., pp. 197, 198.

there is very little indeed in it against which the devout Christian has any adequate motive to rebel. Whether it has evidence enough to be treated as probable—in the absence of direct testimony it must of course remain a hypothesis at best—is another matter. Dr. Frazer himself only brings it forward with hesitation, and the gaps in the evidence are admittedly serious, while the testimony there is shows not a few perplexing discords. The arguments in its favour being conceded, it still remains obvious *ex hypothesi* that countless Hamans had similarly perished without any suggestion of their rising again or any wish to regard them as divine. That the spread of Christianity should have been assisted by this association, if proved, would not in the very least diminish the truth of the assertion that Christianity spread because of the personality of its Founder. Those who would examine Dr. Frazer's Haman theory may see arguments *con*, good and bad alike, enumerated categorically by Mr. Lang on page 202 of his book: we may assume that the author himself will not be long in reinforcing his case. Meanwhile, *non nostrum tantas componere lites.* It is enough to have shown that we have no *a priori* reason to object to the hypothesis, in which the "devout Christian," evolutionist though he be, has manifestly good and sound reason for discerning just what Dr. Frazer eloquently describes for him. And claiming as he does to follow One who is the Truth incarnate, he will not shrink for one moment from the issue. For, verily, "Truth is great, and will prevail."

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

CHRISTIANITY IN INDIA.

1. *Report of the South Indian Missionary Conference held at Madras*, January 2–5, 1900.
2. *The Harvest Field*, Vols. I.—X., New Series.
3. *The Indian Social Reformer*, Vols. I.—IX.

INDIA is generally considered a most difficult sphere for mission work, and many regard the results attained as incommensurate with the labour expended. While we recognise the difficulties of the task,—and some of them are exceptionally formidable,—we demur to the statement that the results are scanty.

The peculiar difficulties of the work must be recognised, or the successes cannot be rightly estimated. The languages of India with their strange idiom are hard to acquire; only this hindrance is common to many lands. The religion and philosophy of India are subtle and highly specialised. Profound thinkers have treated all the phenomena of life and man's relation to the Unseen with an independence and thoroughness met with nowhere else. The peculiar conditions of life in India have helped these metaphysical speculations, and India has provided a unique chapter in the history of human thought. This philosophy has permeated the masses of the people, colouring their thought and language. Hence every word needed to convey a Christian thought is already pre-empted by a pantheistic idea. The task of conveying Christian truth in a language saturated with a pantheistic philosophy is enormous, and few appear to realise its peculiar difficulty. No technical word in an Indian vernacular conveys exactly the same idea as the corresponding one in English. The words—spirit, sin, redemption, faith, heaven, and many

others that a missionary has constantly to use—have all a pantheistic meaning and convey ideas foreign to the genius and spirit of Christianity. Then the social system that has gradually been developed is another unique and powerful obstacle to the extension of the Christian Church. A man's status is fixed by his birth; and if he violates the laws that regulate the community in which he is born, he has no mercy shown to him; ostracism of the severest kind is his lot, and life is to him a living death, for all that a man holds dear—parents, wife, children, relatives, friends—can be enjoyed no longer. These gigantic and powerful forces must be remembered when we consider the position of Christianity in India.

While Christianity has been existent in India from at least the fourth century, yet the actual campaign for the evangelization of that empire was really undertaken by the Protestant Churches only after the Indian Mutiny in 1857. The study of the beginnings of Christianity in India is exceedingly interesting, but the results of such study are disappointing. In the early centuries Christianity in the East was a vigorous and aggressive force; but whether from internal controversy or from the powerful and subtle paganism with which it had everywhere to contend, it lost its vitality and became to a great extent a spent force. It conserved what it had gained, and settled down as one of the many religions of the East. Christianity entered India on the west coast, towards the southern extremity of the peninsula, and its triumphs were won in Travancore and Cochin. Its early history is largely shrouded in myth and mystery; but its spacious churches, its elaborate ritual, its social organisation, and its wealth testify to the position it attained in the land. Its aggressive character has, however, ceased for centuries, and it is not easy to determine the amount of moral and spiritual force it has exerted during its dark ages. Signs of revival are apparent in those Churches, and it is hoped they will enter upon a new era of spiritual aggression. The Roman Church has had its missionaries in the land for centuries, and the name of

Xavier will ever be held in grateful remembrance for apostolic zeal and devotion. Many of the methods of Rome have been contrary to the spirit of Jesus, especially the Inquisition at Goa and the brute force employed in dealing with the Syrian Christians. The energetic labours of the Roman Church have produced a large body of Christians, and so far as adherents are concerned Rome leads the van. The propaganda of Rome is not an open one, and it is difficult to describe the position of that Church in India to-day. A missionary at the end of the eighteenth century, the Abbé Dubois, declared that the conversion of the Hindus was an impossible task, and, in spite of labours abundant and self-denial abounding, he left India convinced that the conversion of India was hopeless. The Roman Church evidently works through its members and relies upon its priestly power. It believes in education, but aggressive preaching is practically unknown. The descendants of the Portuguese and the Eurasians belong in great numbers to the Roman Church. We do not think that the yearly accessions to Rome from Hinduism are large, but the natural increase of the community must be considerable.

Protestantism took the field in the eighteenth century, and the Danish Mission at Tranquebar was the first to enter upon the campaign. Ziegenbalg and his coadjutors were the heroic pioneers of the host of Protestant missionaries that has invaded India, and their names a grateful posterity will not willingly let die. For years they toiled without much sympathy from the Protestant world, but they toiled not in vain; for the influence of the mission was great in South India, and culminated in that self-denying and stalwart missionary—Schwartz. There were fresh reasons for hope when the immortal Carey took up the parable. With breadth of vision he realised the duty of the Church to the heathen, with tenacity of purpose he sought to arouse the conscience of Nonconformity in regard to the state of the world, and with complete self-sacrifice he bade farewell to home and friends and entered what was for mission

purposes the great unknown of Northern India. Landing in British India, he was not allowed as a British subject to live there and propagate Christianity. In spite of gigantic hindrances he and his colleagues undauntedly pursued their course, taking refuge in Danish territory at Serampore, bore down all opposition, and won for themselves a position of security and influence. The story of these pioneers became known in the British Isles, and gradually, very gradually, interest was awakened and help secured. The birth of all the great Missionary Societies may be traced to this movement, and no organisations have been more fruitful of good works and permanent blessing to the human race. But progress was necessarily slow, and work largely tentative. Preparatory work—how vast few realise—had to be done. Languages must be mastered. The whole apparatus of grammars, dictionaries, etc., had in most cases to be prepared. The Bible had to be translated, and some kind of religious literature written. The quiet enthusiasm and noble devotion necessary for work of this kind are not generally recognised. The men who fought and slew the early giants that stood in their path deserve all honour, though the number of converts were few. They completed the preparations that made a steady and speedy advance practicable. The Christian Churches of Britain, however, failed to grasp the situation or to adequately realise their responsibility till the empire was convulsed by the great Indian Mutiny. A deliberate and determined effort was made to throw off British allegiance, and for months a large portion of Northern India was in the hands of the rebels. But British pluck and determination prevailed, and India became tranquil. Public attention was called to that empire as never before, and the Churches began to discharge their responsibilities to the peoples of that land. Missionary Societies reinforced their stations and a forward movement began. America and Germany had long sent a contingent of missionaries, but they also strengthened their missions. Many new societies entered India, and the network of mission stations has gradually extended all over

the country, while the meshes have become by degrees smaller, though some of them to-day represent hundreds of square miles of territory. Such in outline is the history of the missionary movement in India.

The actual progress of Christianity in India cannot be set forth with mathematical accuracy. There are books that deal with sections of India; biographies that are invaluable to those who wish to know the difficulties and triumphs of the work; most interesting records in the various mission-houses of Britain, America, and Germany; but there is no book that brings the subject up to date. In India several religious magazines and newspapers contain the record of passing events, and stirring incidents are frequently found in their pages. There is one magazine devoted to mission work in India, and its pages contain a review of the work accomplished year by year and a valuable discussion of the problems that confront the Indian missionary. *The Harvest Field* has for nearly twenty years been the chief organ of missionary policy and work, and embedded in its volumes are many most valuable and suggestive articles from which the intelligent and instructed reader can learn much. A careful study of the pages of that magazine and other literature current in India enables us to form a clear conception of the present position of Christianity in India.

Any numerical estimate must be more or less a matter of conjecture, as no real religious census has been taken for ten years, the last being in 1890. The following figures are well within the mark, and show the Protestant Christian forces now holding the field: foreign and Eurasian male workers, 1,000; lady workers, 1,000; native preachers, 5,500; native teachers, 11,000; Protestant native Christians, 900,000; Christians of all kinds, including Catholics and Syrians, more than 3,000,000; children in mission day and Sunday schools, 500,000. Such an array is a formidable force, and if operating in a small country like England would undoubtedly be conspicuous; but in India, with its teeming millions, it forms only the outposts of the army that we

hope to see in due time. The mission stations are dotted here and there often with great gaps between. Nevertheless there is an effective and aggressive force in the land, which cannot be ignored or treated with contempt. It has occupied the strategical positions and is bent on victory. Still the force is altogether disproportionate to the task of evangelizing three hundred millions of people; for if we reckon all Protestant preachers and teachers of every kind, there is but one to about 16,000 persons. A careful study of the different missions reveals the fact that the results are generally in proportion to the workers employed, and that concentration has been more successful than covering a wide area with an inadequate staff.

In estimating the position of Christianity in India there are several factors to be borne in mind. The strong well organised staffs of the different missions are the aggressive force. Never in the history of Christianity has so much love, self-sacrifice, ingenuity, skill, ability, and learning been available for the propagation of the faith of Jesus. There is no diminution of zeal. As one worker falls or has to retire, others are ready to take his place, and numbers of volunteers are waiting for the Churches to send them forth. Everywhere the workers are animated with a spirit of courage, of hope, and they are confident that they are engaged in a successful enterprise.

In India the number of converts gained is no indication of the position of Christianity. The story of hundreds of these converts is full of romance or pathos. There has been the failure of faith in an out-worn creed, the renunciation of idolatry and caste with the bitter persecution necessarily entailed, and the acceptance of the fuller and freer faith of Jesus Christ; or there has been the vague consciousness of an unrest, a misery too deep for words, and a dim recognition of the hope and brightness that Christianity brings. Each recruit has his story to tell, and each story but confirms the toiler in his confidence that Jesus Christ is the Saviour that India requires, and that the needs of India's sons and daughters can be met only in Him. The difficulties of

high-caste and low-caste alike in confessing Christ are so great that many missionaries do not expect large numbers of these solitary ones to come out and endure the reproach of Christ. They rather look to the gradual leavening of the people with Christian sentiments, and when the way is prepared by a loosening of the bonds of caste and a more intelligent conception of Christianity on the part of the people, they expect a movement in masses towards the Christian Church. Their history and social organisation point to this as the probable course of events.

In uncivilised and savage countries, as the islands of the Pacific and large regions of Africa, Christianity has speedily attained a triumph. The people have had certain religious conceptions, but these have been so crude and expressed in so rude, cruel, and revolting a manner that the superiority of the Christian Way has soon become manifest. The teaching, work, and lives of the missionaries quickly made a profound impression, and the people have abandoned their fetishes, renounced their cruelties, and embraced Christianity as far as they have been able to understand it. Such movements are not to be expected in India except among the degraded demon worshippers of the lowest castes. Here similar results have followed upon steady, persistent, continuous work among those classes. In Travancore, Tinnevelly, Madura, Arcot, around Madras, along the East Coast, in Hyderabad, in Chota Nagpur, in the North-west Provinces and Rajputana, tens of thousands of these degraded ones have entered the Christian Church as their ark of safety, and are being instructed in their duties and privileges as members of that body. These movements will continue, for Hindus admit that there is no hope for the advancement of these races in their system, and no efforts of any importance are being made by the Hindus to retain these serfs within the pale of Hinduism beyond the persecution of those who seek to enter the Christian fold. The Muhammadan religion has ceased to be aggressive in India; but it would not be safe to predict that it will not be. The prospects are not hope-

ful; for Islam does not make much headway when the authorities are not members of that community. It has free scope for proselytism in India; but its past record of force, and its present state of apathy, are not favourable to an aggressive campaign. If the Christian Church will send labourers sufficient, the uncivilised and aboriginal tribes of India may soon become nominal Christians.

When we survey the caste population of India of many races and tongues, a different problem presents itself. We have already referred to the philosophical thought, highly elaborated worship, and unique social system that characterise these peoples. Christianity does not come to them as a means of deliverance from thraldom, of elevation in the social scale, of hope for progress and enlightenment. It comes in their estimation rather as an antagonist, a rival, whose claims are arrogant, and which if it cannot be ignored must be overthrown. For years it was ignored or treated with contempt. Occasionally the mob was encouraged to fling a few stones, but the higher castes left the preacher alone, or sought to entangle him in an unending discussion of problems that can never be solved. The Christian Church, while always maintaining a frontal attack in the form of a continual proclamation of the gospel of Jesus Christ, has sought to turn the flank of the opposition by seizing the young and instilling in their minds the thoughts, sentiments, and doctrines of Christianity. This is a slow process. It has been carried on for more than half a century, and the wisdom of the course is manifest to-day in the results achieved.

Dr. Duff, when he inaugurated the movement, declared that he was laying a mine that would destroy the Puranic Hinduism that held the field in the middle of last century. The prophecy has come true. No one who has passed through an English institution retains his faith in the gods many and lords many of Puranic Hinduism. He is inclined to cast them off and all that belongs to them. The destructive effect of education is complete. No Hindu who passes through an English educational institution—whether

Government or Mission—can regard the world from the same standpoint as when he entered it. He can no longer accept all the hosts of myth and legend with which Puranic Hinduism is adorned. These are thrown off as weights too heavy to be carried. Hindu philosophy receives some rude shocks, and he is not so sure that his forefathers were the wisest men the earth has produced. He is not prepared to cast aside the subtle idealism running through the Vedanta, but the practical nature of much of his education enables him to regard the philosophy from another standpoint. His social system is one to be dropped as soon as custom will sanction it. Many of his caste customs are too grievous to be borne, and they have for him vanished. Enough is retained to enable him to be regarded as a respectable member of society. The rest disappears, and with it much that is picturesque. That the educated classes are groaning beneath the burden of their social system is evident from the passing of "The Gains of Learning Bill" by the Madras Government. The Hindu joint family system has for its fundamental principle community of property. All that is earned by every member goes to the head of the house for the benefit of all. This new Act makes it possible for a man to keep the money he acquires as the result of his own abilities, though his education may have been defrayed from the common fund of the family. These things are significant of much to those who can read the signs of the times.

Then these educated men are becoming imbued with other sentiments. They examine and discuss questions from another standpoint. A study of Hindu newspapers and magazines reveals the fact that passing subjects are not looked at in the light of Vedanta teaching or Puranic lore, but in accordance with the principles imparted in present-day schools and colleges, and these are chiefly the outcome of Christianity. Pressure of circumstances will sometimes evoke a criticism that is a strange jumble of modern thought and ancient philosophy; but usually there is very little that will shock Christian sentiment, and frequently the comments

are distinctively Christian in their character. Much of this is unconscious Christianity. The writers would probably be the first to disclaim that their sentiments were Christian. They have been so moulded by the education they have received that they think and write according to the ideas that are dominant, and these are Christian, though the native author is unaware of the fact. This is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. The people do not discuss problems from the pessimistic standpoint of Hindu philosophy, but from the optimistic and progressive view of Christianity. Consequently principles of righteousness, justice, equity, integrity, and truthfulness are more widely disseminated and acted upon. A more healthy life pervades the body politic, and a spirit of greater hopefulness prevails.

To Christianity itself there is a different attitude, though its aggressiveness is deeply resented still. Christianity is not decried as once it was, though it has not received the careful study it deserves. The Hindu conception of Christian dogma is crude. From a lack of consciousness of sin there is an inadequate and false idea of the Atonement. The doctrine of substitution has been held in its baldest and most repellent form, and naturally in that shape fails to meet the keen criticism of the philosophic Hindu. He needs a wider and a fuller knowledge of Christian teaching. Some have given the subject closer study, and these are prepared to acknowledge the good they have received from such a course. The revival of a spurious patriotism has prevented the due recognition of Christianity. It is regarded as a product of the West, as a foreign religion, and hence it has been tabooed as contrary to the true interests of Bhâratavarsha, as some patriots like to style their country. Truer ideas of patriotism will prevail in time, and it will be seen that an acceptance of Christianity does not mean a lack of love or loyalty for their land.

The individual accessions to the Christian Church are more numerous than ever, and these indicate one of two things—that profound spiritual influences have impelled a decision that could not be put off, or that some social or

family difficulty has made Christianity a more desirable profession than Hinduism. This latter movement will have to be carefully watched, for it will bring into the Christian Church men without high spiritual motives, but who desire some relief from the galling bonds of caste and the crippling chains of family life. Hindus are recognising the fact that men are forsaking Hinduism on various grounds, and they are arranging ways by which a convert can be readmitted into caste. This in itself is a wonderful testimony to the influence of Christianity in India. It was not long ago that every convert was cast out as evil, and there was no thought of preparing a bridge by which he might return. He was socially dead, and in that state he must remain. Now the wandering sheep is invited to return to the fold, and in the few cases where he has accepted the invitation he has been received with feasting and gladness, and everything done to make his path smooth. But this new attitude has not produced any results that are inimical to Christianity. Missionaries welcome the more tolerant spirit that prevails, for that itself is a powerful witness to the spread of Christian sentiment.

