
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

JULY, 1902.
No. CXCV.

NEW SERIES,
No. 15.

The London Quarterly Review.

CONTENTS.

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

PRICE HALF-A-CROWN.

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1902.

MR. KIDD ON WESTERN CIVILISATION.

Principles of Western Civilisation. Being the First Volume of a System of Evolutionary Philosophy. By BENJAMIN KIDD, Author of "Social Evolution." (London: Macmillan & Co.)

WE take a deep interest in Mr. Kidd. His book on *Social Evolution* was eagerly read, and was welcomed by a number of people, and was thought to be a great contribution to the philosophy of the time. We, too, were among the number of those who read the book with interest and expectation. It was something that religion had appeared to come to its own, and that its great function in social evolution should have received such emphatic recognition. But that recognition had its drawbacks. A heavy price had to be paid for it, for religion was shown to be irrational, unscientific, and a rational religion was declared to be a scientific impossibility. Then, too, we

were told that "the interests of the social organism and those of the individuals comprising it at any particular time are actually antagonistic; they can never be reconciled; they are inherently and essentially irreconcilable." We read the book, we studied it, and came to the conclusion that the statements in it were exaggerated and one-sided.

We took up the present volume with every desire to welcome whatsoever light we might receive from it on the Principles of Western Civilisation. We found in it the same characteristic tone and attitude of mind as we had found in the former volume, the same tendency to over-generalisation, the same neglect of essential principles, and the same love of paradox. We found, too, that there was little advance made on the principles of the former work. What advance is made we shall soon see. But the principles are those of *Social Evolution*, the illustrations of these principles are drawn from the same field of history, and the conclusions are of the same paradoxical kind.

The line of argument is of this kind. Evolution has taken possession of our minds, governs all our thinking, has upset all our old philosophies, and has obliged us to overhaul all our former ways and thoughts. Darwin has shown that life tends to increase in a geometrical ratio, "so that its numbers continually tend to press upon, and even to altogether outrun, the means of comfortable existence for the time being." On this principle Mr. Kidd lays stress; and a second principle elaborated by Mr. Darwin he takes with him: "That we find in all individuals a tendency to variation in all directions within small degrees, with the capacity for the transmission to offspring of the result."[1] From these two classes of facts there has been deduced the distinctive law of natural selection. Such was evolution as it left the hands of Mr. Darwin. But Mr. Kidd tells us that evolution has undergone a great development; since the time of Darwin, Weismann has spoken. Weismann has enabled Mr. Kidd to see that the future is predominant over the

[1] Page 34.

present. The vast majority of individuals interested in the struggle for existence is yet unborn.

We begin to see that in so ultimate and fundamental a matter as the average duration of life in the individual, the determining and controlling end, towards which Natural Selection has operated, must have been, not simply the benefit of the individual, nor even of his contemporaries, in a mere struggle for existence in the present, but a larger advantage, probably always far in the future, to which the individual and the present alike were subordinated. This extended view taken of the operation of the law of Natural Selection, and the consequent shifting into a region no longer bounded by the conception of advantage to existing individuals of the end towards which Natural Selection works, marks the departure we are considering.[1]

The discovery of Mr. Kidd, briefly put, is that efficiency in the future, or "projected efficiency," as he calls it, is the determining quality, and so the future controls the present. Transferring this principle of projected efficiency from the biological to the social sphere, and applying it there, he declares that he has found the key to the whole meaning of human history.

There are, according to Mr. Kidd, two epochs of social development. In the former of these the existing social organisation counted for everything. In the second, "society, with all its interests in the present, is subordinated to its own future." "Projected efficiency" is the secret of success and of progress. When this is absent stagnation is the result. In the city states of ancient Greece and in ancient Rome the present was omnipotent. Even the outlook of such a man as Marcus Aurelius was bounded by the present. Christianity widened the horizon of humanity, and led to the predominance of the future. "The visions of Christianity can never be closed within any limitations of the state or of political consciousness."

Mr. Kidd is lost in admiration of the greatness of the discovery he has made. To him it is the most astonishing, the

[1] Pages 48, 49.

greatest, the most overwhelming, the most illuminating that has ever been recorded in human speech. He pauses at every turn of the argument to impress on his readers the greatness of the thought he has unfolded. He almost exhausts his vocabulary of adjectives in his attempts to impress on the reader the greatness of the successive crises he describes. We began to count these historical crises, but they were so many that we gave up the attempt. We were much interested, also, in the almost superhuman pity bestowed by Mr. Kidd on the philosophers and men of science who are still in the bondage of the present. It is sublime. Such men as Bentham, Austin, James Mill, Malthus, Ricardo, Grote, and John Stuart Mill were good men in their day; but they had not arrived at the freedom of the future, nor discerned its social significance.

As the evolutionist, with the conception in his mind of human society as involved in the sweep of an antinomy, in which he sees all the tendencies of human development tending to be more and more directly governed by the meaning of a process in which the present is being subordinated to the future, rises from the study of Mill's writings, the superficiality of the whole system of ideas represented profoundly impresses his mind.[1]

Such is a specimen of the treatment awarded to past thinkers, who, on any view, deserved well of mankind. As for Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. Kidd is very sorry that Mr. Spencer began his work before the work of evolution arrived at the Kidd stage.

As we follow Mr. Spencer through the successive stages of his theory of social development, we see how he conceives human progress to be controlled in all its features by one fact, namely, the relation of the past to the present in a struggle in which the interests in the present are becoming the ascendant factor in our social evolution. Of that deeper conception of human progress as an integrating social process, of which all the principles are in the last resort controlled by the fact that the present is in reality not so much related to the past as passing

[1] Page 77.

out under the control of the future, there is to be distinguished no grasp in Mr. Spencer's writings.[1]

We are not concerned to explain Mr. Spencer's meaning, but we are persuaded that he would repudiate the statement of Mr. Kidd. Mr. Spencer has his own vision of the future, but he regards it as the outcome of all the evolution of the past. What he would think of Mr. Kidd we may gather from the reference to him which occurs in one of Spencer's latest works, his controversy with Weismann. The reference is to *Social Evolution*:

The work of Mr. Benjamin Kidd on Social Evolution, which has been so much lauded, takes Weismannism as one of its data; and if Weismannism be untrue, the conclusions Mr. Kidd draws must be in large measure erroneous, and may prove mischievous.[2]

Weismannism is still one of the main data of Mr. Kidd, and Weismannism is far from having obtained the acceptance of competent biologists. Weismann believes in the all-sufficiency of natural selection. Natural selection is to him the only factor of organic evolution. Mr. Kidd accepts this position and builds on it. If there is any other factor, his main conclusions are invalidated. Mr. Darwin thus writes in the last edition of *The Origin of Species*:

Species have been modified during a long course of descent. This has been effected chiefly through the natural selection of numerous successive, slight, favourable variations; aided in an important manner by the inherited effects of the use and disuse of parts; and in an unimportant manner, that is in relation to adaptive structures, whether past or present, by the direct action of external conditions and by variations which seem to us in our ignorance to arise spontaneously. It appears that I formerly underrated the frequency and value of these latter forms of variation, as leading to permanent modifications of structure independently of natural selection.[3]

---

[1] Page 83.

[2] *Principles of Biology*, Revised Edition, p. 690.

[3] *The Origin of Species*, p. 657.

Thus Mr. Darwin believed that natural selection was not the only factor in organic evolution. Nor does Mr. Russel Wallace believe that natural selection can account for all the phenomena of life:

At length, however, there came into existence a being in whom that subtle force we term mind became of greater importance than his mere bodily structure. Though with a naked and unprotected body, this gave him clothing against the varying inclemencies of the seasons. Though unable to compete with the deer in swiftness, or with the wild bull in strength, this gave him weapons with which to capture or overcome both. Though less capable than most other animals of living on the herbs and fruits that unaided nature supplies, this wonderful faculty taught him to govern and direct nature to his own benefit, and make her produce food for him when and where he pleased. From the moment when the first skin was used as a covering, when the first rude spear was formed to assist in the chase, when fire was first used to cook his food, when the first seed was sown or shoot planted, a grand revolution was effected in nature, a revolution which in all the previous ages of the world earth's history had no parallel, for a being had arisen who was no longer necessarily subject to change with the changing universe—a being who was in some measure superior to nature, inasmuch as he knew how to control and regulate her action and keep himself in harmony with her, not by a change of body, but by an advance of mind.[1]

Still further Mr. Wallace says:

Man has not only escaped "natural selection himself," but he is actually able to take away some of that power from nature which before his appearance she universally exercised.[2]

Mr. Spencer writes formally on "The Inadequacy of Natural Selection." We have not space to quote, but it seems to us that in some respects he has the best of the argument. Nor have we space to refer to the distinguished men who protest against the view that natural selection is all sufficient. Eimer has written against that view; Oscar

[1] *Natural Selection*, p. 325. [2] Page 326.