The reports of Missionary Conferences held in India also reveal the progress made by missionary bodies in their conception of the state of mission work in that land. The problems that have now to be solved are different from those that confronted missionaries thirty years ago. Then they were engaged in perfecting their weapons of attack. The means by which the Hindu could be reached were sought after and examined. The subjects discussed were—street-preaching, touring in villages, the use of education as an evangelizing agency, medical missions, and similar topics, all dealing with aggressive effort. To-day there is practically no discussion of such topics; for they have been adequately considered, and all are agreed that the methods begun by our forefathers and perfected by their successors must be continued in the highest state of efficiency. Now the Missionary Conferences have not to consider so much the wielding of the large army of aggressive evangelists—

their work is clearly defined; but the means by which what has been won may be conserved; how to utilise to the full the positions gained; how to organise the Christian Church into a body that shall adequately express the mind of Christ and at the same time be an aggressive force to carry on and complete the work of evangelism begun by the missionaries. These and similar questions have now to be discussed. The gravest undoubtedly gather round the organisation of the native Church. The material has in many places been made available, and this must be moulded till the Church shall be able to express its own life in a way that will be loyal to Christ and at the same time influence the non-Christian community by which it is environed. The living Spirit of God is in His Church in India, and there will in time be produced a self-supporting, self-propagating organisation that will evangelize the millions of the land. To clearly put forth the factors of this great problem would require an article; but the future development of Christianity in India will depend chiefly upon the way in which the native Church realises its position and responsibilities and strives to fulfil them.

Another problem that will require careful study and thoughtful management is the condition of the millions of the lowest classes who everywhere show signs of a desire to enter the Christian Church. Their degraded state is borne witness to by all who are familiar with it. The one hope of their regeneration lies in the Christian Church; for all classes of the Hindu community acknowledge that they cannot do anything for these depressed classes. The organisation and carrying out of work on an adequate scale to meet the needs of these people will tax the resources of the Christian Church in many ways. Men of breadth of vision who are willing to stoop to the most degraded and patiently bear with humanity in its weakest and most unlovely aspects are needed for this enterprise. They must be organisers as well as philanthropists, ardent evangelists as well as patient pastors. They must not only bring the evangel of Jesus, but they must prepare a way by which

these despised ones can regain their manhood and earn a living which shall lift them above their present sordid surroundings. To this end industrial enterprises on a large scale will have to be undertaken. The Missionary Societies will have to address themselves to this task with greater energy than that shown hitherto.

The future development of the intellectual and spiritual faculties of those who are able to read presses for more consideration on the part of those who enjoy greater privileges. Without his papers, magazines, and books the modern Christian would be at a great loss, though perhaps the time spent on reading much of the ephemeral literature of the present day if employed in devout meditation might produce a saner and more wholesome spirituality. In India the helps to an understanding of the word of God are lamentably lacking, and the reading public in the vernaculars has few books that are edifying. The supply of a suitable literature for the Indian peoples is engaging the attention of many thoughtful men and women. Missionary Societies are recognising the need of wholesome literature, and there are grounds for hoping that soon something like adequate efforts will be made to meet the need. Revisions of the Scripture are everywhere in progress, and soon the people will be able to read in their own language in an intelligible way the wonderful words that God has spoken to man. Books of various kinds are being produced, but a long time must elapse before there will be a literature to replace the wild legends and grotesque myths that have formed the intellectual and spiritual food of the people for ages.

A short statement of the unique difficulties confronting Christianity in India, a concise survey of what has been accomplished in the leavening of the land with Christian thought and sentiment and in the establishment of infant Churches throughout the country, and a brief enumeration of the problems that now face the Christian missionary and his supporters and sympathisers, reveals the fact that Christianity has made very great progress in the vast continent of India, and that the results amply justify the amount of time, toil,

and wealth spent by devoted men and women during the past century. All we hoped for has not been achieved, all that we expected has not been realised; but it is evident to anyone who will read the history of current Hindu thought and life that Christianity in its various forms has made a profound impression upon the national life and character, and that day by day that impression is becoming deeper and more enduring. Everywhere there are signs of a new life: old practices, ancient institutions are being abandoned, hoary superstitions are put on one side, the wisdom of the ancients is being questioned and tested anew, the faiths of the past fail to satisfy; new thoughts are welcomed, new explanations of the problems of life and duty are sought, the apathy has largely passed away, and with faces towards the light men are eagerly seeking the regeneration of themselves and the reformation of their people. A new hope is inspiring the rising generation, and eager hearts look bravely into the future. At such a period in a nation's history it needs the teaching of Jesus and the influences that spring from His life and death, His resurrection and ascension, to guide and stimulate, to mould and fashion the changing life and character of this ancient and wonderful people. Those who daily pray, "Thy kingdom come," will not slacken in their efforts, but will respond more readily to the appeals for help that come from this nation seeking to begin anew its story under the influences of a purer faith and a nobler ideal. The signs are favourable, the fields are white unto the harvest. Let the labourers be sent forth into the harvest, and without the shadow of a misgiving the reaping-time will come.

HENRY GULLIFORD.

FIVE TYPES OF THE RENAISSANCE.

Renaissance Types. By WILLIAM SAMUEL LILLY. (London: T. F. Unwin.)

MR. LILLY'S *Renaissance Types* is a fascinating study of one of the most notable periods of European history. The Revival of Learning culminated between the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the sack of Rome in 1527. Those memorable seventy-four years formed an era of

intellectual and social awakening, of mental and spiritual unrest; of chaotic opposition between old and new, between self-denial and self-enjoyment, between ecclesiasticism and secularism, between religiosity and sensuousness.

Michelet says:

The sixteenth century, if we take the phrase in a large sense, as we legitimately may, extends from Columbus to Copernicus, from the discovery of the earth to the discovery of the heavens: nay, it includes man's re-discovery of himself.

The Protestant Reformation is one phase of that Revival of Learning which broke the fetters that had held the human spirit in bondage for centuries, and brought Europe out into the light of a new day.

Christianity had manifested itself to the decadent and moribund civilisation of the Roman Empire as a mighty discipline. It came "to cleanse the foul body of the infected world." St. Augustine summed up moral duty in the laws of continence and patience:

Two virtues they are which cleanse the soul and make it capable of the divine nature. To bridle lusts and to conquer pleasures, that false blandishments may not seduce us, or what is accounted prosperity enervate us, we have need of continence,

so that we may give no credence to earthly felicity, and to the end seek that felicity which has no end. And as it is the office of continence to keep us from giving credence to worldly felicity, so it is the office of patience to keep us from giving way to the world's infelicity.

That view of life was strenuously taught during the Middle Ages, yet

the victory of Christianity over Paganism in Italy was superficial. Great saints, great doctors, great popes arose in that country. But Christianity never so thoroughly penetrated the masses and the common life as it did in regions which it won from barbarism. It is not too much to say that Italy was the least distinctively Christian part of Christendom.

Dante's mythology is a proof that the people believed in the old gods and in the old superstitions. "The Middle Ages," as Ozanam says, "are full of the remains of paganism."

All this must be borne in mind by the student of the Renaissance. The old artists, who had been fettered by the stern teaching of the Church, awoke as to the breath of spring when classicalism ushered them into its enchanted world. Heine says:

The artists, in particular, once more breathed freely, as the nightmare of Christendom seemed rolled away from their breast; enthusiastically did they plunge into the sea of Greek cheerfulness, out of whose foam the goddesses of beauty again rose before their eyes; the painters painted again the ambrosial joys of Olympus; the sculptors chiselled again with the old joy, the old heroes sang out of the blocks of marble; the poets sang again the house of Atreus and Laos.

The old rules of self-restraint were shaken off in the intoxication of the time. Men in high places at the papal court jested about religion. Poggio, who had a supreme contempt for Christain faith and defied Christian morality, held lucrative office under eight successive popes. Such men dominated the papal court in the culminating period of the Renaissance, and no one seems to have thought their presence there incongruous. Petrarch, the founder of the

literary Renaissance, lived at the court of Avignon, intent on adding to his rich benefices. He reproved the clergy for luxury and incontinence whilst he was himself hunting after preferment for the sake of his concubines and children. Boccaccio despised all Christian discipline and decency. "His writings transport the reader to the sweltering atmosphere of pagan sensuality." Yet he did not lose the respect of the popes. "In truth, as the Church is always in the world, so is the world always in the Church, more or less. And in this age it was more, not less." The Papacy had become a scandal to earnest men. It was sinking through successive stages of deterioration into selfishness and worldliness. At the Council of Constance, when the very stones were crying out for reform through all Christendom, the only practical measures on which the fathers could agree were the burning of Hus and Jerome of Prague. The council had, however, one good effect, for it brought scholars face to face, and kindled a zeal for the discovery of manuscripts which played no small part in the Revival of Learning in Europe.

The fall of Constantinople in 1453 created universal consternation. Events, however, proved that the greatness of the calamity had been exaggerated, whilst the Greeks of the new dispersion diffused learning and culture through Italy and other countries of Europe. Religion seemed to lose its office. Ancient literature appeared to carry with it the satisfaction of every spiritual need, and to furnish for all men a guide to the true perfection of their nature. Paulsen says:

> The old Christian virtues—humility, self-denial, obedience, faith, piety—lost their attractions in the eyes of the new race; unrestrained enjoyment and free thought, pride and defiant independence, impatience of a master, boldness and strength daring to seize upon everything it can—such are the traits of perfection which hovered before the most advanced spirits of the new time.

Christianity was for the chief leaders of the movement a dead letter. Its warnings against the lust of the flesh, the

lust of the eye, and the vain-glory of life were scouted. Virtuous women, Symonds says, had no place in Rome. Everything was paganised. "The Humanists came to be dreaded as the corruptors of youth."

Mr. Lilly has felicitously brought out the characteristics of this period, so full of interest for artist, literary student, and moralist, by a study of five representative men. History has been called the essence of innumerable biographies. A great man reflects and interprets the age in which he lives. Italy furnishes one of the five great men. Michael Angelo is the typical artist of the Renaissance, and art was the only side of that great movement which Italy fully understood.

Mr. Lilly holds that "of all the wondrous intellectual endowments of man the artistic or æsthetic comes first." No artist has set before the world the "essential, profound, eternal" as Angelo has done with his brush and his chisel. One of his own countrymen described him as "the man with four souls."

Supreme among modern sculptors, the unapproached master of the sublime and terrible in painting, an architect of lofty and daring genius, and a poet who had drunk deeply at the highest founts of inspiration, he is assuredly the greatest figure that art has ever presented.

Symonds calls him the prophet or seer of the Renaissance. He was born at Florence in 1474. His native city lives in the pages of *Romola*, and Angelo owed much to that nest of great men and artists. Books were to him "a dull and endless strife." He was often "marvellously beaten" because he neglected his lessons to handle a brush or visit a studio. His father learned at last to let the boy's genius find its own expression. At the age of thirteen he became the pupil of the Ghirlandaii, who summed up the best traditions of the Tuscan school. His masters taught him much, but he also studied earnestly the work of such artists as Giotti and Fra Angelico. Religion was the ruling spirit of these great artists. They "used their powers of painting," as Ruskin says, "to show the objects of faith";

where others "used the objects of faith that they might show their powers of painting."

Lorenzo de Medici discerned the boy's genius, and invited him to become an inmate of his palace, where he continued till his patron's death about three years later. The youth threw himself with all the intensity of his nature into the study of the antique, "every day showing some fruits of his labours to the Magnifico, and associating with the learned baskers in the same princely patronage." The atmosphere of the palace was a liberal education for the gifted youth. There he caught that passion for Dante which he never lost.

After he returned to his father's house he fell under the spell of Savonarola, who testified of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come in the most beautiful and most corrupt of Italian cities. In listening to this great master a fountain of life was opened for Michael Angelo. Here is the secret of his faith and purity, of his devotion to the cause of freedom. Savonarola lived on in the genius who in dark days infused into art a breath of religion and liberty. Savonarola made him a diligent student of the Bible, and to the end of life he used to recall vividly the tones of the prophet's voice. The deeper and more solemn meaning of life was thus revealed to him.

His "Pieta," executed in 1499, was his first Christian masterpiece. Mr. Lilly says:

> No language can do it justice; it must be seen, studied, felt to be appreciated. And how eloquently does it speak the thought of the mind that conceived it. The sacred subject has become to him a living fact since the time when he first essayed to treat it. The fiery words of Savonarola and his fiery death have burnt into his soul as realities what before were to him but notions. The things of which he has read in the most earnest of books—the Bible and Dante—are apprehended by him with the keenness and directness of a new sense, for the eyes of his understanding have been opened:
>
> deep feelings had impressed
> So vividly great objects, that they lay
> Upon his mind like substances.

Michael Angelo was twenty-five when he thus learned the secret of his life work. He was now in Rome, absorbed in his art. "I have no friends," he tells his father; "I need none, and I wish to have none." Soon afterwards he returned to Florence, where he spent six years, until Julius II. called him back to Rome in 1505. His work during his years of vigorous manhood shows how the artist grew in moral and spiritual stature. The Madonna at Bruges, which marks the beginning of this period, is like a serene morning; the Madonna in the Medici Chapel at Florence, which marks its close, reveals the calm after the tempest.

The fight has been fought, hopes have been destroyed, dearest affections have been wounded unto death; "all that seems" has suffered shock. But the living will has endured, invincible, and "from out the dust" is lifted

A voice as unto Him that hears,
A cry above the conquered years.

Michael Angelo was no stranger to trouble. His enemies clamoured against him, his family preyed upon him all his life. He found his papal masters hard to please. He writes in 1512 to his father:

I endure great weariness and hopelessness. So it has been with me for fifteen years—never an hour's comfort. It is enough to have bread, and to live in the faith of Christ, even as I do here, for I live humbly, nor do I care for the life or the honours of the world.

He was alone and unmarried, a great and solitary soul. In his sixtieth year he was appointed chief architect, sculptor, and painter to the Apostolic Chamber, and his "pure and most sweet friendship" with Victoria Colonna, the most gifted and illustrious woman of her age, began. She was a rare friend, and her sympathy in all his thoughts brightened eleven years of his life. She took his true measure when she said, "Those who admire Michael Angelo's works admire but the smallest part of him."

One of his sonnets, written in his last years, closes with the noble lines:

> Painting nor sculpture now can lull to rest
> My soul that turns to His great love on high,
> Whose arms, to clasp us, on the cross were spread.

Those thoughts were with him on his death-bed. The last words he spoke to his friends were, "When you come to die, remember the Passion of Jesus Christ."

Erasmus is of softer fibre than Michael Angelo. He is the Renaissance Man of Letters, and we have never seen any portrait of the great humanist so attractive as that painted by Mr. Lilly. He is very severe in his strictures on Mr. Froude's Lectures on Erasmus:

> His descriptions are most happy. His portraits are most life-like. His summaries are most brilliant. He abounds in sage sayings, in racy reflections, in caustic criticisms. But of that judical mind, that breadth of view, that philosophic moderation, which are essential characteristics of a great historian, his pages present no trace. He is everywhere an advocate, and not a specially scrupulous advocate.

This criticism must be received with some reserve, though Froude has laid himself open to severe attack. Charles Reade in his noble historical novel, *The Cloister and the Hearth*, represents the parents of Erasmus as married. There is no ground, however, for doubting that he was an illegitimate child. On the death of his parents his guardians forced him into a monastery at Stein. After five years of misery the Bishop of Cambrai chose Erasmus as his secretary, and he escaped from the irksome life of the cloister. Lord Mountjoy's invitation to England in 1497 brought new sunshine into his life. More, Colet, Fisher, and Warham became his devoted friends. He says: "I cannot express how delightful I find this England of yours. I have got rid of all that weariness from which you used to see me suffer." After two years of unmixed satisfaction he went back to Paris, which became his headquarters for five or six years. Ten years after his first visit to England he

was More's guest at Bucklersbury, where he wrote the *Praise of Folly*. It was published in 1512, and went through twenty-seven large editions in his lifetime. With delicious satire he pursues the two great enemies of learning—degenerate monasticism and effete scholasticism. Bishops, cardinals, and popes all come under his lash; yet Rome enjoyed the satire and uttered no word of disapproval. The *editio princeps* of the Greek Testament, which he published in 1516, forms an era in biblical study. His critical work was done too hurriedly, and with scanty appliances; but he pointed out a new road for subsequent generations of scholars.

"His aim in all his work," as Mr. Lilly says, "was humanising: to soften the manners of men, to tame their passions, to make their lives sounder and saner and sweeter. In his prefaces and notes to the works which he edited shrewd appreciations of various aspects of human existence, pungent observations on popular follies, good-humoured pleadings for truth and temperance and tolerance, occupy a larger place than critical disquisitions on his author. His books are brimful of actuality, and that, no doubt, is one reason of the vast influence they exercised."

The Lutheran controversy darkened the last fifteen years of his life. Erasmus sympathised with Luther's war against indulgences; yet he never thought of joining him or quitting the Roman communion. By the Lutherans his moderation was regarded as cowardice; by the Romanists as hypocrisy. "To the last he trusted that it might be still possible to stem the tide of revolution by reform, to reconcile ecclesiastical unity with rational liberty." More than anyone else he made the Renaissance an instrument of liberal culture for the civilised world. "He used the new learning to liberalise the mind of Europe."