Hertwig tells us that evolution is due not to one, but to many factors; Professors Geddes and Arthur Thomson have written in *Chambers' Encyclopædia*, and in many independent works, strenuously against the adequacy of natural selection; and, in short, the biological world is divided in opinion about the theory of Weismann. Many writers of eminence in America, Germany, and in our land contend that there are many factors to be taken into account in dealing with evolution.

We do not enter into the controversy. But we do say that it is not well that Mr. Kidd should take for granted that natural selection is the only factor in the process of evolution. He has ignored the dissent from Weismannism. He has not discussed the question. He simply accepts Weismannism as proven. He has added nothing to the argument. He regards with pity all those who do not accept Weismannism. Nor has he looked at the enormous difference that, on any view, must separate human from pre-human evolution. He takes no notice of the difference between a rational being and an irrational, one aspect of which difference is set forth in the above quotation from Mr. Russel Wallace. This difference might be set forth at length. Mr. Kidd has not seen that as he advances from biological evolution to human evolution he has changed the elements of the conception which he calls by the name of natural selection. Natural selection is one thing as applied to the lower animals, it is another thing in its application to a rational being. With man ideals count. He is a determining element in his own evolution. This is altogether overlooked by Mr. Kidd. In truth, he has here fallen back on what Professor James calls "the enormous emptiness of an abstract proposition." This, however, is consistent with his usual practice. Another statement by Professor James is so relevant here that we feel we must quote it:

> The plain truth is that the "philosophy" of evolution (as distinguished from our special information about particular cases of change) is a metaphysical creed and nothing else. It

is a mood of contemplation, an emotional attitude, rather than a system of thought,—a mood which is as old as the world, and which no refutation of any incarnation of it will dispel; the mood of fatalistic pantheism, with its intuition of the One and All, which was and is and ever shall be.[1]

"A mood of contemplation, an emotional attitude"—how often these words occurred to us as we read Mr. Kidd's book. They occurred with particular vehemence as we read his description of the efficiency of natural selection. The growth and perfecting of life cannot be understood from the action of natural selection alone. We might as well trace the variety and beauty of the world to the action of gravitation. Life in its development and perfecting is a response to many influences, and its history can only be understood by the discovery of the many factors, internal and external, through whose co-operation its wondrous fabric has been elaborated. The problem of life cannot be solved by the action of a single formula. Here, as elsewhere, the saying of Bishop Butler applies, "abstract notions can do nothing."

We notice that Mr. Kidd is very fond of the practice of placing two aspects of a complex whole in opposition to one another, till nothing is left save the bare abstract opposition. Alice was amazed when the Cheshire cat disappeared all save the grin. A grin without a cat was amazing. Abstract opposition is quite as wonderful. We recall how he made an abstraction of the individual and an abstraction of the social organism, till they both disappeared in the irreconcilable opposition of their respective interests. A similar abstraction, or set of abstractions, meets us in the present volume. The present and the future are now presented to us in their most abstract form, and, of course, then they are in opposition to one another. The "ascendency of the present" is a frequent phrase, and "projected efficiency" is the great watchword of the new system of evolution. We have tried to put Mr. Kidd's meaning in a concrete form, and we have failed.

[1] *The Will to Believe*, p. 253.

The present has a concrete meaning only when we include in it all the people living at the moment when we speak. But these people range from the man of a hundred years to the infant of a day. The present has in it people whose work is done, whose work is doing, and whose work has not begun. That is to say, the smallest section of the present has in it the past and the future. To break up a continuous process, to isolate, and abstract sections of it and place them in contradiction to each other, is not a fruitful proceeding. For one cannot isolate a portion of time and keep it by itself. But this is Mr. Kidd's way. In *Social Evolution* he had done this on a large scale, and the process is repeated here. In no age can we have what we call the ascendant present. For as a matter of fact the individuals living at any particular time must have different attitudes towards life and its possibilities. The interest of some are in the past, of some in the present, and of others in the future. All these different attitudes are slumped together under the confusing phrase of "the ascendant present." There is no clearness of description or of definition of what Mr. Kidd calls "projected efficiency." It is vast, vague, and indefinite, and we can form no clear conception of his meaning. But this opposition of the present and the future is of the essence of his theory, and if it is left unclear his work must be a failure.

It is only fair to let Mr. Kidd state the problem as it presents itself to him. We give the statement as he gives it, in all the dignity of italics:

In the first epoch of social development the characteristic and ruling feature is the supremacy of the causes which are contributing to social efficiency by subordinating the individual merely to the existing political organisation.[1]

This is called, also, the ascendency of the present. Mr. Kidd states the problem again and again, he sets it forth from various points of view, he complains that philosophy and social science have not recognised that they are under

[1] Page 140.

the ascendency of the present. To quote one statement out of many:

That deep-lying assumption, which may be distinguished beneath the surface in all the crises of political life in the modern world, and which, in that world, has slowly undermined the foundations of an earlier order of society—namely, the assumption that in the last resort we have a duty, not only to our fellow-creatures, but to principles which transcend all the purposes for which our own lives and the life of the political state exists—was unknown in the ancient world. No sense of responsibility to principles transcending the meaning of the state had as yet projected the controlling aims of human consciousness out of the ascendant present.[1]

When we ask what precisely is the meaning of the ascendant present, we are mystified by such phrases as the "political consciousness," "the organisation of interests included within the limits of political consciousness," "the limits of the consciousness of the state," and so on. Nor is there the slightest hint that in these phrases consciousness is used in a sense more or less metaphorical. A political consciousness is a metaphor, and can only mislead when used as Mr. Kidd uses it.

Earnestly striving to understand the meaning of the phrase "the ascendency of the present," we sought for light in all the places where the phrase is used in the book. Most frequently we found the phrase interpreted by the other phrase, "the subordination of the individual to existing society." In one or other of these phrases Mr. Kidd sums up the meaning of all ancient civilisations, while the civilisation that is to be is described as follows:

In the second epoch of the evolution of human society we begin to be concerned with the rise to ascendency of the ruling causes, which contribute to a higher type of social efficiency by subordinating society itself with all its interests in the present to its own future.[2]

Leaving the question of the ascendency of the future for the moment, let us look at the two descriptions of the

[1] Pages 191, 192. [2] Page 142.

ascendency of the present. The subordination of the individual society is called the ascendency of the present. Supposing that the individual was in ancient civilisations subordinated to society, it by no means follows that he was in bondage to the ascendant present. In so far as he subordinated himself to the state, he was identifying himself with the interests of an entity that had a past, a present, and a future. It is characteristic of man that he looks before and after, and even when the individual was in most abject subjection to the tribe, or to the city, or to the state, he never could be indifferent to the consequences of his own actions. We are unable to draw the boundaries of the ascendant present, and we do not obtain any help from Mr. Kidd in this indispensable task. Shall we draw it at the point where man began to live a year beforehand, as he did when he began to sow and reap and gather into barns? Shall we draw it at the point when men began deliberately to train and educate their children, and fit them for the battle of life? Shall we draw the line at the time when leaders of the people began to plan for the future of the state, and to look forward to a triumphant career for their children and grandchildren in the years to come? In truth, we have found as much difficulty in attaching a meaning to the ascendant present as we formerly found in isolating the present from the past and the future. It seems to us that as soon as an individual identifies himself with a society, and frankly subordinates himself and his interests to its interests, he has transcended the ascendant present in any rational sense of the term.

As we read and ponder the contention of Mr. Kidd in these two volumes, *Social Evolution* and the *Principles of Western Civilisation*, and note the arguments and illustrations he uses, we are slowly driven to the conclusion that he has mistaken the whole drift of evolution, and has neglected some of the most important elements of social evolution and Western civilisation. As we read the story of the unfolding of life, as that story is told us by those who know, we are struck with the fact that life

manifests in its earliest stages those principles and phenomena which Mr. Kidd seeks to impress on us as the latest outcome of the highest civilisation. If we read the story of life backwards, the farther back we go the more thorough and complete is the subordination of the individual to the species, and the more complete is the subordination of those living at any time to those who are about to live. Mr. Kidd's ideal seems to have been realised in that far-off time when the individual withered and the race was all in all. It might have been expected that something like this would be the outcome, from the drastic way in which he sought to apply a mere biological method to the study of social phenomena. We find no fault with biology and its methods, any more than we find fault with physics and chemistry and their methods; they are good for biology, physics, and chemistry; but the ways of life of rational beings can only be understood on the assumption that rationality counts for something in the process of evolution. The study of biology can lead us to the belief that the individual is of value only as a means for the preservation and advantage of the race, and, to use Mr. Kidd's abstractions, the present is of value and advantage only as a step towards the future. But this conclusion is stringent only when we limit our view to the first stages of life, and holds absolutely only of unicellular life. As soon as we come to the study of multicellular life, then the saying of Schelling holds true, "Life is the tendency to individuation." Mr. Spencer points out:

On contemplating the various grades of organisms in their ascending order, we find them more and more distinguished from their inanimate media, in structure, in form, in chemical composition, in specific gravity, in temperature, in self-mobility. . . . Thus we may say that the development of an individual organism is at the same time a differentiation of its parts from each other, and a differentiation of the consolidated whole from the environment; and that in the last respect, there is a general analogy between the progression of an individual organism and the progression from the lowest orders of organisms to the highest orders. . . . Life is the tendency to individuation. For

evidently, in becoming more distinct from one another and from their environment, organisms acquire more marked individualities.[1]

We quote these statements because we believe that they have won the approval of most biologists, and we have not space for many quotations. As we rise in the scale of animated being, the higher we rise the more marked is the tendency to individuation, and the greater is the value of the individual. But no one would ever discover this from the pages of Mr. Kidd. He finds that the individual is always subordinate, and his book is thus very one-sided even from the biological point of view.

At first and for a long time the individual life was possessed of value, because it was necessary for the preservation of the species. The species must be maintained and made perfect, and the way prepared for still higher species; and this end must be attained however numerous may be the individuals sacrificed. Among the lowest organisms the struggle is for the success of the species. This is a commonplace of biology. In unicellular being there is scarcely any individuation, and Weismann could plausibly contend that they were immortal. In the next higher reaches of life myriads of individuals perish that the species may be preserved. Many exist just long enough to exercise the function of reproduction, and die of the effort to reproduce their kind. Cases of this kind are so numerous that we need not instance them. Here the principle of Mr. Kidd seems true and adequate; here, but nowhere else.

The condition under which development has proceeded in life through measureless epochs of time has been, in short, a condition in which the shadow of the future has continually rested upon the present, growing and deepening as the upward process has continued. In the course of this process we must consider that it has never been the welfare of the infinitesimal number of individuals at any time existing which constitutes

[1] *Principles of Biology*, Vol. I., pp. 175, 176, 177, 178, Edition 1898.

the end towards which Natural Selection may be regarded as working. It is always the advantage of the incomparably larger number of individuals yet to come towards which the whole process moves.[1]

This is true of the periods during which the species, not the individual, was the first care of nature. Mr. Kidd, however, takes his principle from the time when the individual counted for little, and nature seemed to care only for life in general. But the process of evolution is a process towards individuation, and when evolution arrived at a certain stage the individual came to have a value in himself. We may refer here to the instructive chapters in Mr. Spencer's *Principles of Biology* on antagonism between maintenance of the individual and propagation of the species. He points out that individuation and genesis are necessarily antagonistic:

Grouping under the word "individuation" all processes by which individual life is completed and maintained, and enlarging the meaning of the word "genesis" to include all processes aiding the formation and perfecting of new individuals, we see that the two are fundamentally opposed. Assuming other things to remain the same, assuming that environing conditions as to climate, food, enemies, etc., continue constant; then, inevitably, every higher degree of individual evolution is followed by a lower degree of race-multiplication, and *vice versâ*. Progress in bulk, complexity, or activity involves retrogress in fertility; and progress in fertility involves retrogress in bulk, complexity, or activity.[2]

Are we to assume that the principles of evolution which were dominant in the lower spheres of life, where the individual was only a link in the chain of life, are to rule in that sphere in which individuals seem to have a value in themselves? So Mr. Kidd says. We venture to doubt and, on reflection, firmly to deny. What rules before the coming of the individual, may be transformed to something higher and better after the arrival of the individual.

---

[1] *Western Civilisation*, p. 63.

[2] *Principles of Biology*, Vol. II., pp. 409, 410.

We cannot quite endorse the statement of Mr. Spencer that "individuation and genesis are necessarily antagonistic." It has too strong a family resemblance to the statement of Mr. Kidd, "that the interests of the individual and the interests of the society are irreconcilable," to be accepted by a reasonable man. In truth, individuation and genesis, the individual and society, are related elements in a complex whole, and cease to have a meaning when taken in abstraction. We may state them abstractly; if we choose, we may isolate them, and press them each against the other; but if we do, we run the risk of talking nonsense. We may also state the course of evolution from an abstract point of view. We may say that the course of evolution is towards the subordination of the individual to the species, and the statement may have a certain justification; or we may say that the process of evolution is towards the coming of the individual, and this has a larger measure of truth than the other. But both statements are partial and one-sided, taken by themselves, and to describe evolution with any adequacy we must describe it from both points of view. Mr. Kidd ignores the tendency to individuation.

There is manifestly in the highest reaches of life a higher value attached to the individual. He is something and does something which may be expressed in terms which do not belong to the value of the general life. But when we come to the plane of personal life we reach a sphere where the value of the individual attains a worth which refuses any save a statement of it in terms of continued personal life and worth. We are thus led to consider the argument of Mr. Kidd in the light of the illustrations of it he draws from history. We consider this to be the most interesting, stimulating, and instructive part of his book. He looks at the history of Western civilisation from a fresh point of view, and he is able to startle and surprise us in many ways. It is well to be startled and surprised, and made to think; and certainly we do find abundant occasion for thought. Looking for illustrations of his thesis of the subordination of the individual to society, and of the subordination of the present

to the future, we need not say that he is able to find them. But he would have found them in larger and more decisive measure in Eastern civilisation, for there is no more conspicuous instance anywhere of the subordination of the individual to society than is found in the Indian caste system. It took a long time before evolution could make an individual of independent value, and even after rational beings appeared it took a long time before the individual could look at himself and his work from a personal point of view. Man was a member of the tribe, of the clan, of the community, and of the city, and he was of value only as a member of the whole. The process of evolution as it went on in the world prior to the advent of man is paralleled by the process of human evolution. The individual in all his thinking, feeling, acting, politically, religiously, ethically is one of the tribe, and apparently never thinks of himself as of independent value. Even among the Hebrews individual responsibility and consequent worth were not discovered till the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. And generally in the ancient world the worth of the individual was an unappreciated truth. There are partial recognitions of the abiding worth of personality among the Greeks and Romans. No one can read the Ethics of Aristotle, and more especially his descriptions of courage, friendship, and of the virtues generally, without recognising that Aristotle has set forth principles which transcended the narrow limits of citizen life within the city state, principles which can only find their application on the recognition of the transcendent value of the personal life. While we think that many statements of Mr. Kidd in this reference require modification, yet on the whole we may let them pass, as the required modifications would take more space than we can afford. But one thing we must say, and it is this, that the process of ancient history may be so far described as a process of the emancipation of the individual, and students of Greek history in particular need not be reminded of that. What is the life, teaching, and death of Socrates but a protest against the tendency to bind the individual in the chains of ancestral custom?

In the closing sentences of the chapter, "The Present and the Future," Mr. Kidd grandly says:

Through unmeasured epochs of time there has come down to us the sound of that struggle, still with us, in which the individual and all his powers and interests are being broken to the ends of a social efficiency visibly and consciously embodied in the state. But now into the vortex of a vaster struggle, a struggle in which the interests of society itself are destined to be broken to the ends of an efficiency beyond the farthest limits of its political consciousness, we are about to witness being slowly drawn, all the phenomena of Western thought and of Western action; all the content of politics, of philosophy, and of religion in our Western world.[1]

Those chapters in which he sets forth the facts and tendencies of European history, which seem to him to prove his thesis, are of supreme interest. We pass rapidly through all the great periods of Western history, from the rise of Christianity to the present hour, and we are ever reminded of the preparation of the Western peoples for the efficiency of the future. Stress is laid by Mr. Kidd on the meaning of Christianity, on the significance of the Holy Roman Empire, on the Reformation, and on the great emancipation movement at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. In a bold, graphic, and original way he sets forth what he believes to be the real evolutionary meaning of these periods. Whether we accept his view or not, we are certainly indebted to him for the vigour and the grandeur of his work, and for the extraordinary suggestiveness of his thought. We say this emphatically, because we question the truth of his main contention. As our space is limited we confine our remarks to one or two of his illustrations.