Reuchlin is the representative savant of the Renaissance. To his own generation his erudition seemed portentous, but the work which his contemporaries valued most highly is lightly prized by scholars to-day. "Probably no human being would ever read one line of his writings save under

the compulsion of a sense of duty." His position as a Hebraist was the misfortune of his life, for it led to his controversy with Pfefferkorn, the converted Jew, who advocated the destruction of all Hebrew books hostile to the Christian religion, or intended as apologies for Judaism. Reuchlin desired the conversion of the Jews, but he was no bigot. He did not hesitate to describe Pfefferkorn's book-burning as "a ruffianly argument." Reuchlin was now plunged into a sea of trouble. The Dominicans, who had taken Pfefferkorn under their protection, condemned Reuchlin's book, and attacked him with a virulence which embittered his life. For eight years he maintained a protracted duel with Hochstraten, the Dominican inquisitor. His book was at last condemned by Leo X., and silence was enjoined upon the great scholar. His religious convictions and his loyalty to Rome did not waver. His chief biographer writes :

> He was a servant of the Church, he was her subject. Highly as he prized scientific inquiry, and unfettered freedom in stating its results, he still submitted his particular writings, and the whole edifice of his teaching, to the judgment of the Church, and he was ready to retract anything wherein he had erred.

The controversy gave birth, in 1515, to the famous *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* which overwhelmed Reuchlin's enemies with ridicule. Ulrich von Hutten was the chief author of these merciless satires. "Their sting lay in their verisimilitude. Indeed, the persons ridiculed took them quite seriously at first, and supposed them to be composed in defence of decadent scholasticism and monkery." Erasmus laughed so heartily when he read them that he is said to have broken a tumour which threatened his life. Reuchlin's devotion to truth and learning made a profound impression on his own age. In some respects he may even be described as the father of all modern savants. His boldness and patience as a student were alike noteworthy, and when his long controversy with Hochstraten ended the old man returned peacefully to his books and studies. Few men have done more than Reuchlin to win unfettered liberty for Christian scholarship in its never-ending search for truth.

Mr. Lilly's study of Luther will awaken much diversity of opinion. He has aimed to set aside all theological tests; but it is manifest that he has little sympathy with Luther, whom he describes as *The Revolutionist.* He pays tribute to the depth and earnestness of the Reformer's religious convictions:

> God and the devil were real to him, with a reality hard to appreciate in these days, when, for so many, the Prince of Darkness has been sublimated into a figure of speech, and the Infinite and Eternal has become "the guess of a worm in the dark, and the shadow of its desire."

He thinks, however, that Luther was essentially lacking in humility:

> Strength is, indeed, from first to last, a distinguishing note of his character: the strength of convictions, which, whether right or wrong, dominated his whole being; the strength of narrow vision and of indomitable will.

The strength, we should rather say, of faith in God and in God's word which made him brave to face the might of Rome, and despite all odds to win the victory.

Mr. Lilly regards Tetzel's preaching as the direct cause of Luther's revolt. He gives us an apologia for indulgences from the Romish point of view, which is of no little interest. It shows, however, that Rome was morally responsible for Tetzel's outrage on good sense and good living. Mr. Lilly frankly acknowledges that "no student of the history of Luther's times, who pursues his studies without blinkers," can hesitate to denounce "that colossal scandal which Erasmus designated 'the crime of false pardons.' The message of the preachers of indulgences practically was that St. Peter for hard cash would open and guarantee heaven." Tetzel "united in himself," Mr. Lilly says, "the most telling qualities of a cheap-jack and a revivalist preacher; and had he lived in this age and country he would probably have been at least a major in the Salvation Army." The bad taste of this comparison is manifest. Tetzel would have

needed a radical change of heart and life before he would have been worthy to wear Salvation Army uniform. There is abundant evidence to show that his preaching was an outrage on the feeling of enlightened men. Luther's theses were intended to bring about a full discussion of the subject of papal pardons. He probably had no presentiment of the work he was beginning when he nailed them to the door of the Church at Wittenberg. Mr. Lilly thinks that Luther's mind was

> in a fluctuating state. It was teeming with half-formed ideas, which might shape themselves in one way or another as events determined. He did not see where he was going. He did not discern the consequences of his own principles. He desired reform. He did not contemplate revolution.

But events pushed Luther forward, and his doggedness was as great as his daring. Erasmus speaks of him as "that vehement genius, that Achilles of men who knows not what it is to yield." When he appeared before the Diet of Worms, in 1521, Cardinal Aleander refers to his "demoniac eyes," and "rude plebeian face, with its huge craglike brow and bones." He confronted the august concourse of priests and nobles over which Charles V. presided, and refused to recant what his conscience had dictated. He did not hesitate to affirm that the Council of Constance had decreed against plain and clear texts of Holy Scripture. Proscribed as a heretic, denied food or shelter, Luther disappeared behind the walls of the Wartburg, where he busied himself with the preparation of his German Bible. He came forth from his retirement to carry forward his great religious revolution.

Here is Mr. Lilly's version of the history of his struggle!

> He increased daily in audacity and power. He was profuse alike in libels and apologies. He attacked the Sovereign Pontiff with the utmost scurrility, and defied the whole authority of the Church. He drew into his quarrel with it princes who saw and seized the opportunity for their aggrandisement, and for whom liberty of conscience meant liberty to pillage ecclesiastical property.

Luther's reply to the strictures of Erasmus Mr. Lilly describes as "equally arrogant, scurrilous, and ineffective," and says it did much to alienate from him such of the more thoughtful and candid minds throughout Europe as still inclined to regard him favourably. His marriage is pronounced to be, both to friends and foes, an inexplicable event. Mozley thinks it lowered him, not only in the estimation of the world at large, but also "in his own estimation. No theory could make the marriage of a monk and a nun not ignominious. No theory could make it necessary for him to marry at all." From that verdict we must express our emphatic dissent. It shows how far ecclesiasticism can blind men to the teaching of the word of God. Luther's marriage with a nun was a double emancipation, which proclaimed to all the world the downfall of monasticism, and gave new dignity to home joys and family life. The immorality of the Roman priesthood stands out in painful contrast with the sweet peace of Luther's fireside. Mr. Lilly's treatment of this subject clearly betrays his Romanist bias.

Mr. Lilly shows that the Lutheran revolution was primarily a revolt against abuses which had become intolerable. Even Pope Adrian VI. bewailed the abominations which had long defiled the Apostolic See, but he failed to cleanse the Augean stable. The dogged opposition of the Roman Curia baffled all attempts at reform. The exactions of Rome were a byword among the nations; the traffic in indulgences showed that the Curia was lost to the sense of shame; even the Catholic members of the Diet of Augsburg "did not deny the frightful fact of widespread sacerdotal concubinage."

Luther had a Herculean task, which had baffled all his predecessors; and though men like Erasmus feared that his hot temper would bring about "a universal revolution" fatal to the progress of good letters, only a mighty man could have wrestled with principalities and powers and overthrown them.

Luther gloried in the fact that he was "a peasant and the

son of a peasant." On this saying Mr. Lilly bases a bitter tirade, which is a caricature, not a criticism :

From first to last his tone and temper are those of a peasant. He has the mind of a peasant, full of ardent and tumultuous passions, utterly undisciplined, coarse and material in its view of all things, human and divine. He has the virtues of a peasant : doggedness of purpose, indefatigable energy, bull-dog courage. He has the vices of a peasant : extravagance and excess, blind trust and incurable suspicion, boastful self-confidence, and the narrow-mindedness of intense subjectivity and most restricted intellectual vision.

Carlyle at least can appreciate Luther's speech :

He flashes out illumination from him ; his smiting idiomatic phrases seem to cleave into the very spirit of the matter. His range of vision may be limited, but he pierces to the heart of his subject, and makes his hearers and his readers see what he himself has seen.

Mr. Lilly is very severe on Luther as a controversialist :

Caricature and calumny, rancorous invective, and reckless misrepresentation were his ordinary polemical weapons. Of all the stimulants to popular passion, abuse is the most potent. To Luther must be conceded the distinction of being *facile princeps* in the art of vituperation. No writer with whom I am acquainted comes within measurable distance of him in power of fierce flagellation and fetid foulness. A very astonishing amalgam of unmeasured violence and unrestrained vulgarity does duty with him for argument. To call names, the vilest and most virulent, is merely his method of signifying disagreement.

Even such a critic is forced to admit that Luther's sincerity from first to last seems open to no doubt, but he holds that animalism is largely written on his life and teaching after the consummation of his revolt. He even regards his dogma of justification by faith alone as "an expression of his rejection of asceticism and self-discipline." Yet the titanic greatness of the man and of the revolution that he wrought are beyond question. Rome itself owed him no small debt. A Catholic historian calls the Council of Trent

the greatest thing effected by Luther, who quickened into new life the theology and the philosophy of his antagonists.

We have allowed Mr. Lilly to state his own case against Luther. We do not ignore the Reformer's faults. Bishop Creighton says that he had "a command of virulent invective and a power of personal onslaught which were unbefitting a zealous seeker after truth." His latest biographer, Professor Lindsay, in one of the best volumes of Messrs. Clark's *World's Epoch Makers*, holds that Luther had "a singular lack of self-control in the use of violent and incendiary speech." Mr. Lilly, however, like Erasmus himself, who complained to Melanchthon of Luther's methods, "underrates the use of violence." That is Dr. Marcus Dods' conclusion in his essay on the great humanist. He says:

> Erasmus had his own clearly defined views as to reforming the Church; that his method was theoretically the better of the two, that he had been working at it consistently with all his might for thirty years; that during that time he had seen considerable results achieved, and that his expectation that a complete reform would be carried through was assuredly not unreasonable. The blame must lie, not with him, but with those who, exasperated as Erasmus thought, by the violence of Luther, ultimately refused the reforms he sought.

Dr. Wace, in his edition of Luther's *Primary Works*, points out that if some expressions in Luther's speeches and addresses

> appear too sweeping and violent, due allowance must be made for the necessity which Luther must have felt of appealing with the utmost breadth and force to the popular mind.

He certainly uses strong language. In his address *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation respecting the Reformation of the Christian Estate*, he says:

> If we wish to fight the Turks, let us begin here, where they are worst. If we justly hang thieves and behead robbers, why do we leave the greed of Rome so unpunished, that is the

greatest thief and robber that has appeared or can appear on earth, and does all this in the holy name of Christ and St. Peter? Who can suffer this and be silent about it? Almost everything that they possess has been stolen or got by robbery, as we learn from all histories.

We may add the verdict of Archdeacon Hare in his *Vindication of Luther*. After referring to the reformer's strong words, he says:

These instances are notorious; a multitude of similar ones might be cited from Luther's writings, especially from those belonging to this critical period of his life, when all his powers were stretched beyond themselves by the stress of the conflict. To our nicer ears such expressions may seem in bad taste. Be it so; when a Titan is walking about among the pigmies, the earth seems to rock beneath his tread. When the adamantine bondage in which men's hearts and souls and minds had been held for centuries was to be burst, it was almost inevitable that the power which was to burst this should not measure its movement by the rules of polished life. Erasmus did so; Melanchthon did so; but a thousand Erasmuses would never have effected the Reformation, nor would a thousand Melanchthons without Luther to go before him and to animate him.

This is the real answer to such critics as Mr. Lilly. Luther was born for his great task, and right nobly did he perform it. He was by no means a paragon of perfection. Wesley, who owed him so much for the light that dawned in Aldersgate Street, said long ago:

O what pity that he had no faithful friend! None that would, at all hazards, rebuke him plainly and sharply for his rough, untractable spirit, and bitter zeal for opinions, so greatly obstructive of the work of God!

Yet Wesley honours him "as a man highly favoured of God, and a blessed instrument in His hands." His heroic devotion to his work is beyond praise. Archdeacon Hare's portrait may be framed beside Mr. Lilly's, and the world may be left to say which was the real Luther.

To some readers it may seem that I have spoken with exaggerated admiration of Luther. No man ever lived whose whole

heart and soul and life have been laid bare as his have been to the eyes of mankind. Open as the sky, bold and fearless as the storm, he gave utterance to all his feelings, all his thoughts; he knew nothing of reserve; and the impression he produced on his hearers and readers was such that they were anxious to treasure up every word that dropped from his pen or from his lips. No man therefore has ever been exposed to so severe a trial; perhaps no man was ever placed in such difficult circumstances, or assailed by such manifold temptations. And how has he come out of the trial? Through the power of faith, under the guardian care of his heavenly Master, he was enabled to stand through life, and still he stands, and will continue to stand, firmly rooted in the love of all who really knew him.

Mr. Lilly's study of More is the most attractive in his portrait gallery. More is the saint of the Renaissance, whose life and spirit were ruled by an intelligent and pious reverence. His father wished that he should learn from his earliest years to be frugal and sober. "He gave him the bare necessaries of life, and would not allow him a farthing to spend freely." In after-days the son recognised the value of such training. His mind was concentrated on his studies, and he did not know what luxury meant. When Erasmus visited England in 1499 he was charmed with his new friend. "Did nature ever frame," he asks, "a sweeter, happier character than More's?" Henry VIII., who had been much struck by the ability which More displayed in a legal case, drew him to court, much against his will. In 1518 he became a member of the Privy Council and Master of Requests, an office which brought him into constant intercourse with the king. He was now forty, and for the next ten years enjoyed the sunshine of royal favour. He was often invited to the king's table, where he amused both Henry and Queen Katharine by his lively sallies. Honour and promotion were showered upon him. Once when Henry dined with him at Chelsea he walked for an hour in the garden holding his arm round More's neck. More replied to his son-in-law's congratulations, "Son Roper, I tell you I have no cause to be proud thereof, for if my head would win him a castle in France it would not

fail to go." Events soon proved the justice of that forecast. Henry greatly desired to win More's approval of his divorce; but that his Chancellor could not give, and in 1532 he resigned the Great Seal into Henry's hands.

Religion was the life of More's life, and his house was a true sanctuary. Every morning and night his household gathered for prayers, every Friday he spent in devotion; before undertaking any business of importance he went to confession and communion. He wore a hair shirt, constantly scourged himself, and made pilgrimages to holy places. God's will was his daily rule.

Anne Boleyn, who resented his refusal to be present at her coronation, sought to compass his destruction. When cited to appear at Lambeth to take the Oath of Supremacy More told his companion, "Son Roper, I thank our Lord the field is won." He meant that he had "conquered all his carnal affections utterly." At Lambeth he declined to take the oath, and after four days spent in the custody of the Abbot of Westminster was sent to the Tower. For a whole year Henry sought to seduce him by the tears and entreaties of his family, but More had counted the cost. He told his daughter, Margaret Roper, that he had spent many a restless, weary night, when his wife thought that he slept, considering

what peril were possible to fall to me; and in devising I had a full heavy heart. But yet, I thank our God, for all that, I never thought to change, though the very uttermost should happen to me that my fear ran upon.

In one of his last letters he told her:

Albeit I am of nature so shrinking from pain, that I am almost afraid of a fillip, yet, in all the agonies that I have had, I thank the mighty mercy of God, I never in my mind intended to do anything against my conscience.

In July, 1535, the great saint of English Catholicism perished on Tower Hill. "The blackest crime," Lord Campbell says, "that has ever been perpetrated in England under the name of law."

Symonds claims that the Renaissance liberated the conscience in religion and established the principle of political freedom. That claim Mr. Lilly cannot allow. With the single exception of Erasmus, no one of that age seems to have had the least feeling in favour of what we now call toleration. It was as remote from the minds of Luther and his disciples as from the mind of a Dominican inquisitor.

It is perfectly true that the Lutheran theory of private judgment involves the absolute independence of the individual to decide for himself in religion; his emancipation from all deference for the opinions of others; his right to disregard all motives and arguments, the force of which he does not himself appreciate. But it is quite certain that throughout Protestant Europe this theory was never put in practice from the days of Luther to the days of Kant.

The Renaissance introduced anew into Europe the Cæsarism of the antique world. The ties to Rome were loosened, but all power was gathered up in the person of the prince. The Church depended not on religious but on political sanctions. "During the whole of the reign of Louis XV., the advance of absolutism throughout Europe, in the machinery and outward expression of government, was unchecked." This seems a disappointing result after the bright hopes of earlier times, yet that very delay in reaching the ideal of civil and religious liberty has been part of the education of the world for the fuller and more glorious life of our own day.

Mr. Lilly has given us much food for thought in his frank and catholic-spirited volume. We cannot accept his judgment on Luther's character or the development of his teaching; yet every Protestant may learn much from his vigorous study. After all, Luther comes well out of the fire of criticism.

JOHN TELFORD.

The World of Books.

I. THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS.

The Progress of Dogma. By James Orr, M.A., D.D. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

In this volume the author adds a worthy supplement to his former work, *The Christian View of God and the World.* It is a general survey of the entire field that he gives, not a detailed description. The latter is supplied in innumerable forms. The author's task is the more necessary and valuable one. We need to understand the dogmatic movement as a whole. To-day the whole trend of feeling is against dogma in every shape and form. The Christian teachers who take this line pursue a suicidal course. It is to acknowledge that scientific knowledge of religion is impossible; and what respect will be felt for a subject which cannot be reduced to science, it is easy to see. It is right enough to dispute particular systems of theology, but to proscribe theology is absurd. "I venture to say that what the Church suffers from to-day is not, as so many think, too much theology, but too little theology of an earnest kind."

Of necessity, in present circumstances, Dr. Orr appears as a defender to a certain extent not only of dogmatic teaching in general, but also of the particular form which it has taken in the past. Here he comes into collision with Harnack and his school. There is no little danger of our admiration for the learning and brilliance of that school and its leader carrying with it acceptance of their main position, which is one of utter antagonism to the theology of the past. However the antagonism may be veiled, there is no doubt of its reality and earnestness. Not this or that detail, but the whole of the old theology is rejected. The reconstruction, when it begins, must be from the lowest course. The entire Nicene system with its corollaries is regarded as a colossal aberration, while it is acknowledged that the system

goes back to much earlier days. It is time to put in an effective caveat, and Dr. Orr does this. Much more is involved than even the Nicene theology. In German phrase, the infant is thrown away with the bath.