Speaking of Christianity and its growth, Mr. Kidd says:

It may be noticed on every hand in the inner life of the new movement during the first centuries of its history, how great is the interval which has begun to separate us from the standards of the ancient civilisations. We see that not only has human con-

[1] Page 238.

sciousness become related to principles which transcend all the existing interests of the individual and all the recognised aims of the state; but that the conception which underlay the whole fabric of the religious, ethical, and political life of the ancient civilisations, namely, that of an equilibrium between the conditions of virtue and the unrestrained expression in the present of human nature, is no longer recognised. Nay, more, it is significant to note that it is this latter conception which is intuitively singled out for special condemnation. It is the doctrine, directly contrary to it, of the entire insufficiency of the individual in respect of his own nature to fulfil the standards required of him by any merit, however transcendent, which becomes visible as the central and fundamental principle of the movement now in progress in the world.[1]

This is the principle which Mr. Kidd finds predominant in the early Church:

> Once more we have the emphatic assertion of the antithesis in its most inflexible terms, in the doctrine of the entire insufficiency of the individual in respect of his own powers to rise to the standard required of him, or to fulfil, in virtue of his own nature, the conditions held to be necessary to his salvation.[2]

We may accept these statements, and feel that Mr. Kidd has done service in his emphatic recognition of them. We need not accept the inference he draws from them, that they are steps in the process of the subordination of the individual to society, and of the present to the future. The utter insufficiency of the individual to rise to the standard required of him is a testimony to the raising of the standard. But Mr. Kidd forgets to state the other side of the Christian belief, namely, that however high the standard of life may be placed, and however great may be the inability of man, considered in himself, to reach it, yet it may be reached. Christian hope looks forward to the perfecting of the individual in the kingdom of God. The doctrine of the insufficiency of man to work out his own salvation is the other side of the doctrine that by the grace of God he can attain to the conditions necessary for holiness and salvation.

[1] Pages 217, 218. [2] Page 222.

No doubt the present is subordinated to the future, but the conception of the future in the pages of Mr. Kidd is altogether different from that embodied in the Christian hope. The future with him is a future altogether on this side, a future in which the individual of any given time can have no personal share, a future limited by the lifetime of the sun and the duration of the present cosmos; the future of Christianity, while inclusive of that set forth by Mr. Kidd, is a future on the other side, in which the individual will have his share, and a future which shall have no end: not mere social efficiency, but a life in which all the gains of time will be conserved, and in which the cost of evolution will be seen to be justified.

This side of religion is altogether neglected by Mr. Kidd. To him it is merely an irrational something by which the individual is constrained to subordinate his own interests to those of a larger whole. He has declared that a rational religion is an impossibility; and as for the poor individual, he has no rational sanction for conduct. On the contrary, we contend that religion is as much egoistic as altruistic, and has as much regard to the individual as to the whole. Christianity appeals both to self-love and to the love of one's neighbour.

The love of thyself is as legitimate as the love of thy neighbour. Only, however, when it is of the same kind. The second commandment is like unto the first and great commandment, in that it enjoins only pure, true love. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind." To Him who is Absolute Truth, Perfect Goodness, Infinite Holy Love, thou shalt give an unrestrained, unlimited, unswerving, true, pure, and holy love. And thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But how, then, mayest thou love either thy neighbour or thyself? Only with a love which is true love; which seeks thy own true good and his; which aims always at what will ennoble, never at what will debase thee or him; which prefers both for thyself and for thy neighbour the pain and the poverty which discipline and purify the spirit to the pleasure and prosperity that seduce and corrupt it; which does not forget at any time to ask both as regards thyself and thy neighbour, What

is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man gain in exchange for his soul? and which, in a word, in no way withdraws thee from, or diminishes in thee, the love thou owest to God, but is itself a form and manifestation of that love. From God all true love comes, and in Him all true love lives. True love of self is as essentially in harmony with love to God as with love to man.[1]

The Christian view transcends the antinomy on which Mr. Kidd lays so much stress. It does not suppress the individual, nor destroy his faculties; it consecrates them to the service of God and man. Christian people, no doubt, have made mistakes. They may have practised an unchristian asceticism, may have misconstrued the Christian ideal; but even their mistakes prove how vital is that element in human motive that springs from an enlightened self-regard. Believing in the eternal worth of personality, Christianity will not suppress the individual, nor look on him as only an instrument for present or projected social efficiency, but will cherish him, strengthen him, fit him for a life of eternal service in the kingdom of God, in which he will have his own place, a place which no one else can fill, his own work, a work which no one else can do. It was the neglect of this side of Christianity and of moral life in general which led Mr. Kidd to the supposition of an irrational religion, and to the impossibility of finding, for the individual, a rational basis of conduct. As regards this result we might recommend Mr. Kidd to look at the position set forth in the following extract from his own work, in its bearing on the apparent antagonism between the individual and society, and between the past and the future:

On looking back over the remarkable position which has so far resulted from the first contact in Western history of the human mind with the concept that what it has come to know as its spiritual welfare is of more importance than temporal interests, we see now that there is only one way in which the controlling principles of the religious consciousness can be ultimately projected beyond the content of all systems of authority

[1] Dr. Flint's *Socialism*, pp. 366, 367, 368.

whatever in which the ascendant present has thitherto been able to imprison the human spirit. The Western mind, we begin to realise, is destined, sooner or later, to rise to a conception of the nature of truth itself different from any that has hitherto prevailed in the world. It must conceive truth at last, we perceive, as being capable of being correctly presented in the human process in history, only as we see it presented in all forms of developing life; namely, as the net resultant of forces which are in themselves apparently opposed and conflicting.[1]

If Mr. Kidd had thought of truth in this light before he wrote the book on *Social Evolution*, a great part of it would have never been written. Yet how inadequate is his attempted statement of the organic character of truth. He states it as he might state the parallelogram of forces. But the conception of truth cannot be stated in that mechanical way. We owe it to Hegel and his followers that we are able to think of truth as organic, of opposites harmonized in a higher unity; of truth as being not abstract, but concrete; as not a net resultant, but as the differentiation of unity and the integration of differences. Hegelians would never have stated the conception of truth as Mr. Kidd has stated it. But even the imperfect statement of it is sufficient to condemn a large proportion of his work.

In this, as in his former work, Mr. Kidd is of opinion "that there is not, and there never can be, any purely intellectual sanction for the submission of the individual to a world-process in which he has absolutely no interest," and he still thinks of religion as affording a sanction which never could be derived from the intellect. Even the principle can only be held as an ultimate conviction of the religious consciousness. Will not the "emancipated intellect," instructed by Mr. Kidd, come to see that its own interest is bound up with the interests of the future? Surely when instructed by Mr. Kidd it will intentionally strive towards the ideal sketched by him:

The ideal toward which they are carrying the world is that of a fair, open, and free rivalry of all the forces within the social

[1] Page 309.

consciousness—a rivalry in which the best organisations, the best methods, the best skill, the best abilities, the best government, and the best standards of action and belief, shall have the right of universal opportunity.[1]

What has been the aim of Mr. Kidd in the elaboration of this ideal? Is it to emancipate our intellects, and to persuade us to help consciously towards its realisation? But what is the use of it all, if there is no rational sanction for the conduct demanded from us by the great evolutionary process? We are afraid that in the free competition, so free and strenuous as to dwarf all former competitions, depicted by Mr. Kidd as the ideal of the future, a form of conduct which has no rational sanction, and a form of religion which admits of no rational justification, will not survive. Seriously we object to the handing over to irrationality of so large a sphere of human conduct. It is, however, another outcome of the application of biology to the explanation of human life and conduct. Biologically, moral beliefs are the result of habits and traditions that have grown up independently of the operations of human reason, and are beyond the scope of logical tests. It is merely a mode of adaptation to environment, and conformity to the social tradition and habit need not bring us any nearer to the rational meaning of life. We cannot argue the question here, but we may say that habit and tradition are themselves the outcome of reason. From the time of Aristotle it has been seen that moral action is already the implicit recognition of moral truth. "He that doeth the will of God will know of the doctrine," is the saying of a greater than Aristotle.

It seems to us that the initial fallacy of Mr. Kidd's whole procedure lies in the assumption he makes that the individual is unsocial. Out of that flows the view that reason is a mere individual quality, the function of which is to look after the interests of the individual. But society exists as a fact, and some explanation of it must be given. So Mr. Kidd has to invent some means by which individuals, who are

[1] Page 387.

represented in their naked individuality as antagonistic to society, must be broken to the uses of society. Religion is the means to this end. It reminds one of the individualism of former days, and the artificial social contract by which the lost harmony must be restored. It is an artificial procedure all through, for the social feelings are as natural as those which tend towards self. Society is the medium in which the individual lives materially, intellectually, and morally. There are no personal duties wholly without social references. The individual of the works before us is a pure abstraction. While, however, the individual man exists in and by society, it does not follow that he is to the society as the cells are to the body. For man is a person, a free and moral being; a being, that is to say, whose end and law are in himself, and who can never be treated as a mere means, either for the accomplishment of the will of a higher or for the advantage of society, without the perpetration of moral wrong, without desecrating the most sacred of all things on earth—the personality of a man. With reference to the ultimate end of life, man is not made for society, but society for man. Here we touch the great difference between ancient and modern ethics; and when we mention personality we have substituted the idea of individuals to whom social union stands as means to an end, for the idea of individuals the end and purpose of whose being was a highly organised form of social life. In other words, Mr. Kidd has again set back the clock of time, and has come to nothing more advanced than a wider form of the essential idea of Greek ethics. To subordinate the individual to society, and the present to the future, would be to throw away all the gain won by the toil and travail of men during the eventful centuries of Christian time. What is to become of the hopes, the aspirations, the dreams of perfection, which men have fondly hoped for, if their only outcome is the ideal depicted by Mr. Kidd of universal strain, and endless competition, and universal fitness to compete? What of the hope that one would be able in the eternity to come to realise himself in all the completeness of his personality?

There is no room for ideals, either personal or social, on the scheme of Mr. Kidd. Earthly society can never be an adequate end for man. Projected efficiency, however far thrown forward, is only finite after all, and we have learned through Christianity to demand eternity for our reasonable satisfaction. When we have grasped in any degree the Christian ideal, society as it is, or as it can be under conditions of time and imperfection, can only be external and mechanical. Each of us is more than the society that unites us, because there is in each of us the longing for a perfection which that society can never realise. When a man once has a vision of perfection, he will find no satisfactory end short of perfection.

Further discussion on this line would lead us into more fundamental questions than we can handle now. There is the question of the individual and social values, and their relation to one another. There is the view of Mr. Bradley, that ethical valuation is a function of personality alone; and the fact that all the sciences, even ethics, neglect personality. But any system that deals with the whole man must recognise those values which can only be expressed in terms of personality. But the question is too large to be treated in a paragraph.

As to the question of religion and its function, it might be argued on the part of Mr. Kidd that he has a right to limit his treatment of religion to its effect on society alone, and that he has a right to abstract from the bearing of it on the individual, his fears, hopes, and aspirations. But such an abstraction would be illegitimate; for everything that exalts the personality, and every view that recognises its eternal worth, has a manifest social effect. If life and immortality have been brought to light, this fact has a meaning not for the individual alone, and its influence must be felt in the promotion of social efficiency in the present and the future. It will need, however, a larger and more adequate formula than that which has been expounded in the books of Mr. Kidd.

JAMES IVERACH.

THE LAST LETTERS OF JOHN HUS.

Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus, vitam, doctrinam causam, in Constantiensi Concilio actam, Illustrantia, quae partim adhuc inedita, partim mendose vulgata, Edidit FRANCISCUS PALACKY. Regni Bohemiae Historiographus. (Prague. 1869.)

Historia et Monumenta Joannis Hus et Hieronymi Pragensis. Two Volumes. Folio. (Nuremberg. 1558. Also, with different pagination, 1715.)

I.

AMONG the lost arts of the twentieth century Macaulay's New Zealander will probably reckon the writing of letters. Leisure, dear old inefficient Leisure, who delighted in correspondence—such budgets too !—has been killed by the telegram, the postcard, and the rush of life, or drags out a precarious existence among the spinsters of a cathedral close. How much the next generation will lose can only be realised by those who remember the part that letters have played in the literature of the past. The correspondence of Cowper will outlive his poems. The letters of Gray are worthy of comparison with his Elegy itself. The place of Byron as a poet is still a matter of dispute ; his supremacy as a correspondent is beyond cavil. Others might be named, to confine ourselves to England, whose letters form the highest art, and give perpetual pleasure.

From the standpoint of history letters often give us the truest insight into the real character of the actors on the stage of life. Blue-Books, Rolls of Parliament, Speeches, and Transactions supply only the material of history. The constructing a living record from these alone is the making of bricks without straw. For the indispensable cement of life we must look elsewhere. The best illustration of this will

always be the life of one of the greatest masters of correspondence the world has known. How little we should know of the real Cicero if we were dependent on his speeches. But through his letters, now accessible to all in first-class English translations, the man and his age so live before us that we really discern his character more clearly than we can that of Beaconsfield or Gladstone. But we need not go to Rome for illustrations. How imperfect would be our knowledge of Cromwell, we do not say of the historical events of his life, but of the character of the man, if we had not the help of his rugged, terse, but living letters, so often overflowing with a sympathy and tenderness that otherwise we should never have suspected.

In cases not a few the lack of all correspondence has led to historical indistinctness. A good illustration is Wyclif. Unfortunately not a single letter of the great schoolman has survived, and only one or two very doubtful anecdotes. For our knowledge of Wyclif we are absolutely dependent on his formal writings and the political records of his age. The result is fatal. Despite fifty years of research the judgment of Shirley remains true: "On most of us the dim image of Wyclif looks down like the portrait of the first of a long line of kings, without personality or expression—he is the first of the reformers," the author of endless writings that are caviare to more than the general. Of the man himself, apart from his work, we know little or nothing. How different is the case with Anselm, Bernard, Luther, or Wesley. In intellect Wyclif was in no respect beneath them, in energy their equal; but the complete absence of all personal elements in our knowledge of the great iconoclast makes us feel, perhaps unjustly, his inferiority to them. We sigh for the rapture that draws us to St. Bernard, the heart that makes us feel our kinship with Luther and Wesley.

Our mention of these saints leads us to linger over the illustration they give of the importance of letters. Of the four men, the letters of Anselm, historically speaking, are the

least valuable. But what a perfect reflection they give of his character. No man ever lived who played so great a part on the stage of events who was yet so completely a mystic dreamer indifferent to, even unconscious of, the events that took place around him. Anselm emphatically was not of this world. Over four hundred of his letters have been preserved. On every page we feel the tenderness and spiritual power of the poet dreamer whose soul was as pure as the snows of his own Alps. But of interest in the world around him not a trace. Of the great conflict of Hildebrand with the empire, of the wild struggle on Christmas Eve in the crypt of St. Maria Maggiore, when the greatest of the popes was dragged by the hair of his head by hired assassins across the silent city to the dungeon of the conspirators, of that memorable humiliation of the heir of all the Cæsars in the snow outside Canossa, of William's conquest of England, not a word.

It is otherwise with the letters of Bernard. Without his correspondence we should never have understood the extraordinary hold of this mystic ascetic upon the heart and conscience of Europe. The secret is revealed when we turn to his letters. His correspondence is incredible. Everybody writes to him, and he writes to everybody. His letters range in subject from the most spiritual matters, through all the tangled diplomacy of Church and State, down to the stealing of pigs. But whatever the subject he is the same Bernard, that unique combination of mystic and man of affairs who was both an uncrowned pope and a supreme saint. One other matter we may notice. Whatever the subject, Bernard's rhetoric never fails him. Sometimes it oppresses us by its exaggeration; more often it sweeps us along, despite the lapse of centuries, with the rush and life which made him the dictator of his age.

The contrast of the correspondence of Luther and Bernard is typical of the contrast between the men themselves. Instead of the rhetoric of the mystic we find power and bluntness, always fervent, oftentimes violent. Luther's words are half battles; but his courage is not more conspicuous

than his tenderness and simplicity. Above all, we feel as we read how intensely human was this prophet of the Reformation; almost too human at times it may appear to some. For Luther and not Goethe is the real hero and type of the latter-day Fatherland. Bismarck and Luther, as may be seen in their Table-Talk and letters, are made of the same clay.

In the case of Wesley the human element, which alone gives permanence and distinctness, is chiefly supplied by his incomparable *Journals*. These have already taken their place as one of the great classics of our language. To the student of the eighteenth century they are an invaluable living document; to his sons in the gospel a perfect photograph. But of the *Journals* we need say no more. The English world is awaiting with expectation the new edition of its great legacy which the Methodist Church is preparing.

We have lingered on this matter of the importance of correspondence in historical study for a special reason. In ecclesiastical history it is above all things needful that the historian should make his readers feel the communion of saints. For the history of the Church is not the dull record of strife, decay, and evolution. Rather it should be a means of grace, the emphasis not so much of the things wherein we differ or have erred, as of that essential oneness of all good men in whatsoever things are lovely and of good report. In the history of the Church the human element, which in this case is the divine element, must not be pushed on one side by matters merely ecclesiastical or theological. We need to make these dry bones live. We must widen our narrow spiritual outlook by taking part in the great experience meeting, if we may so speak, of all the ages. In these days of the decay of experiental religion—the word is ugly, but will indicate our meaning—we plead for a revival of spiritual biography, a *Plutarch's Lives of the Church*, a *New Acts of the Apostles*, a *Continuation of the Eleventh of Hebrews*, a series of studies in the soul history of the great saints. Such studies Nonconformity cannot surrender, as alas she is doing at present, to other Churches, except at her peril. The study of the experience of the saints of God must

ever remain a mighty factor in a strong present-day faith. Such study, however, is of little value unless based upon an intelligent knowledge of environment, unless accompanied, that is, by an accurate, scientific study of Church history.

In the case of Wyclif this soul history, as we have seen, is for ever impossible. Fate has dealt more mercifully with the greatest of his sons. Eighty-six letters of Hus have survived the ravages of time, the preservation of which we owe for the most part to the care of Peter Mladenowic, the secretary of Hus's friend and protector, the noble John of Chlum.[1] On November 9, 1536, four of these letters were 'edited in German'[2] by Martin Luther, who in the following year contributed a preface to a larger edition of the *Letters of Hus*[3] brought out at Wittenberg. The preface is a thoroughly characteristic piece of work; 'the bishop of Rome,' it begins, 'if bishop we may call that basilisk of the Church, that pest of the world.' But Luther's editing is worse than indifferent. He mends Hus's Latin that it may

[1] Of these, sixty-five only are in the *Monumenta*. Of the rest, nine were first published by Höfler, *Geschichtschreiber der husitischen Bewegung*, 1865; the remainder by Palacky.