The first of the ten lectures discusses the nature and laws of dogmatic growth in general. What are the tests of truth in relation to this? Dr. Newman laid down general tests in his celebrated essay. Dr. Orr sums them up as Scripture, the sum of Christian experience, logical harmony, practical results, and the verdict of history. Whatever will bear these tests is surely worthy of confidence. The old system comes well out of the trial. The entire history is one of progress combined with continuity. In an interesting way Dr. Orr shows that the ordinary arrangement of topics in theology corresponds with the order which the historical development has taken—prolegomena and the subject of the Godhead in early times, anthropology with Augustine, soteriology with Anselm and the Reformation, eschatology in our days.

One of the points on which Dr. Orr criticises Harnack is in reference to the judgment passed on the early Greek apologists. These, the latter says, reduced Christianity to mere natural religion. It is shown that while they had good reason for their line of advocacy, their Christian faith included more positive elements (p. 49). Another strange eccentricity is to describe the Gnostics as "the first Christian theologians." The Christian element in Gnosticism was a very minor quantity. Harnack says that the Gnostics simply carried out rapidly that secularising of Christian thought which the Church did gradually. Perversity could scarcely go farther. All the early Fathers thought that in fighting might and main against Gnosticism they were fighting against anti-Christian teaching. Now it seems that Tertullian and Irenæus were on the same side as those whom they denounced. Dr. Orr may well say, "I confess I feel it difficult to know what to make of the theory of Christianity involved in such a dictum" (p. 55). Harnack groups Irenæus with Paul, Valentinus, and Marcion, describes the two latter as "scriptural theologians," and says that "Irenæus and Hippolytus merely followed them." He also does his best to find a humanitarian Christ in the early Fathers, as in Hermas. He might find this in Paul of Samosata, far on in the third century; but then Paul was condemned and deposed (p. 77). No one of course is insensible to the great services of Professor Harnack

and the school he represents; but it is time that a word of emphatic caution should be uttered. "It is one of the outstanding merits of Harnack's work on Dogma that he is able to do so much justice to Augustine. Only Augustinian theology, with which sympathy is shown, needs to sustain it a stronger foundation than Harnack's picture of original Christianity yields." Harnack's limitation of dogma to the Catholic system is another singular position. The first six lectures deal with the early period of development, the seventh with the Middle Ages, the eighth with the Reformation, the last two lectures with modern developments. The volume, it will be seen, is one of permanent value to students, and supplies a much-needed corrective to doubtful tendencies of our days. J. S. B.

Scenes and Studies in the Ministry of Our Lord; with Thoughts on Preaching. By James H. Rigg, D.D. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 5*s*.)

We are all of us proud of Dr. Rigg, of his long life of toil and usefulness, of the skill with which for many years he has guided the councils of our Church, of his literary ability and his mastery of all the moods and phases of nineteenth-century theology, and of his consistent plea for cautious progress. We shall all welcome therefore a volume from his pen, different in character and aim from his other writings. For the works of Dr. Rigg hitherto have been chiefly polemical. The book before us lifts its readers far above the sound of a trumpet and the voice of words into the changeless peace which surrounds the Christ.

Dr. Rigg has given us neither a volume of sermons nor yet a Life of Christ. "The 'Scenes and Studies,'" he tells us, "are hardly to be called 'Sermons.' They lack the element of personal appeal, and, in fact, as here published, they were never preached. . . . They represent the basis of narrative and exposition, worked out in the mind by way of premeditation." On the other hand, they are scarcely a Life of Christ. Nothing is introduced save what might well be given us in a somewhat extended introduction to any sermon on a gospel story. Yet in a real sense they form a "Life of Christ," none the less because of gaps here and there. In fourteen studies, clear-cut, simple, and always experimental, the Christ as He lived and moved among men is pictured before us, especial stress being laid on the incidents in that divine life which illustrate His care for

souls. Only twice, in the study on our Lord's Mediatorial Prayer, and in the sermon or exposition on "Jesus, the Bread of Life," does Dr. Rigg forsake this fruitful field of the study of the Son of man in His relations to men. In this delightful volume of studies Dr. Rigg has given us the ripe fruit of mellow thought, the harvest of a rich and living experience, and the wise judgments of one who for eighty years has served the will of God in his own generation.

The second part of Dr. Rigg's work consists of about sixty pages entitled "Thoughts on Preaching, Ancient and Modern; and, in particular, on Extemporaneous Preaching." We think Dr. Rigg would do well to publish this paper as a separate tract, for it is one of those short but valuable helps which many would like to put into the hands of candidates and others at the commencement of their ministry. The first part of the paper is not, in our opinion, altogether satisfactory, even making due allowance for its necessary brevity and that it is not intended as a history of preaching. Justice is scarcely done to the great missionary-preachers, such men as Cuthbert, Cyril, Methodius, Anskar, and others by whose labours Europe was won for Christ. Nor is it strictly correct to say that in the Middle Ages "preaching of necessity died out" (p. 207). Mediæval preaching was an intermittent spring, always rather of the nature of a special mission, and at one time regarded as the peculiar work of the bishop. Though Dr. Rigg is undoubtedly right in his broad characterisation of the times, yet it were well to remember that the supply of mediæval preachers never failed. Nor are the mediæval sermons that have come down to us merely official sermons and the like. Several of them are what we should now call volumes of "skeletons," one of which, under the suggestive title of "Sleep Sound," long held the field; while MSS. of the "skeletons" of Milicz of Kremsier are to be found in almost every library of Europe. We might add more, but the subject of mediæval preaching is a large one. In any case Dr. Rigg is surely nodding when he writes (p. 209): "After Bernard, for a full century, one knows not where to find any preachers; it seems impossible to discover any traces of them." The century after Bernard's death saw the rise and influence of such mighty preachers as Francis, Dominic, and the "brother preachers," and of many others of whom we could say much.

When Dr. Rigg leaves the Middle Ages he treads with the

firm step of the master. His survey of later English preaching, especially when we remember its narrow limits, is a thoroughly characteristic and fine bit of work, evidently enriched with personal reminiscence; while the lessons he teaches should be read and re-read by every preacher and candidate. But "read sermons" are not, we fear, "in Scotland abjured with an almost superstitious dread" (p. 236, quoted from Kidder, without comment). We would that Dr. Rigg's comments on this perilous practice were read aloud in every synod.

The book is beautifully got up, and admirably printed. Ruysbroëk and Grossetete are probably printer's blunders (pp. 210, 211), while "Wickliffe" is an impossible form, only retained through German influence, which Dr. Rigg in a second edition would do well to discard. H. B. W.

Godly Union and Concord. Sermons Preached, mainly in Westminster Abbey, in the interest of Christian Fraternity. By H. Hensley Henson, B.D., Canon of Westminster, and Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster. (London: John Murray. 6*s.* net.)

Canon Henson's frank retractation of his former opinions is very refreshing. He had taken a strong position against Bishop Perowne and Archdeacon Sinclair for their catholic bearing towards non-Episcopal Churches. But events have taught him that he was wrong, and he has been manly enough to say so. His Introduction, with its significant comparison between the utterances of Dr. Christopher Wordsworth and his son, the present Bishop of Salisbury, and its critique of Dr. Moberly's singularly unenlightened utterances on "Ministerial Priesthood," supplies abundant food for thought. Canon Henson has a strong argument, and he does not fail to press it home. His sermons are marked by the same candour and fearlessness as his Introduction. He is a disciple of Cheyne's, and his adhesion to the Higher Criticism is somewhat pronounced, especially in dealing with the earlier chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Master of a strong and incisive style, the canon occasionally rises to real eloquence, and there is much to learn from all his sermons. Their surpassing interest, however, lies in their protest against "Apostolic Succession as the title-deeds of an exclusive hierarchy." This he does not hesitate to describe as a fiction. His plea for intercommunion will stir many hearts.

"I submit that in the interest of our self-respect the cruel and insulting contrasts which I have described should cease, that we should at least receive to Holy Communion those whom we hail with much ostentation as our fellow-disciples, to many of whom we are under such great spiritual obligations." "The scandal of our shattered fellowship" has been burnt into Canon Henson's conscience, and members of Nonconformist Churches will heartily wish God-speed to a preacher who has the courage of his convictions and knows how to speak bold and true words from a pulpit that commands the ear of England. A more significant volume of sermons has not appeared for a generation.

The Church's One Foundation: Christ and Recent Criticism. By Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Ten recent leading articles of the *British Weekly*, bearing on present-day critics and criticism of Christianity, are here happily republished with an Introduction. The articles made a deep impression in a wide circle at the time of their first publication, and they cannot fail to do good in this collected form. Dr. Nicoll sees clearly that Christ's miraculous life and work are the citadel of Christianity, and if these are taken away nothing is left worth preserving. Nothing can bridge the gulf between naturalism and supernaturalism. He does great service in driving home again and again the pitiless dilemma, Either—Or. This was the dilemma that faced the French Reformed Church in 1872, as it faces us to-day in many German and British writers, whose names are loudly acclaimed,—*Either* the Christ whom the Church has worshipped for nineteen centuries, *or* bald deism. Dr. Nicoll in his Introduction makes two strong points. First, it is opponents who approach the subject with a preconceived theory—the impossibility or incredibility of miracle. It is the old position of Hume. No evidence could prove a miracle; the assertion of miracle *ipso facto* discredits any narrative. He also contrasts the ease with which critics divine different authors in Scripture with the difficulty of detecting authorship in ordinary literature. Nothing is more difficult even in our days, and in the case of accomplished experts. The keenest judgment is often baffled. Dean Church confidently ascribed *Ecce Homo* on its first appearance to Dr. New-

man. Yet our critics can discover at a glance any number of authors in books of Scripture. The work is a strong apology for the faith. J. S. B.

A Relation of the Conference between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit. By the Command of King James of Ever Blessed Memory. New Edition, with Introduction and Notes by C. H. Simpkinson, M.A. (London : Macmillan & Co. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This new volume of the "English Theological Library" has played a considerable part in the Roman controversy. The Conference was held at York House, in 1622, for the benefit of the king's favourite, the Marquis of Buckingham, and his mother, who were greatly impressed by the arguments of the Roman propaganda. Then as now the Roman advocates argued, "We cannot both be right. You allow that we may be saved. Ours then is the better position." Whether it was worth while to include a controversy on the old lines in a modern series may seem doubtful. The question has moved to new ground and uses new weapons. The time for giants like Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, Jewel, Gibson, Chemnitz, and also for Laud and Fisher, is gone for the present, although it may return. There can be no doubt that the old disputants went to the root of things—they dealt with essentials. Here may be found the opposing authorities, chapter and verse, in abundance. Indeed, these authorities, given in the notes at the foot of the page, are the best part of the book. The editor has taken great trouble in verifying, supplementing, and translating them, so that the work is quite an armoury for controversialists. The whole of the editor's work is admirably done ; the printing and publishing are equally good. The mother of the marquis eventually became a Romanist. B.

St. Luke the Prophet. By E. C. Selwyn, D.D., Head Master of Uppingham School. (London : Macmillan & Co. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The volume is a sequel to the author's former work, *The Christian Prophets*, which is often referred to. It displays the same scholarship, independent judgment, keenness of criticism. A scholar who will parody Horace is equal to anything. Many

of the suggestions and conclusions are startling enough. One will be glad to hear what experts like Professor Ramsay and others will say. The parallel run between portions of the Acts and the Book of Joshua or Jesus is surely original, not to say fanciful. The author argues strenuously for the identity of Luke and Silas or Silvanus, showing that where one name is absent the other is present. Still bolder is the elaborate argument to prove that the two Epistles of Peter are Luke's work (1 Pet. v. 12), Luke writing as Peter's deputy. A chapter is devoted to the correspondence between Ephesians and 1 Peter. There are other surprising coincidences and comments. The author has spared no time or labour in the working out of his conclusions, and an equal amount of time and labour would be necessary in order to an adequate estimate of their correctness in every instance. He earnestly maintains the genuineness of 2 Peter. It is interesting to find him making such frequent use of Theodor Zahn, a scholar not much known yet in England. He is the equal of the negative theologians in learning and ability, and maintains positive positions. Dr. Selwyn is the first to bring him to the front. J. S. B.

Inns of Court Sermons. By H. C. Beeching, M.A., Chaplain to the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn. (London : Macmillan & Co. 4*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Beeching gives his readers much food for thought in these sermons. They were preached at the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn, at the Temple Church, and in the University pulpit at Oxford. The substance of the first sermon, on "Religious Poetry," formed an article in the *Spectator*, and few men are better qualified to deal with the subject. Mr. Beeching thinks that the most successful religious poetry is a lyrical expression of the soul's delight in God, or in the world of nature regarded as His handiwork. Reference is made to the difficulties that beset the poet, and a tribute is paid to the great poets of our age who, "when a crowd of novelists have been teaching that adultery is the legitimate privilege of both men and women," have "almost universally held by the Church in their various exhibitions of the deep truth of that primeval covenant by which God indissolubly knits two souls together in a spiritual concord." The references to the life and work of Coventry Patmore, Lord Russell of Killowen, Bishop Creighton, and Queen Victoria are admirably conceived and expressed.

The Temple Bible. (J. M. Dent & Co. 1*s.* per Volume, net.)

Six volumes of the *Temple Bible* have now been published, and it is possible to estimate the service which Messrs. J. M. Dent & Co. have rendered to the British public by this spirited effort. To begin with the volumes. They are so dainty and so light that they almost beg for a corner in a traveller's bag, and can be slipped into a pocket as the best of companions on a short journey. The clear print, the rough paper, the masterpieces of art that have been selected for frontispieces, all increase the hold that these volumes take upon us. The introductions are the best that Christian scholarship can furnish, and the notes light up points on which an ordinary reader needs information. The volume which contains the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, that which gives "The Johannine Books," and the "Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther," are little "divine libraries" in themselves. "Isaiah" was the last work of Professor A. B. Davidson, who had revised the introduction and notes just before his sudden death. A graceful tribute is paid to his memory by the general editor. The little volume itself will be his memorial. Its introduction is full of spiritual insight and tenderness, and even those who do not feel able to accept his position as to the two Isaiahs will feel the charm of his reverent and gracious spirit lingering in his work. This is the most attractive edition of the Bible that was ever published, and it ought to have a real and lasting influence for good on the Church and the world.

Addresses on the Acts of the Apostles. By Edward White Benson, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. (London: Macmillan & Co. 21*s.* net.)

These addresses, as readers of Archbishop Benson's life will remember, grew out of a mission held in the West End in 1885. They were intended for the educated and leisured classes, and such ladies as the Duchess of Bedford used their influence to gather a representative congregation at Lambeth Palace. Dr. Benson's addresses produced a deep impression, and several courses were given extending between the years 1887 and 1892. Miss Margaret Benson has not had an easy task in editing them. The earlier addresses had to be put together from the original notes with the help of reports furnished by ladies who heard them. At a later stage the Duchess of

Bedford employed a shorthand writer. The addresses form a running comment on the text, with applications to present-day life and problems. The first duty of the apostles was to bear witness to Christ, and that is the first duty of every Christian to-day. The vivid and homely style of the addresses is their chief charm, and one feels thankful that such thoughts were put into the minds and hearts of the leaders of English society. Preachers will find the volume very suggestive. Dr. Benson speaks of some people "living to vanity with a religious twist"; he describes "living souls recovering dead souls"; and brings out the gloomy forecasts that met St. Paul on his way to Jerusalem—"the warnings were repeated like the tolling of a bell." "God indeed uses the foolish and weak if they are as strong as man can make them, but He does not turn carelessness and coldness into power." The very diffuseness of the addresses adds to their charm, and they are full of applications to daily life and personal work. The book will be a precious memorial of a strenuous and devoted servant of Christ. We are bound to add that the remarks on "Congregationalism" and on "bishops" (pp. 10, 343) are scarcely candid, and the reference to John Wesley's loss of faith in his ordinations for America is rather absurd.

The Acts of the Apostles. An Exposition. By Richard Belward Rackham, M.A. (London: Methuen & Co. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

This new volume of the "Oxford Commentaries" is the best exposition of the Acts of the Apostles that we know. Preachers will find it a gold-mine. It abounds in suggestive notes, and is so arranged as to form a continuous interpretation which may be read straight through without interruption for consulting notes. It is chiefly intended for educated people who do not rank as scholars, but students will not be slow to claim their share in a volume which throws welcome light on many pages of early Christian history. Codex Bezae or D_2, which is the treasure of the University Library at Cambridge, has an extraordinary number of variations from the ordinary text, and nowhere are its variations and additions so striking as in the Acts of the Apostles. What value must be assigned to these is one of the problems of textual criticism; but Mr. Rackham has largely availed himself of the manuscript, and the result

is often striking. In some points he fails to convince us that his exposition is correct. St. Paul's words about "the prophets" in 1 Thessalonians ii. 15 he refers to the persecution about Stephen; in Acts xii. 17 he thinks Peter wanted silence "for fear of attracting notice." We always understood that the eager questions and congratulations made it impossible for him to tell his story of deliverance. But where Mr. Rackham may not convince he suggests and stimulates. One feels on closing his volume that the Acts of the Apostles has been filled with new light and new meaning.

The Teacher's Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. By F. N. Peloubet, D.D. (Oxford University Press. 5*s*.)

Everything that a teacher needs is here in the most compact form. Dr. Peloubet takes pains to give the exact meaning of the text, and he enriches his notes with quotations from poets and historians. The lessons to be drawn from the narrative are also well brought out. The illustrations are a real addition to the value of the work, and the mode of showing the variations between the Authorised and Revised Versions is most convenient. *The Teacher's Commentary* is just what Bible-class teachers most want.