[2] I have not seen this 1536 edition. I have a suspicion that by 'edited in German' Luther means translated from Czech into Latin for Germans. Luther knew no Czech, and when Mladenowic fails him over a word he leaves it as it is. In the 1537 edition, which I have seen, there is no German. It seems that the first printed edition of any of the writings of Hus was brought out at Prague in 1502. It was to this edition, possibly, on its first appearance, that Luther refers when he tells us how, 'when a tyro at Erfurt,' he came across a volume of Hus's sermons in the Library. He opened it 'burning with curiosity,' and was soon amazed that they should have burnt a man 'so skilled in expounding Scripture.' 'I used to think,' he adds, 'the name of Hus so detestable that if honourable mention were made of him the heavens would fall. . . . I consoled myself with the thought that perhaps he had written these things before he fell into heresy. For I was as yet ignorant of what was done at Constance.' (*Monumenta*, i. Preface.) Can any of the readers of the LONDON QUARTERLY inform me whether any copy of this 1502 edition still exists?

[3] *Epistolæ quædam piissimæ et eruditissimæ Joannis Hus.* Wittenbergæ, 1537. The editor is unknown. But some of the letters bear marks of Luther.

be more classical. What is worse, he often gives us not what Hus said, but what Luther thought he ought to have said. He translated Hus, in a word, like at times he translated the Bible. This little volume, with all its mistakes, was incorporated bodily into the two vast Nuremberg folios, *Monumenta J. Hus*, 1558, a great part of which, we remark in passing, is not the work of Hus at all.[1] But with this matter we shall deal elsewhere. The wise man will flee from these volumes to the splendid edition of the indefatigable Palacky. He will speedily discover that such is the anxiety in England to encourage historical study that there are not a dozen public libraries in the country in which the work can be obtained, though without it it is impossible to obtain any accurate knowledge of the great Bohemian hero. Yet we are amazed that the Reformation is losing its hold on the national consciousness!

We may safely assert that in the years to come the letters of Hus will form the only part of his voluminous writings that will live. For the works of Hus are for the most part mere copies of Wyclif, oftentimes whole sections of the great Englishman's writings transferred bodily, without alteration or acknowledgment. The very titles of his works are not original; their parade of learning, which deceived Luther, is completely borrowed. The Englishman Stokes was right when in 1411 he bluntly but correctly asked Hus: 'Why do you glory in these writings, falsely labelling them your own, since after all they belong not to you but Wyclif, in whose steps you are following?'[2]

But the case is otherwise with Hus's letters. They form a priceless memorial of one of the truest-hearted of the sons

[1] i. 336–68 is really by Milicz of Kremsier; i. 376–471 by Matthias of Janow; the latter error is copied from an edition brought out by Otto Brunfels at Strasburg, 1525. In my forthcoming work, *The Age of Hus* (Charles H. Kelly), I hope to show that twenty-six of the twenty-eight sermons in the *Monumenta*, Vol. ii., 54–80, are not by Hus at all, at any rate in their present form, though accepted as such by Neander and even Loserth.

[2] *Documenta*, p. 308. The relation of Wyclif and Hus has been settled by Loserth's *Wiclif and Hus*. Trans. Evans, 1884. But recent researches

of God. His later correspondence, especially his letters from prison, show John Hus to be one of the chosen few who exalt and glorify humanity. We feel as we read how human he was, how lovable. We can still enter into his Gethsemane. We can still trace the agony of self-conquest, the slow steps by which he won the victory. But in that hour of his anguish he was not alone, nor were his disciples sleeping. The love of his friends surrounds him. In the midst of the furnace, moreover, we see One walking with him like unto the Son of man.

Our space is limited. In the following pages we must limit ourselves strictly to the last letters of the reformer. We shall not attempt to enter into the circumstances under which they were written, nor to supply a running commentary on passing events.[1] Such extracts as we shall give will speak for themselves. Lastly, we may assure our readers that the extracts are in nowise the few nuggets extracted from a waste of sand. In the whole correspondence there is nothing unworthy, nothing tedious. Every letter is instinct with the spirit of Jesus and the beauty of a life hid with Christ in God. We begin at the end simply because the circumstances of Hus's death will be more familiar to our readers than the obscurer events of his ministry at Prague.

II.

On October 11, 1514, Hus set out for Constance, guarded by John of Chlum and Wenzel of Duba, accom-

---

have shown that Wyclif himself is not quite so original as was at one time supposed. The mediæval ethics of plagiarism differ from modern ideas. Cf. Poole, *De Dominio Divino*, p. xlviii., and my *Age of Wyclif*, p. 154, n. 3.

[1] For all this, I may be pardoned if I refer the reader to my forthcoming work, *The Age of Hus*. The letters of Hus are not always easy reading, the Latin being at times of the "dog" order; *e.g.* 'numquam equitavi in czotato caputio' (*Doc.*, 75) would puzzle Cicero—while their terseness makes a translation at times almost impossible without becoming a paraphrase. For the few written in Czech, Palacky gives a Latin translation.

panied also, to our lasting advantage, by Peter Mladenowic. The whole party consisted of thirty mounted men and two carts, in one of which Hus rode with his books. 'God be with you,' cried a Polish tailor, 'for I do not think you will return.'[1] A presentment of his fate led him to leave with his disciple Martin a sealed letter, 'not to be opened unless you hear for certain that I am dead.'

'Master Martin, dearest brother in Christ. I exhort you in the Lord that you fear God, keep His commandments, flee the company of women. Be cautious when hearing their confessions. . . . Do not struggle for a benefice, but if called to a living let the honour of God and the salvation of souls move you. Beware of having a young cook . . . and don't spend your money in feasts. . . . I beseech you by the pity of Christ that you do not follow me in any frivolity which you have detected in me. For you know, alas! how before I became a priest I was always ready for a game of chess, frittering away my time and provoking myself and others to anger. . . . My grey gown you can keep if you like, as a memento. But I think you do not care for grey; so give it to whom you like. My white gown give to the curé. To my pupil George Grizikon give sixty groschen or my grey gown, because he has faithfully served me.'[2]

Equally pathetic was his farewell to his congregation at the Bethlehem Chapel, Prague:

'Faithful and dear friends; you know that for a long time I have faithfully instructed you, preaching to you the word of God without heresy or falsehood. For I have always sought and shall ever seek, as long as I live, your salvation. I had intended to preach to you before my journey to Constance, and to lay bare before you the false evidence and false witnesses against me. If I am condemned persevere still in the truth, without hesitation, with no dread at heart that I have been condemned on account of any heresy. . . . Beloved brothers and sisters pray earnestly that God may deign to give me perseverance and keep me from all blemish. But if in any ways my death may redound to His greater glory and your advantage may He grant that I may meet it without evil fear. . . .

[1] See other cautions, *Documenta*, 110, 111. [2] *Doc.*, 74, 75.

Perhaps you will not see me in Prague again before my death. But if Almighty God should in His mercy bring me back to you again, with what gladness shall we see each other, at any rate when we meet in heavenly bliss.'[1]

The journey of Hus to Constance was almost a triumphal progress.

'As soon as I crossed the frontier, at Beraun, the rector and his curates met me. When I entered the common room of the inn (*stubam*) he at once fetched a great beaker of wine, and said that he had always been my friend.'

'At Sulzbach we arrived at an inn in which a court was sitting. So I went up to the magistrates round the fire and said: I am John Hus, about whom you have heard, I imagine, much scandal. Ask me what questions you like.'[2]

As Hus rode along he 'posted up notices on the doors of the churches' setting forth the reason of his journey to Constance. Arriving at Nuremberg he found that the news of his coming had been brought by some merchants.

'As we entered the people stood in the streets gazing and inquiring: Which is Master Hus? Before dinner the rector of St. Lawrence sent me a letter saying that he had long wished to have a free talk with me. I wrote back on the same sheet, come! and he came. . . . When the burghers and magistrates, wishing to see and converse with me, came to my inn, I at once rose up from the table to meet them. The magistrates gave instructions that our conversation should be private. I replied: "I preach publicly, moreover I want everybody to hear." And so we openly conversed together until nightfall. There was a doctor, a Carthusian, who argued incredibly. I noticed that the rector of St. Sebald's was sore displeased because the citizens were on my side. In fact, all the magistrates and citizens stood round me right well pleased. I have not yet found one enemy. In every inn I leave the host a copy of the Ten Commandments.'[3]

---

[1] *Doc.*, 71–73.

[2] Cf. Wesley's *Journals*, Vol. I., p. 478. Other resemblances might be pointed out.