The Century Bible. "The Acts." Edited by J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A. "Hebrews." Edited by A. S. Peake, M.A. (Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack. 2*s*. net.)

This volume on "The Acts" meets every need of the teacher and preacher. Professor Bartlet sets the reader at the author's standpoint, and lights up the whole controversy between Judaism and Christianity. The notes are clear and judicious. It is a little book that deserves a warm welcome.

Professor Peake inclines to Harnack's view that Priscilla was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. His introduction deals with the difficult questions that surround the letter in a way that is very helpful, and the notes could scarcely be improved. They are judicious, clear, and well balanced throughout.

It will be a boon to students to have Professor Kirkpatrick's three volumes on "The Psalms" in the *Cambridge Bible* compressed into one by the use of thin paper. It makes a light book,

and one that is very convenient to handle. The margins are wide, and the type is clear. If a student can only afford one commentary on the Psalms, this has the first claim, and its modest price (6*s*.) puts it within the reach of all preachers and teachers.

1. *Apocalyptic Studies.* By J. Monro Gibson, D.D. (2*s*. 6*d*.)
2. *What Nonconformists Stand For.* By. J. Hirst Hollowell. (2*s*. 6*d*.)
3. *Why? Religious? Christian? Protestant? Free Churchman?* By W. Garrett Horder. (1*s*. net.)

(London: Arthur H. Stockwell.)

1. Dr. Monro Gibson's *Apocalyptic Studies* form the first volume of "The Free Church Pulpit" series. The subject chosen is one that has been a happy hunting-ground for fanatical interpreters. Dr. Gibson gives a clear, sensible exposition, which will commend itself to all who hold that they are "entirely astray who try to make the book a chart of the world's history, mapped out beforehand, to satisfy curiosity" concerning times and seasons. The devout reader will learn a great deal from this acute and judicious set of studies.

2. Mr. Hollowell is a sturdy champion of Nonconformist principles, and his outline of "What Nonconformists stand for" is very clear and well filled in. He goes further than some of us; but he always keeps his head, and states his case with vigour. His book may be recommended to all who want a Nonconformist tonic. It will help them to stand their ground amid difficulty and opposition.

3. Mr. Horder's little book is both bright and weighty. It is admirably reasoned and beautifully expressed.

The Preacher's Magazine. Edited by Arthur E. Gregory, D.D. Volume XII. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 5*s*.)

The Methodist lay-preacher will find no more helpful magazine than this. It abounds with sound exposition; its sermon outlines are well adapted to its constituents; it gives good advice as to the books that a young preacher ought to read; whilst such articles as that by Dr. Rendel Harris on "The Use of the Con-

cordance and of the Bible Text-book" will stimulate and help all who study them. Dr. Gregory is to be congratulated on a thoroughly practical and useful volume.

Psychic Power in Preaching. By J. Spencer Kennard, D.D. Edited, with Memoir, by his son Joseph Spencer Kennard. (Philadelphia: G. W. Jacobs & Co. $1.20.)

The title is a faithful specimen of the entire work. "Psychic power in preaching" means simply the personal element in preaching. This meaning must be read into the chapters on "Sympathy an Element of Psychic Force," "The Psychic Power of Authority and Love," "The Psychic Power of the Holy Spirit." Much that is good is said about the place of personality in preaching; but to English thinking it would have been more usefully said in simpler style. The elevated style does not soothe British nerves. The volume contains excellent counsel, founded on the author's experience, and illustrated by quotation and anecdote common and uncommon. The author lays great stress on the psychical element—appearance, voice, gesture. "Dyspepsia and the worries that wait upon its leaden steps are terribly ageing. Care for the hygienics and athletics of his entire nature will reward him openly." "Robust and surgent animal force and instinct, such as spring from splendid health and natural passions, are a huge element of power in the preacher, when reined and guided by the dominating power of the Spirit of God." The Memoir prefixed to the work is written in the same pronounced style, and it does not show that the subject was specially distinguished. On the whole, the volume will scarcely meet the needs of English readers of homiletics.

Christ the Way (Longmans, 1*s.* 6*d.* net) is a little volume of addresses given by Bishop Paget at Haileybury, which deal with the conduct of life in a manner that is both simple and profound. It is a book full of Easter joy and rich experience of heavenly things.

II. FOR BIBLE STUDENTS.

St. Paul and the Roman Law, and other Studies on the Origin of the Form of Doctrine. By W. E. Ball, LL.D. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 4*s.* 6*d.*)

DR. BALL refers to three factors which have greatly influenced the statement of Christian doctrine — Roman Law, Greek Thought, and Jewish Tradition. The two latter elements are often dealt with. The first represents a comparatively unexplored field. The six chapters, occupying half the volume, are a fresh and original contribution, and should greatly help commentators and expositors. St. Paul especially was influenced by the Roman spirit, as his writings bear witness. But other epistles present similar phenomena. The Roman legal ideas chiefly occurring are those bearing on adoption, covenants, and inheritance, and on this class of passages the volume throws much light. Adoption is St. Paul's equivalent in Roman phraseology for the Jewish idea of the new birth. The latter would have been unintelligible to Gentile hearers and readers, and so it is translated into Roman terms. Romans viii. 23 presents a difficulty, as it implies that the adoption is future, whereas a previous verse makes it present. Dr. Ball's explanation is that the reference is to the manifestation of the act that had previously taken place, and the Greek term, he thinks, admits this. He would also translate "release from the body." The differences between Roman and English law come out in the explanation of heirs and heirship. In the former, we are told, the fact of death was eliminated. "The moment a child was born he was his father's heir." But is not that true of English law? The difference lies rather in the absence of primogeniture and the equal share of the children in the family possessions. The phrase "heirs of God" presents "a most vivid conception of the intimate union between the believer and God, and of the faithful soul's possession in present reality of the kingdom of God." The author rejects the rendering "an heir through God" in Galatians as impossible. The discussion of the terms covenant and testament is more complicated, but at least it suggests new points of view which legal minds will appreciate. The difficult passage in Hebrews ix. 15–17 becomes somewhat clearer. The mention of death seems to upset the author's theory. But he justly says,

"Christ is not the testator who makes the new testament; He is the Mediator, *i.e.* the intermediary between the testator and those who are to receive the inheritance." The explanation is too long to summarise here. A new translation of Ephesians i. 13, 14 is suggested. The chapters on "Roman Law in Church Formularies" and "Ante-Nicene Theology" are full of interest. The Athanasian Creed is usually referred in substance to Augustine. Dr. Ball supplies parallels as far back as Tertullian. J. S. B.

The Passing and the Permanent in Religion: A Plain Treatment of the Great Essentials of Religion, being a Sifting from these of such Things as cannot Outlive the Results of Scientific, Historical, and Critical Study,—so making more clearly seen "the Things which cannot be Shaken." By Minot Judson Savage, D.D., Harvard. (London: Putnam's Sons. 6*s.*)

"The Passing" in the author's treatment is very evident. It includes everything which all Christendom has understood by "the great essentials of religion." Discussing the Universe, Man, Bibles, Gods and God, Saviours, Worship, Prayer, the Church, Hells, Heavens, the Resurrection, Life, the author riddles all the old interpretations with pellets of criticism, and demolishes everything to his own intense satisfaction. "The Permanent," that is left, is not so clear. As far as we can discover, it is Truth, Love, Service, and such statements as "The universe is a living being, and we are a part of this infinite life," "It is one life everywhere, and that one life God." The destructive part of the volume is thorough in its way—the author revels in the ruins he makes; but the constructive side is conspicuously absent. The model worshippers are Byron and Huxley. Paul was "a distinct and definite Universalist." "We cannot be absolutely certain of a single text in the New Testament, that it is in the precise shape in which it fell from the lips of Jesus." "I do not believe that Jesus claimed ever to be the Messiah that the Jewish people expected." "The God of Moody and the great modern revivalists was not nearly as good as Jesus." We had thought of giving specimens of still wilder and more shocking statements, but we forbear. The lighthearted way in which the author runs a tilt against doctrines which have lain at the foundation of the best lives the world has ever seen is most distressing. He was brought up as a Congregationalist under Calvinist

teaching. Here is the extreme reaction. Still, he had better have remained a Calvinist of the strictest sect than drift away from all anchorage. He tells us that theology, while inevitable, is always passing away. "The pathway of human history is strewn with fallen religions as our country roadsides are strewn in the autumn with fallen leaves." His own theology of course must meet the same fate. There is no reticence, no reserve in the book. It is iconoclast in form as well as matter. The style is vigorous enough. We note some peculiar idioms—"athrill," "help educate," "resurrect," "our machinery hums," "I wondered how my prayer was going to affect the matter any." The publisher has done his part well. The frame is too good for the picture. J. S. B.

Last Essays. Second Series. "Essays on the Science of Religion." By the Right Hon. Professor Max Müller, K.M. (London: Longmans. 5*s.*)

This eighteenth volume of Professor Müller's Collected Works is the last fruit of an old tree. The tree was good of its kind, and the fruit is good. The diversified contents of the volume bear on the author's favourite theme—comparative religion. If there is less glow and fervour of style, there is more of the tempered strength and serenity of mature thought. While there is much that is new in the setting, there is nothing new in substance. The author's favourite theory of the close association of language and religion is here again. The only new article is one on "Ancient Prayer." A very suggestive article it is, bringing together notable prayers from uncivilised and civilised quarters alike, from the prayer of the African negress, "God, I know Thee not, but Thou knowest me; I need Thy help," to the psalms of the Rig-Veda, which Max Müller did so much to make known. A reprint of three articles from the *Nineteenth Century* gives a very lucid account of the three state religions of China. One is surprised to read the opinion expressed, "After our late experience it must be quite clear that it is more than doubtful whether Christian missionaries should be sent or even allowed to go to countries the governments of which object to their presence. It is always and everywhere the same story. First commercial adventurers, then consuls, then missionaries, then soldiers, then war." On the writer's own showing "it is quite clear that it is more than doubtful whether commercial adventurers and consuls"

should be allowed to go. The last two essays are an answer to the questions, Why I am not an Agnostic, Is Man Immortal? The answer is satisfactory to a certain extent. Max Müller held to faith, although the creed that expressed it would have been as vague and shadowy as that of the Indian speculators whom he knew so well. J. S. B.

The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Edited by Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. Three Volumes. (Cambridge University Press. *7s. 6d.* each.)

Dr. Swete has just issued a third edition of his first volume of the Septuagint, which has been revised with the utmost care and thoroughness. The second and third volumes have already reached second editions, and a fourth volume, *The Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, to which tribute was paid in these pages a year ago, supplies a wealth of information as to the history of the Alexandrian version, the Alexandrian canon, the text and textual conditions of the Septuagint. Students have now all the material in their hands, and it is possible to estimate the debt which Christian scholarship owes to Dr. Swete and his colleagues as well as to the Cambridge University Press for this monumental work. It was Dr. Hort to whom the undertaking chiefly owed its inception. Dr. Scrivener had pointed out the necessity for it as far back as 1875, and had submitted a scheme for carrying it out. In 1883, when it was found that increasing years and preoccupations compelled him to decline the editorship, it was entrusted to the able hands of Dr. Swete. Dr. Hort, Dr. Westcott, Dr. Kirkpatrick, Professor Bensly, formed a committee of superintendence, and gave all possible help to the editor in his onerous task. But his chief assistance has been drawn from younger men: Mr. Redpath (the editor of the Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint), Dr. Nestle, Dr. C. J. Beard, and especially the Rev. Forbes Robinson and Mr. St. John Thackeray. The late Dr. Moulton's list of readings in 2 Maccabees is gratefully recognised. The prefaces to the three volumes bring out the greatness of the editor's task. It has now occupied nearly twenty years, and before the larger edition appears about a quarter of a century will probably have been devoted to the work. Four other primary editions of the Septuagint have been previously published, but there was still room for an edition "which should endeavour to exhibit the text of one of the great uncial codices with a precision

corresponding to our present knowledge, together with a full *apparatus* of the variants of the other MSS., or at least of those which have been critically edited." That need has been met in a way that entitles Dr. Swete's Septuagint to be regarded as the best edition ever published. The preface to each volume gives particulars as to the MSS. used in its preparation. It is impossible to speak too highly of the care with which the readers, officers, and workmen of the University Press have done their part. Dr. Swete pays tribute to this in each of his prefaces, and it is manifestly well deserved. The volumes are very convenient for use, and though the type is small it is beautifully clear. We should like to see a Table of Contents added to each volume. It now remains for everyone who wishes to understand the language of the New Testament and its citations from the Old Testament to avail himself of this noble work. No Hebrew scholar can be equipped for his studies unless he has this edition at his side and in constant use.

The Journal of Theological Studies. Volume III., January, 1902. (London: Macmillan & Co. 3*s.* net.)

The first three articles alone are enough to make a very strong number—Dr. Swete's "Eucharistic Belief in the Second and Third Centuries," Dr. Rashdall's criticism of "Dr. Moberly's Theory of the Atonement," and Dr. Sanday's review of Professor Gardner's "Historic View of the New Testament." The result of the first is to show the vague, indeterminate character of the belief in question. There were merely germs which might be developed in very different forms. How they were developed we know from history. The second is a drastic, yet appreciative, criticism. The inconsistencies of Dr. Moberly's book are clearly pointed out. Critic and writer seem one in the repudiation of retributive justice and substitution, the former writing from the Maurician standpoint, the latter adopting McLeod Campbell's idea of vicarious penitence and combining it with other incompatible elements. What meaning there is in atonement from the critic's standpoint is far from clear. Dr. Sanday is at great pains to find points of agreement with the work he criticises, but with little success. In the end he is obliged to assert the historical roots of Christianity of which Professor Gardner knows nothing. It is noteworthy that in the second and third articles Ritschlian influence makes itself strongly felt.

III. DEVOTIONAL.

1. *Prayer.* By A. J. Worlledge, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Truro. (5*s.*)

2. *Suggestions on Prayer.* By Lucy H. M. Soulsby. (1*s.* net.)

3. *The Personal Life of the Clergy.* By Arthur W. Robinson, B.D. (2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

4. *The Ministry of Conversion.* By Arthur J. Mason, D.D. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

(London : Longmans & Co.)

1. CANON WORLLEDGE writes from the standpoint of a moderate High Churchman, and his illustrations are drawn from the teaching of Churchmen, though he pays tribute to those "masters of prayer who have risen far higher than their self-imposed limitations, such as Richard Baxter, Jonathan Edwards, Adolph Monod, George Müller, William Arthur, and, in a most remarkable manner, William Milligan." He has spent three years on this volume, and it is worthy of such devotion to the subject. Everyone will find it a real help to intelligent prayer, though some readers will not be able to accept all Canon Worlledge's views. "Promises of God in Answer to Prayer" and "The Transforming Influence of Prayer" are sections that have greatly impressed us. Here is a saying to think about: "Life is a whole, and the ordinary frame of the daily life will be, practically, the mood of the hour of prayer." A devout reader will find this a book after his own heart, and it would be a great blessing if every Christian man and woman would read it.

2. Miss Soulsby's *Suggestions on Prayer* are just what one wants in a brief manual. Quotation and incident are skilfully used, and the book is full of good feeling. It is a devotional gem.

3. This book gains much by its sobriety. It deals with a difficult subject in a plain and simple way that begets confidence, and from first to last it convinces the judgment and warms the

heart. The life of a true minister of the gospel has many difficulties, and his own standard is a rebuke as well as an inspiration; but a man is abundantly repaid who can win the tribute paid by a hard-headed schoolmaster in a colliery village to his old vicar, "Why, you have only to shake that man's hand to feel that he is full of the Holy Ghost!" A labourer was asked whether a minister who died early had done any good in a village. He answered without hesitation, "I never saw that man cross the common yonder, sir, without being the better for it." The chapters on Penitence, Prayer, Devotion to our Lord, Secularisation, and Depression are full of words in season. This is the first volume of a very promising series of "Handbooks for the Clergy."

4. Canon Mason's little book is not free from animus against Nonconformity, and he speaks of Wesley's methods in visiting parishes where he was not invited as "impatient and disloyal." He would have limited the great evangelist's labours to places where he was welcomed by the clergy! At that rate the Evangelical Revival would never have even begun. The chapter on "The Place of Confession," despite the canon's safeguards, shows the trend of his sympathies, and he pleads for the formation of "religious houses of men in the England of to-day." His attempt to harmonize baptismal regeneration with conversion is very instructive to an outsider. But though we have often found ourselves in conflict with the writer's opinions, we have felt the stimulus of his book, and see how much all "fishers of men" may learn from it. It is the fruit of much experience as a mission-preacher, and it is often very suggestive.

Messrs. Methuen & Co. have made two welcome additions to their "Library of Devotion" (2*s.* per volume). The selection from *The Thoughts of Pascal* has been prepared by Mr. Jerram, who has supplied a valuable Introduction and added Dame Perier's Life of her brother, now for the first time translated into English. It is both tender and touching, but its picture of health wrecked by false views of religion is very pitiful. St. Francis de Sales' famous treatise *On the Love of God* has been edited by Canon Knox Little, who makes a strange blunder as to dates on his first page. The book bears many marks of its Romanist origin, and one smiles at the credulity of the writer; but the love of God is made so reasonable and so attractive that it is a real help to saintly living. There are some beautiful touches in the little treatise, and the translation is well done.

1. *The White Stone. Some Characteristics of the Christian Life.* By John McGaw Foster. (Longmans. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

2. *Christ and His Cross. Selections from Rutherford's Letters.* Arranged by L. H. M. Soulsby. (Longmans. 2*s.* net.)