[3] *Doc.*, 76. Oct. 20, 1514.

The next letter of Hus was written from Constance. There he lodged with 'a certain widow Faith in the street of St. Paul,' who kept a bakery with the sign of the White Pigeon. From this house he never stirred until his arrest. He saw nothing, therefore, of the wonderful life which had transformed this little town of five thousand inhabitants into the court of pope, kings, and princes, for three years the capital and centre of Europe. But on the sights of Constance we must not linger. The day after his arrival Hus wrote to his friends in Prague:

'We arrived in Constance on the Saturday after All Saints' (*i.e.* November 3), . . . 'and are lodged in a street near the pope's. We came without a safe conduct. The day after our arrival Michael de Causis filed accusations against me in the cathedral, and affixed his signature, with a long commentary that "the writs are against that excommunicated and obstinate suspect John Hus." With the help of God I take no notice of the matter. . . . In three days Sigismund ought to be in Aachen for his coronation. I imagine he will scarcely arrive here before Christmas Day, so I think the Council, if it is not dissolved, will end about Easter. Lacembok is riding off to-day to Sigismund, before whose arrival he has ordered me to attempt nothing. The living here is very dear, a bed costing half a florin a week. Horses command high prices. . . . I think I shall not be long before I want common necessaries. Please mention my uneasiness on this to my friends, whom it would take too long to name. There are many Parisians and Italians here, but few archbishops, and even few bishops. The cardinals are numerous, riding about on mules, but oh such scrubs![1] . . . Many of our Bohemians have spent on the way all the money they had, and are now suffering misery. I am full of sympathy, but cannot afford to give to all.'

Two days later Hus dispatched another letter to Prague. It begins with a pun. His sense of humour was strong, and never forsook him. His letters are full of jests both on his own name, which in Czech means Goose, and on the brighter sides of life.

[1] Hus cannot give "such scrubs" in Latin, so falls back into Czech as more forcible. So *passim*.

'I came to *Constance* without the pope's safe conduct. Pray God therefore that He give me *constancy* because many strong adversaries have risen up against me, stirred up by the sellers of indulgences. But I fear none of them, hoping that after a great fight I shall win a great victory, and after the victory a great reward, and greater discomfiture of my enemies. . . . On my journey here I had a herald, the Bishop of Lubeck, who was always one night ahead of me. He published abroad that they were conducting me in a cart in chains, and that people must beware of me for I could read men's thoughts. So whenever we drew near a town, crowds turned out as if to a show. But the enemy was overthrown by his own lie, and the people grateful when they heard the truth. Surely Christ Jesus is with me as a strong champion. Therefore will I not fear what the enemy can do. I think I shall be hard up, if the Council is protracted.'

On November 28 Hus was arrested and confined 'in a dark cell hard by the latrines'[1] in the monastery of the Dominicans, familiar to-day to every tourist in Constance as an hotel. A week in such a hole brought on a fever so severe 'that they despaired of his life. But John XXIII. sent his own physician who administered to him clysters.' On his partial recovery and removal to a better lodging in the convent Hus once more began his interrupted letters. They were passed out by means of his Polish visitors, and by the connivance of his gaoler Robert, whom he had made his devoted servant, and for whose benefit he penned in prison several short tracts, still preserved to us, on *The Lord's Prayer*, *Mortal Sin*, and *On Marriage*, 'which estate, please God, Robert is shortly about to enter.'[2] He wrote so much that ink and pens ran short. So he sent Chlum a letter asking for more, and also for a Vulgate, and a copy of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, for the books which he had brought with him had been taken away.

[1] Not an uncommon device of the Inquisition. See Lea, *Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, ii. 461.

[2] *Monumenta*, i. 29–34. Hus on *Marriage* is a much more human document than some of Wyclif's remarks (especially *Trialogus*, 315–325). These treatises are the most original of Hus's writings; for, as he tells us, he had no books.

Of the letters written by Hus in his first prison—*i.e.* from December 6, 1414, to March 24, 1415—we have space for but few extracts. We may add that we have chosen the extracts to illustrate different sides of Hus's character, or to present some vivid picture of his prison life. But choice is difficult where all the letters are of the profoundest interest. The first extract is from a letter written to his unfailing friend, John of Chlum:

'I passed almost the whole of last night in writing answers to the charges which Palecz has drawn up against me. He is striving hard to bring about my condemnation. God pardon him, and help me. . . . Tell Doctor Jesenicz and Jerome of Prague that they must not come here on any account. I am surprised that Sigismund has forgotten me and that he never sends me a word. Perchance I shall be condemned before I have speech with him. If that is his honour it is his own look out. Noble Lord John, my noble benefactor, my intrepid defender, don't be anxious either on my account or because of the losses you sustain. Almighty God will give you more than this. . . . Tell John Cardinalis to be cautious, for all the men who gave themselves out as friends were really spies. . . . I am surprised that no Bohemian visits me in prison. Perhaps they are acting for the best. Let this letter be torn up at once. Send another shirt by the bearer. . . . I should at least like to speak to Sigismund once before I am condemned, for I came here at his request, and under his promise that I should return safe to Bohemia.'[1]

In the next two or three letters Hus is sadly depressed. He misses much the Sacrament. 'But the apostles of Christ and many other saints were without it also in prisons and desert places. I am well,' he adds, 'but shall be better after death, if I keep the commandments of God unto the end.'[2]

Our next letter is again written to Chlum. To understand it we must remember that Hus had adopted a novel method of advertising his creed. He had found a use for the great bare walls of the Bethlehem Chapel at Prague, his

[1] *Doc.*, 89–91. [2] *Ibid.*, 97.

own chapel. On them he had painted up at various times sundry arguments, and theses, once even a long treatise.[1]

'Expound my dream last night. I dreamed that they wanted to destroy all the pictures of Christ in the Bethlehem, and they succeeded. Next morning I saw many painters at work on finer and more numerous pictures, upon which I gazed with gladness. And the painters, together with a vast crowd, were crying out: "Let the bishops come now and hurt us." Whereupon the crowd rejoiced, and I with them. And when I awoke I found that I was laughing.'[2]

This dream, as John of Chlum wrote back to explain, was more than an allegory. It was a prophecy. Only he wishes Hus would think rather about his reply to the Council than of dreams. But perhaps he is right in thus obeying the gospel command: It shall be given him in the same hour what he ought to say.

Our next extract is from a letter written to Chlum on March 4, 1415:

'Gracious Lord; I do so rejoice in your health, your presence, and your constancy in all the toils which you have undertaken for poor me. God has sent you to me as a helper, for your gain I hope, both in this world, and in eternity. I ask you then, by the mercy of God, to await the end like a soldier of Jesus Christ. . . . The God of all goodness at one time consoles me, at another afflicts me, but I have faith that He will never leave me in my trouble. I have been horribly troubled with stone, from which I never suffered before, and with severe vomiting and fevers. My gaolers were frightened that I should die. . . . Oh! how I should like to see you. I think if you speak to the pope's under-chamberlain you may get permission. But you must be careful to talk in Latin before my guards, and in going out your secretary will do well to give them some drink-money. . . . I will answer the accusations

[1] *Mon.*, i. 191. Hus probably copied the practice from the monastery of Königsaal, the burial-place of the Bohemian kings. There "around the walls of the garden the whole of the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation, was engraved with letters enlarging in size with their distance from the ground, so that all could be easily read." (Lea, *op. c.*, ii. 432.)

[2] *Doc.*, 93.

of Gerson if I live. If I die God will answer them at the day of judgment. Do not trouble that expenses in Constance mount up. If God shall free "Goose" from his prison you will not regret these expenses. Noble Lord, stay till the end comes.'[1]

On March 20, 1415, Pope John fled from Constance. The excitement was intense. For a time no one knew what would happen, or who was in authority. Hus was as anxious as the rest.