3. *Mosaics. A Thought for Every Day.* By J. C. Wright. (S. W. Partridge & Co. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.)

1. Mr. Foster is rector of the Church of the Messiah in Boston, Mass., and his little book has grown out of a series of addresses to the students of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, U.S. It is a real contribution to the solution of the problems of the Christian life by a true and devout thinker. "Life," he says, "is a monotony of commonplace details. To comparatively few is it given to rise far above their level; few, comparatively, sink into awful depths. But into the midst of any such life there may come, as the sunlight bursts into the winter world, a transforming splendour. That is consecration—life's resplendent commonplace. Rather than any change in the form of life, it is a change in its mode." Old truths are reminted here, and thoughtful readers will find much to feed both mind and heart.

2. *Christ and His Cross* is a happy title for a selection from Rutherford's Letters, undertaken to win new readers for that devotional classic. The selection is made with great taste, and the introduction strikes exactly the right note. It is a dainty little volume, and ought to be very popular.

3. Mr. Wright has given a quotation for every day of the year in his *Mosaics*. They are culled from poets, preachers, and moralists of all schools, and give a happy start for each morning. Miss Rossetti is a prime favourite, and Ruskin. The Rev. J. Brierley, A. J. Southouse, May Kendall, A. J. Bamford have been laid under contribution. From Phillips Brooks comes the fine saying, "I am sure that God and His angels help many a struggler who does not know where the help comes from." Everyone who uses the selection will be happier and wiser for it. The printers have turned out a very attractive volume.

IV. HISTORY.

The Ancient Catholic Church, from the Accession of Trojan to the Fourth General Council (A.D. 98–451). By Robert Rainy, D.D. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 12*s*.)

THIS is a welcome addition to a valuable series. It is a pleasant change to learn the story of the early Church from a non-Anglican standpoint. The change is not simply from Episcopal to Presbyterian. The question of polity does not bulk so largely, because it is no longer treated as an essential of Church life. It is therefore treated more dispassionately. More room is left for more vital matters. The subject is treated in the broad, living, philosophic way that we should expect from Dr. Rainy. The second volume, which is to carry the story down to Gregory VII., will no doubt be marked by the same high qualities. The ante-Nicene age is wisely divided into two parts. We wish the next period could have been similarly split up. Though it barely covers a century and a half, it is crowded with pregnant events. It is characteristic of Dr. Rainy that he seeks to understand what he narrates, to see and make us see the rationale of great movements of thought. The discussion of Gnosticism in its reasons and aims is especially satisfactory. If he does not convert us into Gnostics, he enables us to see more law and purpose in these fantastic speculations than we ever saw before. The same may be said of all the great doctrinal movements. The chapter, "Christ and God," in the second division (180–313 A.D.), shows us the preparations for the Nicene discussions and decisions. The author replies to false theories without naming them. Nothing is more common now than to represent the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity as the outgrowth of Greek philosophy. Dr. Rainy writes : "The train of ideas which the Logos suggested had an obvious interest and value for the apologists. It enabled them at once to divine the Christian conception of Christ in relation to an immense mass of pre-Christian thought, just because the word Logos belonged to that region of thought and had been borrowed from it. And as Christian faith must understand itself, not only by binding on itself, but by comparison and contrast with the thinking of the

world in which Christianity lives, this aspect of it may well be of permanent value. Yet for the domestic interests of the faith, the use of this word is not indispensable. The Church has framed all her great creeds without employing it." The author calls attention to the reason why the early Church cannot be regarded as a perfect model of doctrine and faith. That Church quite failed to assimilate the spiritual faith of the New Testament. For many of the early Christian writers St. Paul might never have existed. Indeed, the apostle did not come to his own till the Reformation. "Perhaps the most needful preparation for appreciating the beliefs of the early Church is to get rid of the assumption or impression that the first apostolic Church started with the fulness of the apostolic teaching, as that is embodied, for instance, in the New Testament. That is a natural assumption, and it is often made without a thought; but it is entirely opposed to facts. What the apostles and some others of their generation taught is one thing, what the Church proved able to receive is quite another. . . . Elementariness is the signature of all the early literature." The volume has many such sagacious suggestions. Dr. Rainy points out the mistake made in supposing that the Nicene Creed was completed at Constantinople in 451 (p. 355). The entire discussion of the Nicene controversy is eminently sane and illuminative. "Theologically, the writer believes that the turn of thinking on this high subject at Nicaea was the just outcome of the whole discussion. Whether the terms employed to express it are the best or the only ones, has been questioned." The author is quite at home in dealing with the relations between faith and philosophy as in the case of New Platonism. We could have wished a more adequate account of Augustine. It is characteristic that the account of Origen is fuller and more sympathetic. Yet Augustine should have attractions for sons of John Calvin. Through Calvin one side of the great African's theology acquired an influence which it never had before.

J. S. B.

The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages. By H. R. Mann. Vol. I., Part I., 590–657. (London: Kegan Paul. 12*s.*)

Mr. Mann may be congratulated on a successful start of a great undertaking. If the other volumes are as good as this, he will confer no slight gift on historical students. Mr. Mann

rightly pleads that there is room for his work. The lives of the early popes, in fact, have been somewhat indifferently treated in England. From Urban VI. (1378) onwards we have the excellent and full narratives of Creighton, Pastor, and Ranke; but for the popes before the Schism we must fall back on detached works, or on Greenwood's *Cathedra Petri*, Milman, or Gregorovius. Gregorovius deals rather with Rome, the city, and its fortunes. Greenwood is too prejudiced, though accurate and painstaking. Milman, in many respects the best, needs complete revision in the light of modern research. Mr. Mann justly complains of his "wholesale inaccuracies," but scarcely does justice to his general merits and breadth of view. There are, of course, separate monographs; but even the greatest of the popes, Hildebrand, has had no adequate biography in England; while for Innocent III. we are still reduced to the German of Hurter.

Mr. Mann is a Roman Catholic, the head master of St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle. He has given us, however, on the whole, an eminently fair story, quite as fair, at any rate, as Greenwood. In the case of Mr. Mann, leaving out a few slips like the unworthy one on the top of page 271, what bias there is appears rather in what he leaves out than in what he says. Two or three instances will explain our meaning. Take the excellent narrative of that great saint, Gregory the Great, "the father of the Modern Papacy," as Milman rightly calls him, with whose life Mr. Mann begins his work. We think that he is quite successful in his defence of Gregory's relations with Brunichild, but are not so sure as to the perfect uprightness of Gregory's dealings with Maurice and Phocas. But here there is liberty to differ. What we complain of is, that anyone reading this history and knowing nothing of the real facts would get a wrong impression, not so much by what is said, as by what is not said, of Augustine of Canterbury, and of the work of the Scot missionaries. We the more regret this because in reality a fuller account of Augustine would have shown us the essential greatness of Gregory by the very contrast presented. Or take another instance. Mention is made once or twice of St. Patrick. There is not a hint in the notes of the difficulties which surround the story of Patrick, difficulties so great that they have led that excellent scholar, Mr. C. Plummer, to be sceptical as to his very existence (Bædæ, *Op. Hist.* ii. 25). We might mention other cases. Mr. Mann's defence of Honorius I. against the charge of heresy is only what we might

fairly expect from a modern Roman Catholic, and of this we have no right to complain. But we do complain of the general tone of Mr. Mann's allusions to the Eastern Empire, and of a certain lack of proportion due to the controversial needs of the Roman claims. Mr. Mann, moreover, in our opinion, has somewhat crippled the usefulness of his work by his method of treatment. He would have done better, we think, to have given us a history of the Mediæval Papacy, rather than of the popes. The difference is important. History cannot well be written on the plan of watertight compartments. Mr. Mann will have difficulty in avoiding the defects inherent to this method, and of which a good illustration, *i.e.* of the defects, may be found in Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*. A single instance will suffice. The greatness of Gregory's work for God cannot be understood unless the reader remembers that he and Muhammad were practically contemporaries. But Muhammad, at whom Mr. Mann hurls epithets—"fanatical impostor," etc. —that are neither dignified nor scientific, is kept over, on the watertight principle, for one of Gregory's "ghostly" successors, Boniface V., to whose life he more strictly belongs. But we must take our author as he is. From Mr. Mann's standpoint the work he has done is excellent.

The student will rejoice in the full and excellent references and discussions which Mr. Mann supplies. For foreign literature, especially Roman Catholic literature, they are most complete. In the case of English and Anglican works we detect gaps, some of which no doubt are due to the difficulty in Newcastle of obtaining recent works and editions. References to Bede are given to Migne instead of Plummer. Gibbon is quoted from an edition of 1825, instead of Bury's; while Gasquet's edition of Montalembert is also neglected. We note that the reference on page 154 is most one-sided. Such works as Collins' *The Beginnings of English Christianity*, Mason's *Mission of St. Augustine* should have been quoted for another view. We could, in fact, in more places than one, considerably add to the references, though not always perhaps such as Mr. Mann would approve. We have detected here and there one or two instances of carelessness, especially in the use of English. But our last word shall be one of thanks to Mr. Mann for a most scholarly and valuable instalment of a great task, to the successive volumes of which we look forward with anticipation.

H. B. W.

Select Pleas, Starrs, and Other Records from the Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, A.D. 1220–1284. Edited for the Selden Society by J. M. Rigg. (London: Bernard Quaritch. 28*s.*)

We cannot undertake in a brief notice of this important volume to explain what the "Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews" may mean. There is very much in the mere title of the volume to explain, enough to fill out a small pamphlet. The whole subject is full of antiquarian puzzles, and the volumes stood much in need of the introduction which is prefixed by the editor.

Mr. Rigg is best known among students of mediæval history by his *Life of Anselm*, the unique merit of which is recognised alike at Oxford and at Harvard, by English and by American students of Anglo-Norman history and of scholastic philosophy and divinity. He is also known as the writer of the masterly article on "Duns Scotus" in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and of a large proportion of the biographies of great lawyers and statesmen of all centuries, but especially of the eighteenth century, in the same Dictionary. The large and handsome volume now lying before us must, however, have been the most tediously difficult work to which he has put his hands. Crabbed law-Latin and Norman-French statutes and records, relating to the hitherto unknown subject of the special legislation for the Jews, and their criminal history, their wrongs and sufferings, their gains and their fines and impositions, the pros and cons of their dark and strange annals, so sordid usually, but also not seldom so harrowing, are rendered into clear and exact English, printed side by side with the Norman-French and law-Latin of the "Rolls." In the learned and elaborate introduction the social and political conditions, so altogether exceptional, are explained, under which the Jews were suffered to live and traffic in England during the Middle Ages. This is just the sort of book for the Selden Society to publish, and it is well they have found a scholar who has not shrunk from the labour which such a work required.

Napoleon's Campaign in Poland, 1806–7. By F. Loraine Petre. With Maps and Plans. (London: Sampson Low, Marston, & Co. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is a military history, written in short paragraphs, with no attempt at rhetoric, but its very reserve makes it more impressive. It shows what war is with a ghastly realism, and helps us to

understand the fatal catastrophe of the retreat from Moscow, which wrecked Napoleon's fortunes in 1812. Mr. Petre has lit up a period of which comparatively little is known. The first Russian campaign has been overshadowed by Austerlitz and Jena, but the scheme for the destruction of Bennigsen, which failed largely through the capture of a single despatch entrusted to a young officer, was scarcely inferior in strategic skill to the marches upon Ulm and Jena. The French emperor's care for his army shows how keenly alive he was to the essentials of success. Each man had two reserve pairs of shoes in his knapsack, and arrangements were made that he should receive two other pairs on the march. Yet notwithstanding this care for their food, their clothing, and their boots, the French troops were often in dire distress for all three. The fight in a snow storm at Eylau makes one's heart bleed. After the battle of Heilberg, a horde of plunderers stripped the dead and wounded, so that thousands of naked bodies lay on the plain, some still alive and shivering with fever after the night of rain. Mr. Petre has provided a history which soldiers will study with profound interest, and all lovers of their kind with deepening horror and dismay.

The Medici, and the Italian Renaissance. By Oliphant Smeaton, M.A. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 3*s*.)

Mr. Smeaton's object has been to trace the continuity of aim which ran through the Renaissance patronage of the great house of Medici from the days of Cosimo to the time of Pope Clement VII., and he has done his task well. The record of shame and political betrayal associated with the Medici must not blind us to their devotion to literature. Throughout a whole century they proved themselves among the truest patrons of learning that the world has known. Lorenzo the Magnificent did more to place Florence in the forefront of the world's culture than any other of its citizens. "His influence was great because he was in sympathy so catholic with all the varied life of his age and circle. Truly a unique personality, at one and the same time the glorious creation and the splendid epitome of the spirit of the Renaissance!" In 1492, a month before his death, his son Giovanni, a youth of sixteen, was invested with the honours as cardinal, which his father's influence had secured for him three years earlier. He became pope in 1513, and gave full play to his humanistic bent. He drew around him such a vast and varied

assemblage of talented and cultured men and women as has probably never been gathered together before or since in a single city. Mr. Smeaton shows us the glories of the age, and his picture is singularly impressive. Its darker sides must be added from other sources. Liberty and morality were sacrificed to a heathen ideal of culture. Art and literature flourished; religion seemed on its death-bed. Its resurrection was not due to the Medici, but to the son of a German peasant.

The Early History of Venice. By F. C. Hodgson, M.A. With Map and Plan. (London: George Allen. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Hodgson traces the history of Venice from its foundation in the lagoons of the Adriatic to its conquest of Constantinople in 1204. He has made a close study of the original documents, and his book is likely to become a standard work. It eschews rhetoric, it is judicial in tone, clear and simple in style, and is packed with information. The picturesque legends of St. Mark and St. Magnus are brightly told, and the aspect of the city nine hundred years ago is set forth in a valuable chapter. The power of the doge is very clearly described, as also is the bridal ceremony by which Venice asserted her "true and perpetual dominion" over the sea. The plan and map give a wonderful idea of the sea-city. Mr. Hodgson has good cause to be proud of this workmanlike volume.

Memorials of Old Buckinghamshire. Edited by P. H. Ditchfield, M.A., F.S.A. (London: Bemrose & Sons. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Mr. Ditchfield and his contributors have given us a book of varied interest. It describes famous mansions like Stowe, Bulstrode, Fawley Court, and Hartwell House; it traces the steps of Milton to the little village of Horton, where his mother was buried in 1637, and to Chalfont St. Giles, where he handed the manuscript of *Paradise Lost* to his friend Ellwood. There is a good chapter on "The Penn Family in Bucks," and on John Hampden's home in the Hundred of Aylesbury. Lady Verney's paper on "Claydon House and the Verneys" is full of good things. Mr. Ditchfield writes on "Historic Bucks," "The Civil War in Bucks," and "Hartwell House," where Louis XVIII. lived until the collapse of Napoleon's power in 1814. Bucks is rich in historic seats and famous men. This volume is very bright reading. Its full-page illustrations are excellent. On page 89, "Canons, near Edgeworth," should read "Edgeware."

V. BIOGRAPHY AND LETTERS.

The Life of Lord Russell of Killowen. By R. Barry O'Brien. With a Portrait and Facsimiles. (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

MR. O'BRIEN has written a Life of Lord Russell which admits us almost to personal intimacy with the great advocate. The stories with which the volume opens are very racy, and save for a few paragraphs about the Russell pedigree, the interest of the book grows steadily to the last page. Lord Russell was born at Ballybot in 1832. He began life as a solicitor in Belfast, but his skill in handling two or three contentious cases led far-seeing friends to advise that he should try his fortunes at the English Bar. His mother was troubled by the proposal; but when she appealed to Miss Mulholland, to whom her son was engaged, to use her influence to prevent that step, the lady replied, "If he does not go to the Bar, I will never speak to him again." The young people were married in August, 1858, and the following January Russell was called to the English Bar. His uncle, Dr. Russell, President of Maynooth, gave him a letter of introduction to a Liverpool merchant, who secured him the friendship of a leading Roman Catholic solicitor of that town. Russell needed nothing more. He had an unlimited capacity for taking pains, and put his best strength into every case entrusted to him. He was neither eloquent nor witty, but he had a clear view of the essentials of a situation, and a bull-dog tenacity in urging his case. His overbearing manner with jurors and solicitors was in large measure due to his determination to get to the core of a subject without delay, and nothing irritated him more than any beating about the bush. No profession presents such difficulties to the beginner as the Bar. Gully and Herschell, who were among Russell's contemporaries at Liverpool, once dined with him there when they were despairing of success in England. Russell himself was never despondent. Nor had he any need. In his first year he made £117, next year £261, the third year his fees were £441, the fourth £1,016. He was soon in the front rank of the Junior Bar, and the year before he took silk, in 1872, he had an income of £3,000. His largest return was £22,517 in 1893, the year

before he became a judge. He did not get an early opportunity of playing a prominent part in any leading case, but ordinary business came freely, and he proved himself "on every occasion to be a clear-headed, painstaking, strenuous man." He was never a lover of books; his strength lay in action, and he could not bear to be idle. His first London triumph was not won till 1878, when he defended Mr. Labouchere in an action for libel. Sir George Lewis briefed him because of the reputation he had won on the Northern Circuit, and he had good reason to be satisfied with the result. Sir George holds that Russell had "no equal as a cross-examiner. He had no equal as an advocate; there never was a greater man at the English Bar than Russell." The Piggott chapter brings out splendidly the characteristics of Russell's cross-examination. For a rogue he was a ruthless antagonist who stripped off every disguise, till such a man as Piggott was turned inside out. Mr. O'Brien shows that Russell was most slow to accept Home Rule. He would have preferred a generous measure of Local Government, though he threw himself into the attempt to carry Mr. Gladstone's ill-fated programme. He was an Imperialist who saw that Irishmen owed their opportunity for distinction and power to the empire. As Lord Chief Justice he won a great reputation, which would have become greater had his life been spared. Nothing did him such honour as his fearless stand for commercial integrity. He was a devoted member of the Roman Catholic Church. His love of racing and card-playing was carried to great lengths, and in this respect his influence was much to be regretted. His home life was singularly happy. Lady Russell was a "solace and an inspiration" to him for more than forty years. He died on August 9, 1900, with the prayer on his lips, "My God, have mercy upon me."

Letters of John Richard Green. Edited by Leslie Stephen. (15*s.* net.)

Oxford Studies. By John Richard Green. Edited by Mrs. J. R. Green and Miss K. Norgate. (5*s.*)

(London: Macmillan & Co.)

It is not often that the world gets such a volume of Letters as these, and Mr. Leslie Stephen's exquisite introductions form a condensed biography which lends added charm to the revelation made by the letters themselves. We watch, almost

wondering at the privilege allowed us, the writer's mind and heart expanding under the stress of disappointment, ill-health, and straitened means, with a pathetic interest. Green, as an East End clergyman, is a real hero. His faith wavers, his physical strength ebbs away, yet his courage never fails nor does his devotion to duty flag. His earlier letters are chiefly addressed to his friend Professor Boyd Dawkins, the later letters to his patron and confrére, Edward A. Freeman. The most amusing letters, rippling with fun, are written to Miss Olga Von Glehn. Green was a native of Oxford, where his father was a "registrar and maker of silk gowns for fellows." His life at Jesus College proved very uncongenial, and, from the first, he pursued his own course of reading. Ill-health and disgust at his college were producing a bad effect on both his character and his work, when he wandered into the lecture-room where Arthur Stanley was discoursing on the Wesleys. There his enthusiasm for history returned, and during his last year at the university he did some solid and fruitful work. He was so self-willed and opinionated, however, that he would not even read Paley's *Evidences* or Pearson on *The Creed* for his ordination. Green is indeed far from admirable in these early days, and his letters rather grate upon a sensitive taste. But life proved a good schoolmaster. His first vicar was the father of Mr. Humphry Ward, and the influence of the vicar's wife was the chief blessing of his early manhood. Long afterwards he described her as "the greatest and best person I have ever met, or shall ever meet, in this world." His sermon on her death is given in this volume, and shows how deeply Mrs. Ward had left her stamp on the young curate's mind and heart. Green was impatient of authority, and his religious views grew more and more unsettled, till he was glad to resign his living at Stepney. In his last years he came back nearer to his old belief. "New life," he wrote, "brings with it new hopes, new cravings after belief, new faith that we will know what is true. Vague, dim hopes; vague, dim faith it may be, but I am not impatient of vagueness and dimness as I used to be."

The *Short History* was written after Green's retirement from clerical life in 1869. Sir Andrew Clark found that his lungs were seriously affected, and henceforth he was an invalid, though he laboured with singular energy. The judgments of his friends on parts of his history submitted to them were by no means uniformly favourable, and certainly no one was prepared

for the great success won by the *Short History*. It had errors and blemishes, due largely to the conditions under which Green had to work—in foreign hotels, and with enfeebled health; but it was an epoch-making book. Instead of the old "drum and trumpet history" it laid stress on "the unity and continuity of great religious or literary movements or of economic changes, such as the growth of town life, in which the leading moments are not defined by the accession of kings or the event of battles."

Henceforth Green was famous. His days of poverty and obscurity were passed, and his health improved. His marriage in June, 1877, to Miss Alice Stopford, daughter of the Archdeacon of Meath, brought him new life. Tennyson welcomed husband and wife to Aldworth, and told Green: "You're a jolly, vivid man, and I'm glad to have known you; you're as vivid as lightning." That witness was true, and it is the vividness of these letters that makes them so fascinating. The honesty of the man is strikingly shown in the candid critiques sent to his friend Freeman. No historians could have helped each other more than these strangely contrasted masters of their art. The closing scenes of Green's life, the indomitable spirit that kept him alive till he had finished his most pressing work, form one of the historic tableaux of literature winning its spurs from death. One feels ashamed of one's own work in the presence of such an example. The book cannot fail to inspire and delight all who read it.

The Eversley edition of Green's *Oxford Studies* has an Introduction by Mrs. Green which throws further light on the making of an historian, and the Studies themselves are characteristically vivid. Their material is drawn from contemporary poems and papers, and a thousand little details are preserved which help us to see the town and university with our own eyes. Valuable notes have been added by the editors, and the little book will be prized by all who know how to appreciate such glimpses of the past.

A. W. Kinglake: A Biographical and Literary Study. By W. Tuckwell. (London: Bell & Sons. 4*s.* 6*d.*)

The author of *Eothen* and of *The Invasion of the Crimea* died eleven years ago, but no biography of him has appeared. Mr. Tuckwell fills the gap with this volume, which sparkles with good stories and gives a living picture of a man about whom

many will be glad to know more. He sprang from a Scotch family called Kinloch, who came into England with King James, and changed their name to Kinglake. The future historian was born at Taunton in 1809. He was trained for the Bar, but in 1834 set out on the Eastern tour which bore fruit ten years later in *Eothen*. That book actually transported its readers to the East, yet it is neither history nor geography, "only Kinglake, only his own sensations, thoughts, experiences," told in the most entrancing fashion. He entered Parliament as member for Bridgwater, but was not a success there, and in 1868 was unseated for bribery on the part of his agents. Henceforth his strength was given to his book on the Crimean War. He had seen much of the war as the guest of Lord Raglan, and that general is the Hector of his history. It was written largely as a defence of Raglan, and closes somewhat abruptly with his death. Kinglake's terrible indictment of Napoleon III. is perhaps "unequalled in historical literature," and the event proved how wonderfully he had read the emperor's character. Mr. Tuckwell's critique of the history deserves careful study, and his account of Kinglake's friends and methods of work is of great interest. We have got much pleasure out of his book, and wish it had been longer.

John Hall, Pastor and Preacher. Biography by his Son, Thomas C. Hall. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Hall was for thirty years the most influential pastor and preacher in New York. His style was not American, but in contrast with what Americans regarded as eloquent or profound; this may in part even have contributed to his unequalled moral and spiritual influence. When he went to the great American city in 1867, the singing in all the churches was in the hands of quartets—professional singers all of them in the chief churches—listened to and criticised as such. He found the practice established in the First Presbyterian Church—the leading Church in New York of that leading denomination—and without any delay he intimated to his "elders" that if that was to be the mode in the Church to which he had consented to minister, he must return to Ireland; that the only sort of singing he could work with was congregational singing, with no quartet, but with an organ and a leader, the congregation being expected to do the singing collectively, and as many as could to sing by note.

The elders at once submitted. His was the one church in New York in which true congregational singing was to be heard. The writer worshipped in the church in 1876, and heard the finest volume of congregational psalmody he ever heard, from a congregation of 2,000 in a wonderfully noble church building, in the grand Fifth Avenue of New York.

Dr. Hall was not brilliant, nor was he a profound teacher in the way of abstract thought. But he was an admirable pulpit teacher and preacher; he was all round a strong and impressive pastoral counsellor and expositor, a "master in Israel." He never lent himself to extremes in anything; but neither was he a narrow man. His last years were saddened by the growing spirit of rationalism in his own great Church, which also to some extent infected his own congregation and flock. The Briggs controversy was a sore grief to him. He held Professor Briggs' views to be dangerously wrong, and yet he could not join with those who would have exercised severe discipline upon him. His health broke down under the controversial strain, heart-trouble supervened, and he died years earlier than might have been expected.

Doubtless the strain of his great Church had told on his constitution. Nevertheless, but for the theological controversy, he would probably have lived years longer, and might have survived to a ripe old age in a venerable retirement. He was a Scots-Irishman, from the North of Ireland, a farmer's son, a hard worker from his youth. While still a young man he was called to the important Church of Armagh, one of the most influential in Ireland. Afterwards he became pastor of St. Mary's Abbey Church in Dublin, and held a position in the Irish capital inferior in influence to none held by any minister of his standing. But his views as to national education were too enlightened and progressive for some of his seniors; and it was partly to escape into larger and fuller life that he accepted the great call from New York, where for thirty years he held an unrivalled position as pastor and preacher. He died in October, 1898. This memoir is modest and true, but it needs careful "reading" and editing to remove minor blemishes.

John Henry Cardinal Newman. By A. R. Waller and G. H. S. Burrow. (London: Kegan Paul. 2s.)

This little volume is sure of a warm welcome. It is a record of facts, freshly put, and marked by much judicial restraint.

There is little that is new, and we are at a loss as to the writers' personal views save when we find Father Dominic's reception of Newman into "the one fold of the Redeemer" described as "the greatest triumph of His Church in England during three hundred years," and are told that Newman "found strength in what must surely be the great consolation of a convert to Rome, in the continual presence of the Blessed Sacrament." We think the analogies of the first pages somewhat strained, and Julius Cæsar was not a Roman emperor, as is stated on page 73. The "Westminster Biographies" are a very dainty set of volumes, and the subjects are well chosen.

Newman: An Appreciation. By Alexander Whyte, D.D. (London: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Whyte's enthusiasm for Newman does not blind him to the grave defects of his character and his theology. "The very best of the sermons are continually tainted with some impertinent aside at some Evangelical truth, or at some real, or imagined, or greatly exaggerated defects in the doctrine or in the life of the Evangelical preachers of his day. . . . The finer and the more fastidious your mind is the more you will enjoy Newman's sermons. But the more burdened and broken your heart is, and especially with your secret sinfulness, the less will you find in them that which, above all things in heaven or earth, your heart needs." His sermons at St. Mary's knew nothing of "the righteousness of Christ," and there is a whole chain of gospel texts on which he never touches. His Roman Catholic sermons have lost the refinement and the delicacy of his Anglican discourses, but they have a freedom of treatment, a breadth and depth of colour, and a dramatic movement which the earlier sermons lacked. Dr. Whyte's book is arranged in three sections. After a brief outline of biography we have a critique of Newman's writings, followed by a selection of choice passages which cover a hundred pages. Some letters from Newman to his friend and critic are added, which show Newman in an attractive light. Dr. Whyte is a true Catholic who has room in his heart for all good men and all good books. The *Appreciation* is just and generous, but it does not lack edge or teeth.

The Rev. Jabez Marrat has written a penny life of *John Fletcher: Saint and Scholar*, which every young Methodist ought to read. It is full of anecdotes about the saint of the Methodist

Revival, and Mr. Marrat never allows the reader's interest to flag. The pictures add to the value of a bright and compact biography.

Felicia Skene of Oxford. A Memoir. By F. C. Rickards. With numerous Portraits and other Illustrations. (London: John Murray. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is an inspiring book. Felicia Skene was a queen among women, and the consecration of her life to the outcast and the prisoner in Oxford makes one proud of human nature. Miss Wordsworth, of Lady Margaret Hall, says: "It is an addition to one's weight of moral indebtedness and responsibility to have known anyone whose life was a daily realisation of the teaching of that *Inasmuch* in one of our Lord's most solemn parables." She belonged to an old Scotch family, and her father was one of Sir Walter Scott's most intimate friends. Thirty years after Scott's death Mr. Skene, who was then in his ninetieth year and had the use of all his faculties save that his memory failed with regard to recent events, told his daughter that he had had a delightful surprise: "Scott has been here! dear Scott!" Miss Skene had many offers of marriage, but she refused them all, devoting her life to her friends and her labours of love. She had some notable successes, due to her overflowing sympathy and kindness. "It is by working on their affections alone," she said, "that there is the least chance of winning them." She was a woman of overflowing spirits and kindly humour, and her friendships with Mrs. Humphry Ward, Lady Sophia Palmer, and Mr. C. W. Wood are very pleasant to read about. Lady Sophia leaves the impression that Miss Skene was a strong advocate of the confessional; but Mr. Wood, in his charming reminiscences, says "she lived to see that confession was a practice that too often brought about the very evils it was supposed to remedy, and must never be permitted to obtain foothold in our Church of England." We have read this book with unfeigned delight and admiration. Its fine portraits and pictures add much to its attractiveness.

Some Unpublished Letters of Horace Walpole. Edited by Sir Spencer Walpole. With Two Photogravure Portraits. (London: Longmans. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

These letters were written to their editor's grandfather and great-grandfather, and are homely, unaffected, and warm-hearted,

but by no means brilliant. The writer's concern for his friend, Madame du Deffand, in her last illness, is very touching, and does much credit to his heart. Fox is his hero. To Pitt he is neither just nor generous, while his political forecasts illustrate his dictum: "The wisest penetration does not condescend to calculate the thousand foolish reasons that weigh in, and determine, political events." He complains that "we lived two years upon the dotage of Dr. Johnson and his foolish biographers." The death of Frederic the Great, he says, did not make much public sensation in London, "even among the pamphlet shops; not so much as Dr. Johnson's—but of him there is an end too." In another place he writes that the doctor's friends "out of zeal have exposed the poor man, by relating all his absurdities and brutalities, more than they had blown up the bladder of his fame before." The little volume has no special value for historians or connoisseurs, but it is an undress portrait of an old friend which makes one like him better, and reveals the real warmth of his feelings towards his own circle.

Westminster. By Reginald Airy, B.A. With Fifty-one Illustrations. (London: Bell & Sons. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is a welcome addition to Messrs. Bell's "Handbooks to the Great Public Schools." It does not profess to give such wealth of detail as historians of Westminster School like Mr. Sargeaunt and Mr. Forshall have furnished, but it tells the main facts in a pleasant fashion, and gives such a view of the school in its present condition as can be found nowhere else. It has been said that Westminster School "has greater traditions than Eton or Winchester," and it is encouraging to find that Busby's School is thoroughly healthy and prosperous. Mr. Airy thinks that the reasons which have led to the removal of Christ's Hospital and Charterhouse School into the country do not hold good for Westminster, and we are disposed to agree with him. The illustrations are exceptionally good.

The Literary Year-Book (G. Allen, 5*s.*) is a guide that no writer or publisher can dispense with. Many welcome improvements have been made in this year's issue. We have had the *Literary Year-Book* in constant use for two or three years, and have found it invaluable.

VI. BELLES LETTRES.

Shakespeare's Tragedies; Histories and Poems; Comedies with General Glossary. Three Volumes. (3*s.* 6*d.* each vol. net.)

The Life and Achievements of Don Quixote de la Mancha.

Tennyson's In Memoriam. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

(London : George Newnes.)

THESE volumes are printed on extremely thin yet thoroughly opaque paper, and bound in limp lambskin with designed end papers and covers, and gilt tops. The Shakespeare volumes have from 950 to 1,050 pages each, yet they do not exceed five-eighths of an inch in thickness. The result is not gained by the use of small type, for it is a pleasure to read one's Shakespeare in such an edition. The photogravure frontispiece and title-page to each volume are the work of Edmund J. Sullivan, and are daintily printed on Japanese vellum. They represent Shakespeare brooding over his mighty dramas, with the muses guiding his hand or inspiring his fancy, and are very finely conceived and executed. The three volumes in their neat little case are a treat such as a book-lover does not often have. A more charming present could not easily be lighted on.

The *Don Quixote* (3*s.* 6*d.* net) is the translation by Motteux, which is very pleasant to read. The volume has a photogravure frontispiece and title-page from drawings by Edmund J. Sullivan, printed on Japanese vellum. This will be a real boon to all who wish for a handy edition of a great classic.

In Memoriam belongs to the "Caxton Series of Illustrated Reprints of Famous Classics." The style of get-up is similar to the Shakespeare, but here are nineteen wonderful pictures by Alfred Garth Jones which have caught the mystery and sadness of the poem, and quietly set one dreaming. Such illustrations would have delighted Tennyson.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published an edition of *In Memoriam* (2*s.* 6*d.* net), with a Commentary by Dr. Morel. He supplies an analytical summary of each section, with notes on words and allusions which represent wide reading, and are a real help to the enjoyment of the poem. Students will find much material here.

The Teachings of Dante. By Charles Allen Dinsmore. (Westminster: Constable & Co. 6*s.* net.)

Mr. Dinsmore has given us a very fine book. It is full of enthusiasm, but it is clear-sighted, and is marked by much grace of style as well as freshness of thought. He points out that Dante was "great as an artist because he suffered greatly as a man." Michael Angelo had no opportunity of concentrating all his strength on one masterpiece. Dante was able to brood continuously over one colossal theme, and gather into one monumental whole the results of his splendid genius and energy. No wonder the "Divina Commedia" is the "mediæval miracle of song." It is "not only the first great Christian poem, but it is distinctively the Christian poem of the world in its majestic conception of man and his possibilities." Dante has a message of "victorious joy" for a burdened world. His thought swept beyond all lower conceptions to the idea of a "superhuman exaltation in which the soul, above the limitations of the flesh and escaping its bondage, should habitually dwell in the presence of eternal realities, illumined by the divine light, exultant with celestial joys, and consciously one with God Himself in purpose and in desire."

Isopel Berners. By George Borrow. Edited by Thomas Seccombe. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The "Red Leather Series" owes its name to the get-up of its dainty volumes, which, with their gilt edges and good type, appeal to everyone who likes an attractive book. Mr. Seccombe has taken from *Lavengro* and *Romany Rye* the story of one of the queens of autobiographical fiction, and has given us an introduction which is a real help to the understanding of Borrow and his books. Their wonderful open-air character gives them an interest of their own in literature. We feel the wind on the heath, the sunshine and the rain; we mix with the vagrants of the wood and forest, and find them really alive. Borrow was uncouth and unconventional, but his work has the touch of genius, and Mr. Seccombe has proved himself a worthy interpreter.

A Sheaf of Stories.

The Making of a Marchioness, by Frances Hodgson Burnett (Smith, Elder, & Co., 6*s.*). Emily Fox-Seton richly deserves her good fortune, and one follows the story of her unconscious

conquest of the somewhat elderly marquis with unfeigned interest. She had lived in sight of the workhouse till wealth and title came to her in the most unexpected fashion. The first part of the book is idyllic; the second is not so perfect. The plots against Emily's life savour of melodrama, but she escapes the snares laid for her by the worthless heir-presumptive, and before the story closes has won her husband's love as well as his esteem and regard, while the birth of little Lord Oswyth has put the succession on a sound basis. Mrs. Burnett has given us a charming study of a good woman's heart. *The Firebrand*, by S. R. Crockett (Macmillan & Co., 6*s*.), is a Carlist story with a Scotch hero. Rollo Blair sets out to entrap the Queen-Regent and her daughter, the little Queen Isabel, and deliver them into the hands of the Carlists. He fails to accomplish his purpose, but saves the royal household from a party of gypsies who attack the palace of La Granja. There is much exciting adventure in the story, but it is free from the horrors which Mr. Crockett loves too well, and he has given us nothing better than the gypsy scenes of this book. The Carlist sergeant, who turns out to be a noted gypsy brigand, is a powerful study; and Concha, the merry and brave Andalusian girl, soon wins one's heart. *The Old Bank*, by William Westall (Chatto & Windus, 6*s*.). This book improves as it goes on. The run on the old bank is described with much vigour, and the wealthy American merchant who saves it by a timely deposit and then comes to the rescue in a more serious crisis by turning the bank into a joint-stock concern, is a good study. Mr. Westall might have made his story better with severe revision, but it is pleasant to read, and Ida Fynes and her three lovers make a lively company. One of them is a villain, but the banker and the lawyer are really fine fellows. *Judah Pyecroft, Puritan*, by Harry Lindsay (Chatto & Windus, 6*s*.), is a romance of the Restoration, which gives a vivid picture of the events that followed Cromwell's death. It is pleasant reading, well suited for the family circle, and it throws much light on a memorable epoch of English history. *The Tory Lover*, by Sarah Orne Jewett (Smith, Elder, & Co., 6*s*.), is a story of the American War, in which Paul Jones and his raids on British shipping play a large part. Roger Wallingford, who is really a friend of England, consents to stay with the privateer, and his love and adventures are the theme of a very graceful story. It is well fitted for family reading.

Audrey (Constable & Co., 6s.) is the best story that Miss Mary Johnston has written. It enthralls one's attention from the first page to the last, and its pictures of Virginia life are so clearly etched that every detail lingers in the memory. Mr. Marmaduke Haward is a subtle study, and the fierce Highlander with his Quaker sweetheart is almost as interesting. Miss Johnston is a true artist, and there is a rare vigour and beauty about her work.

Princess Puck, by U. L. Silberrad (Macmillan & Co., 6s.), is a masterful brown elf, who casts her spell over every reader as she cast it over Kit Harborough. Nothing could be more unconventional than Bell's ways, and nothing could be more delightfully true and tender. Much real enjoyment is in store for everyone who reads this bright and clever story.

Mr. Grant Richards sends us three volumes of "The World's Classics." They run up to four hundred and fifty pages, and are published at the price of one shilling net per volume. Nothing better worth having is to be found in the book market. The selection is catholic. The series opens with *Jane Eyre*, which is followed by *The Essays of Elia*, *Tennyson's Poems* 1830–1858, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, *Hazlitt's Table Talk*, *Keats' Poetical Works*, *Oliver Twist*, *The Ingoldsby Legends*, and other volumes equally attractive. An edition in leather gilt is published at two shillings, but people to whom a shilling is a consideration will find the cheaper binding all they need. Such a spirited attempt to supply good reading at the most modest prices must win the success it deserves.

A Dream of Realms Beyond Us. By Adair Welcker. (San Francisco: Cubery & Co.)

Mr. Welcker certainly dwells in "realms beyond us." His "Prefatory Notes" are very wild and very insincere. In one of them he states that he will supply his few verses for forty shillings a copy, and in a final note he tells us that he will send a copy to any address for fifty cents. We do not wonder that only one of the seventy best known universities and colleges to which he sent his pamphlet felt inclined to remit him fifty cents. His good taste may be gauged by one sentence. Conscience is to come down to dwell on earth. "Then there will not be done by armies of people that thieve and partition, or be done to women and babes in camps of concentration, work for which a Herod of old, of Judæa, or a Jack the Ripper should blush."

VII. ART AND RURAL LIFE.

Christian Art and Archæology. Being a Handbook of the Monuments of the Early Church. By Walter Lowrie, M.A. (London: Macmillan & Co. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

MR. LOWRIE was a Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies at Rome, and has studied the monuments of the Early Church with unwearying attention. He avoids controversial questions, and seeks to supply a handbook treating all branches of Christian art and archæology as completely as is possible within the limits of one modest volume. After an introductory section on Christian art we have a chapter on the "Christian Cemeteries," which is evidently the work of an expert. The catacombs were not intended to secure secrecy. They were well known to the authorities, and were clearly recognised as the corporate property of the Church. Mr. Lowrie's description of the inscriptions and the burial customs is deeply interesting. Architecture is treated very fully. It is a mistake to suppose that the term *basilica*, as applied to places of Christian worship, indicates that the halls of justice were ceded to the Church or that the Christian basilica was copied from such buildings. No description of the basilica so complete or so instructive as this has come into our hands. The sections dealing with painting and sculpture, with their effective illustrations, will be much prized by students. The mosaics, the minor arts, and the dress of the first six centuries are also discussed and described. The book is severely condensed and full of facts, but it is delightful reading, and there is much to learn from every page.

Giotto. By F. Mason Perkins. (London: Bell & Sons. 5*s.* net.)

Mr. Perkins is untrammelled by traditional views of Giotto. He regards Vasari's biography of this painter as the most untrustworthy and incorrect of all his Lives, and uses his own

eyes and his own judgment in studying the work attributed to Giotto in that great arena of mediæval art, the Church of San Francesco at Assisi. The result is stimulating. The book will make an impression on art circles, and it will add to the interest felt by lovers of mediæval art and religion in one of their greatest exponents. No painter ever made so tremendous a transformation in the field of painting as Giotto did in his earlier years. It was not merely a fundamental change in technical treatment and spiritual significance, but also in the spirit of independence which he breathed into the profession of the artist. "In dramatic force of representation, in unfailing directness of expression, in concise significance of action, in dignity and nobility of conception, in sanity of imagination, and sincerity of feeling he stands unsurpassed among the painters of Italy and the world."

The Cathedral Church of Chichester. By Hubert C. Corlette, A.R.I.B.A. With Forty-five Illustrations. (London: Bell & Sons. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Chichester is one of the best cathedrals for a student of architecture to visit, and Mr. Corlette is a thoroughly competent and most interesting guide. He gives a lucid summary of the history of the fabric, with the exciting episode of the fall of the spire in 1861. This is followed by a detailed study of the exterior and interior, and a chapter on the diocese and see. The illustrations are well chosen and very clear. Such books are a great boon to the tourist, and Mr. Corlette has spared no pains to give us a full and reliable account of one of our most interesting cathedrals.

Westminster Abbey, in the same series, is by Charles Hiatt. It has been compiled with great care from the best authorities, and is especially full on the monuments. Visitors could not have a better guide to the most famous of English minsters.

The Cathedral Church of Amiens (Bell, 2*s.* 6*d.* net), by T. Perkins, is a fitting handbook to the church which is the pride of Picardy. The wealth of imagination shown on its west front, the perfection of its details, the glory of its carved choir-stalls make a profound impression. Mr. Perkins has not only described the building and told its story, but has himself taken the fifty-seven photographs which give such charm to his volume.

Scenes of Rural Life in Hampshire among the Manors of Bramshott. By W. W. Capes. (London: Macmillan & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

During his thirty years as rector of Bramshott, Mr. Capes has been an eager student of all that concerns a parish lying at the meeting-point of the three counties of Hampshire, Surrey, and Sussex. His aim in this book is "to inquire into the varying conditions of the people, and to trace in successive ages the gradual changes of landed tenure and of rural life." He has brought to his task a vast store of knowledge of English Church History in the Middle Ages, as evidenced in his volume on that period, and a healthy independence of judgment. Some of his chapters may not attract ordinary readers, but students will not be slow to recognise their learning and research. Mr. Capes sets aside the derivation of Bramshott given by "Mr. Isaac Taylor, a competent but self-confident authority on place names," who says that it originally ended in "holt." The earliest ending of the name is "sete," which points to the settlement of some family or clan, or to some natural features of the spot. Mr. Capes is a student of court rolls and parish registers. He has no treasures for the lover of natural history, such as once came from the neighbouring parish of Selborne, but he throws a flood of light on rural life in Hampshire, and his book is one that all who wish to reconstruct the village society of past generations will study with profound interest.

Richard Jefferies' *Life of the Field* deserves its place of honour in Messrs. Chatto & Windus's tasteful "St. Martin's Library" (2*s.* net). It is not merely a delightful series of nature studies; it is literature of the most chaste and finished kind. The book will be welcomed by every lover of nature's poetry and pageantry.

Messrs. Dulau & Co. have published a new edition of Mr. Baddeley's *Thorough Guide to Bath and Bristol, and Forty Miles Round* (5*s.*). It is everthing that a guide should be, rich in maps, full of condensed information, most conveniently arranged and well written. The tourist will find all his wants met in the best and most thorough style. Mr. Baddeley should add some facts about the Wesleys at Bristol, Bath, and Devizes in his next edition. Messrs. Dulau also publish a ninth revised edition of Baedeker's *Southern Germany* (6*s.*), which is a classic for travellers. Most of the country described has been repeatedly explored by the writer with a view to fulness and accuracy.

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS.

The World and the Individual. Gifford Lectures. First Series. "The Four Historical Conceptions of Being." By Josiah Royce, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.)

THIS profound volume is a new attempt to solve the problem of knowledge by a definition of Reality or Existence. The earlier chapters contain a searching criticism of what the author calls Realism, Mysticism, and Validity. By Realist, he means that class of thinkers who suppose reality to be an existence independent of the thought and ideas of observers. By Mysticists, he means those who test reality by its immediate effect on their own thought and feeling. The upholders of the third conception of Being—Validity, are the spiritual children of Kant, who content themselves with proving that an idea or experience is "determinately possible" (p. 227).

The thoughtful reader finishes the perusal of these earlier chapters with the impression that in spite of several arguments that fail to carry conviction, the three conceptions of Reality dealt with are certainly insufficient.

When the author begins to expound his own theory of Being and knowledge, we find the genuine note of the idealist. "To talk of Being is to speak of fact that is either present to a consciousness or else is nothing" (p. 400). "There can exist no fact except as a known fact" (p. 397). "That my object is, is true in so far as the whole of my object is empirically expressed in an individual life which is my real world" (p. 388). Readers of Berkeley will not therefore be surprised that Dr. Royce at last takes refuge in the theory that all things exist because God knows all things. "The whole world must exist only as present to the unity of a simple consciousness which includes both its own and all finite conscious meanings in one final, eternal, present insight" (p. 397).

Such theories naturally suggest a query. If perception gives existence to the perceived object, when this is doubly perceived does it doubly exist? Again, the Omniscient perceives the object *always*. When I *also* perceive it, does it *exist more*? Dr.

Royce does not mention this difficulty, but an answer is suggested in the following sentence: "[The divine consciousness] includes both our own and all finite conscious meanings in one finally eternal present insight." His whole treatment (pp. 424–427) of the Eternal Consciousness is extremely suggestive.

But in spite of the keenness of thought and breadth of view displayed, the general contention of the volume is unconvincing. Many considerations point to this conclusion, but we must restrict ourselves to the bearings of one brief passage. The crown and crisis of all his argument is that the three theories of Existence are safely embodied and duly supplemented in this Fourth definition (p. 398): "Whatever is, has its being only as a fact observed and exists as the fulfilment of a conscious meaning."

If that be so, take any object, A. It exists because it fulfils an idea or conscious meaning which we may call B. But since B really exists,[1] it must follow that it fulfils another idea, which we may call C. But C also must exist if it is fulfilled. Yet it can only exist because it fulfils another idea, D. And so we might proceed *ad infinitum*. Such a definition at once entangles us in one of those infinite series of shadowy concepts which will assure any philosophical worker that the definition has not defined existence, but simply translated it into terms unthinkable and unknowable. J. A. C.

The Oxford English Dictionary. Volume V., Jew–Kairine, Kaiser–Kyx. Volume VI., L–Lap, Lap–Leisurely. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.)

The completion (with the letter K) of the fifth volume and the commencement (with the sections L–Lap, Lap–Leisurely) of the sixth volume of this great work is an event which indicates a very satisfactory rate of progress. A further section of Volume VI. is promised at an early date, and when that volume is completed fully half the Dictionary will be in the hands of the public; and we may fairly anticipate that the remainder will be forthcoming with no less commendable punctuality.

Especially interesting are the articles on *jewel*, of which, however, the etymology is left undetermined, though the prevalence in the thirteenth century of the form *jocale* would seem to be

[1] On page 413 he attributes Being to mental ideas.

conclusive against the alternative derivation from *gaudium, judge, jury, justice*, and cognate terms, all of which are treated with a fulness of detail that leaves nothing to be desired. The K sections abound in words such as *kavass, kazi, khanjar, khutbah, kittisol, kosher*, and *kow-tow*, the forms of which proclaim them of outlandish origin, and which serve to illustrate the assimilative powers of our language, and afford abundant scope for learned and in some cases distinctly original research. Under *lad* the current etymology is disposed of, but nothing satisfactory is put in its place. Much, though not too much, space is allotted to *lady*; but the most elaborate articles are those on *land, law*, and *lay*, the last of which occupies no fewer than eight pages. Under *lavender* reasonable doubt is again cast upon the current etymology, but we cannot profess to be satisfied with the suggested alternative. The sections on the whole are of unusual interest and importance; nor do we observe the slightest declension from the high standard of typographical accuracy hitherto maintained. J. M. R.

Words and their Ways in English Speech. By James B. Greenough and George L. Kittredge. (London: Macmillan & Co. 5*s*. net.)

The writers of this book set themselves to make the "amazing phenomenon of articulate speech" come home to their readers as a kind of "commonplace miracle," and they have achieved a real success. Every side of the subject is discussed. The "unsolved problem" of the origin of language, the poetry of language, learned words and popular words, technical words and slang, form the subjects of chapters which open up a thousand delightful suggestions. Slang is aptly described as "a peculiar kind of vagabond language, always hanging on the outskirts of legitimate speech, but continually straying or forcing its way into the most respectable company." The exaggeration that comes from courtesy is responsible for *saleslady* or *washerlady*, or the *gentleman* who sweeps the crossing. "Words from Places or Persons" is a chapter full of things one wants to know. *Sandwich* is due to the Earl of Sandwich, who once saved time for gambling "by stratifying the bread and meat which his servant brought to the card-table." The one word *bedlam* cannot be "completely understood without some knowledge of the history of Europe and Asia for more than fifteen hundred years."

Young people will find this volume as delightful as Trench *On the Study of Words* was to their fathers. The authors have spared no pains in their work, and the book is a mine of information as to "words and their ways in English speech."

Swiss Life in Town and Country. By Alfred Thomas Story. With Twenty-five Illustrations. (London: Newnes. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Mr. Story knows Switzerland well, and has learned to esteem its people for their simplicity and sincerity. He does homage to their diligence, which makes the country a perfect hive of industry, and to their devotion to the training of the young. They regard the generation of to-morrow as largely plastic in the hands of the generation of to-day. The Swiss woman is not beautiful, but as wife and mother she is almost unrivalled. The people are not great readers, but in almost every house the newspaper will be found lying about or put on the shelf with the usual books of devotion. Mr. Story writes gracefully, and he knows his subject thoroughly. The book is a welcome addition to a series in which there is not a poor volume.

IX. SUMMARY OF FOREIGN REVIEWS.

METHODIST REVIEW, SOUTH (January-February).—Dr. Turrentine, of the Western North Carolina Conference, writes on "Methodism's Educational Mission in National Life." Methodist colleges and schools, "though numerous, are poor, as a rule, like most colleges in the South." They need and deserve stronger support. All the schools should be combined into a connected system, and a liberal contribution made from the Twentieth Century Fund. In a note on Canon Henson's article in the *Contemporary*, the hope is expressed that members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, who dislike the spirit of bigotry and intolerance, will become as "active agitators and propagators of their views as are those of prelatical, and even papistical tendencies." Then there will be "hope of a better day among the Protestant Churches of America."

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, edited by the Divinity Faculty of Chicago University, and published every quarter from the University Press, opens with an article on "The Outlook of the Twentieth Century in Theology." The writer thinks the Christo-Centric position of the new theology must bring about an increase of spiritual unity that will lead to organic union, and cause the great Churches of the Reformation to rewrite their confessions, adapt them to our own time, and find out the extent of the common ground on which Christians now stand. The sketch of "Nathanael Emmons," who carried on the work of Jonathan Edwards as a theologian, is well worth study. Emmons and the other Hopkinsians belonged to those enthusiasts who expressed "a willingness to be damned for the glory of God." The little preacher was absorbed by his parish, his pulpit, and his theological students. His voice could scarcely be heard, yet he often thrilled his audience by his impassioned eloquence. The article is noteworthy as a picture of a vanished world.