'My gaolers have already all fled. I have nothing to eat, and I know not what will happen to me in prison. Please go with the other nobles to Sigismund, and get him to take some steps about me, lest on my account he fall into sin and confusion. Please come to me, with the other Czech nobles, for I must have a word with you. Please go to Sigismund at once; it is dangerous to wait. . . . I fear lest the master of the pope's household shall carry me off with him to-night, for to-day he has been hanging about the monastery. . . . If you love your poor "Goose," get the king to send me guards from his own court, or to set me free from prison this very evening. Written in prison, late on Sunday night.'[2]

In spite of his safe-conduct, and much tall talk about enforcing it, Sigismund, though his opportunity had now come, did nothing. Instead of releasing Hus he handed him over to the Bishop of Constance, who that same night took Hus, fettered in a boat, to his episcopal castle at Gottlieben. 'There he lay in fetters in a lofty tower.' He could walk about by day, but 'at night was handcuffed on his bed to the wall.'[3]

At Gottlieben Hus missed the kindly Robert, who had formed the link with his friends outside. Not a single letter written from Gottlieben has been preserved, if indeed Hus succeeded in writing any at all. But in June, as all was now ready for the closing scenes of his trial, he was brought back for convenience from Gottlieben to Constance, and lodged in a tower adjoining the Grey Friars. From his cell

[1] *Doc.*, 98, 99. March 4, 1415. [2] *Ibid.*, 100; on March 24.
[3] *Ibid.*, 255.

there he wrote a series of letters, thirty in all, to his friends. They show us the coils slowly but inexorably fastening round him, the rage of his foes, the fidelity of his friends. They reveal the fiendish ingenuity of the Inquisition, in one of the few public trials which enable us to discern clearly the methods more commonly carried on in the secrecy of the torture-chamber.[1] Above all, they reveal to us John Hus himself, tender, patient, brave, a man of whom Luther might justly write: 'If this man is a heretic, it is difficult to see where under the sun you will find a true Christian. For by what fruits can the good man be recognised, if these, with which Hus was adorned, be not the real fruits.'[2]

The following extract from a letter to Mladenowic, to whom others beside Hus owe much gratitude, was written early in June. We note that Hus now foresaw the result of his trial. The Inquisition was rarely known to release its victims.

'If Lord John Chlum meets with any loss on my behalf, dear Peter, when you return home, see to it, as also in the case of my other friends whom my pupil knows about. If I have any horse left, with a car, it ought to be Chlum's. As for you, Master Martin, if he is alive, will give you a portion of the small sum I left with him. Please do not look on it as payment for your fervent and faithful love of the truth, or for your service and consolation of me in my troubles. For this God will be your wages, for I have nothing whereby to reward you. If I ever see Prague again you shall share everything with me like my own brother; but I do not want to return unless it be the will of God. Dispose of my books according to the instructions I gave to Master Martin, and please select for yourself some works of Wyclif. My chief distress is over our brethren, who

---

[1] Lea has shown (*Inquis. in M. A.*, ii. 450–505) that the proceedings were carried out by the formal Inquisition, on their usual lines or rather on lines more merciful than usual. Neander and others have erred from not knowing the technicalities and procedure of the mediæval Inquisition.

[2] LUTHER: "Preface to Letters of Hus." In *Mon. Hus*, i. (no pagination).

I imagine will suffer persecution, unless the Lord lay bare His arm. I fear that many will be offended.'[1]

When the hour of persecution came the Bohemian brethren were more steadfast than Hus anticipated. Chlum, alas! the noble, tender-hearted Chlum, was forced, ere he left Constance, to recant.

Revile him not—the Tempter hath
A snare for all,
And pitying tears—not scorn and wrath,
Befit his fall.

Let us remember rather what Hus wrote to him: 'Dear friend in God, faithful and steadfast knight, may the King, not of Hungary but of heaven, give you an everlasting reward for all your faithful toil in my behalf.'[2]

In our next extract we give a peep at the trial before the Council, held in the refectory, now the dining-room of an hotel. There had been a warm tournament on the endless scholastic theme of essences and their relation to transubstantiation.

'An English doctor got up to carry on the discussion, but at once broke down. He was followed by another Englishman, a man who had come to me privately and said that Wyclif wanted to destroy all learning. So he rose up and began to discuss the multiplication of the body of Christ in the host, but broke down also. When told to be silent he called out: "This fellow is deceiving the Council; the Council must take care that it is not deceived." When he was silenced another one began a noisy speech on the creation of the common essence. The crowd yelled him down. But I stood up and asked that he might be heard: "You have argued well," I said to him, "I will gladly answer you." But he broke down, so added in a temper: "This is a heresy." How great was then the clamour, catcallings, and

[1] *Doc.*, 103, 104.

[2] *Doc.*, 111. Meaning quite missed in Neander x. 461, who wrote before Palacky, and so had only the inaccurate text of the *Monumenta*. So *passim*. In the case of Bonnechose *Letters of John Hus* (Trans. Mackenzie, 1846) we have not only an inaccurate text, but a translation of a French translation often faulty, and a hopeless chronological arrangement.

blasphemy in the assembly you can hear from Chlum and Peter Mladenowic, his secretary, brave soldiers and lovers of the truth of God. So I, being often overwhelmed by such brawlings, said: "I thought in the Council there would be greater reverence, piety, and discipline." Then they all heard me, for Sigismund commanded silence.[1]

But we must hurry to the close. The following letter, written in the last days, so wrought upon Luther that he burst out, "read this letter and rejoice." We too rejoice. But we have room for a fragment only.

'Michael de Causis, poor fellow, has often come to my prison with the deputies of the four nations. When I was engaged with the deputies he said to the guards, "By the grace of God we shall soon burn the heretic on whose account I have spent many florins." But in writing this know that I do not want vengeance on him. This I leave to God. I pray for him rather with all my heart.

Be prudent over my letters. Michael has given orders that no one is to be allowed in the prison, not even the wives of the gaolers. . . . God Almighty will strengthen the hearts of His faithful ones, whom He chose before the foundation of the world, that they may receive an incorruptible crown. And though Antichrist rage as he will, he shall not prevail against Christ, who shall kill him with the breath of His mouth. . . .

I am greatly consoled by that saying of Christ: "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you," etc. A good, nay the best of greetings, but difficult, I do not mean to understand, but to live up to, for it bids us rejoice in these tribulations. . . . It is easy to read it aloud and expound it, but difficult to live out. Even that bravest Soldier, though He knew that He should rise again on the third day, after supper was depressed in spirit. . . . On this account the soldiers of Christ, looking to their leader, the King of Glory, have had a great fight. They have passed through fire and water, yet have not perished, but have received the crown of life (James i. 12), that glorious crown which the Lord, I firmly believe, will grant to me, to you also, earnest defenders of the truth, and to all who steadfastly love the Lord Jesus. . . . O most holy Christ, draw me, weak as I am, after Thyself, for if Thou dost not draw us we

[1] *Doc.*, 106–8, cf. 139.

cannot follow Thee. Strengthen my spirit, that it may be willing. If the flesh is weak, let Thy grace prevent us; come between and follow, for without Thee we cannot go for Thy sake to cruel death. Give me a fearless heart, a right faith, a firm hope, a perfect love, that for Thy sake I may lay down my life with patience and joy. Amen. Written in prison in chains on the eve of St. John the Baptist, who in chains and in prison was beheaded on account of his reproof of wickedness.'[1]

On June 29, a week before his death, Hus wrote his last letters. They are three in number, one to Chlum, another to Duba, a third to his friends in Bohemia. The letter to Chlum is in Latin, the others are a curious mixture of Latin and Czech. In the letter to Chlum there is no hesitation or fear. The bitterness of death is overpast.

'He who serves Christ, as Gregory has said, will have Christ in the Fatherland of heaven as his servant. Blessed is that servant whom his Lord welcometh, etc. The kings of the earth do not act thus with their servants. They only care for them so long as they are useful to them. Not thus Christ, the King of Glory. . . . The apostles Peter and Paul[2] have now passed their trials and torments; for them remains the life of rest, without suffering, and bliss without measure. Now they are with the choirs of angels, now they see the King in His beauty. . . . May these glorious martyrs, thus united with the King of Glory, deign to intercede for us, that strengthened by their help we may be partakers in their glory, by patiently suffering whatever God Almighty shall deem best for us.'

To Duba he writes in a different strain. He is delighted to hear of his approaching marriage. May it lead him to flee the vanities of this world. 'And in fact it is time, for he has for a long time ridden to and fro through the countries, broken lances, wearied his body, spent his money, and offended his soul. Let him now remain at home in peace with his wife and serve God.'[3]

---

[1] *Doc.*, 129–131. June 23, 1415.

[2] June 29 is their festival. Hence the allusion.

[3] *Doc.*, 146.

His last letter is for his friends in Bohemia.

'God be with you, and deign to bestow upon you the eternal reward for the great kindness you have lavished upon me, and still lavish, though perchance when you receive this I shall be dead. Do not allow the Lord of Chlum, faithful knight, and my kind friend, to get into any danger. . . . I beseech you live good lives and obey God. Pray God for me, in whose gracious presence we shall soon meet through His help. I write this in fetters in prison, in expectation of death.

MASTER HUS, a servant of God in hope.

P.S.—Peter, dearest friend, keep my fur cloak in memory of me.
Master Christan, faithful and beloved friend, God be with you.
Master Martin, my disciple, remember the things I have faithfully taught you.
Master Nicholas, and all other masters and priests, study the word of God.
Priest Gallus, preach the word.
In a word, I beseech you all, persevere in the truth of God.'[1]

They were his last written words. A week later, July 6, 1415, he was burnt at the stake, 'chanting, in a loud voice: Christ Thou Son of the living God, have mercy upon me.'[2] He died as he had lived, 'persevering in the truth of God.'

H. B. WORKMAN.

---

[1] *Doc.*, 147, 148.

[2] *Doc.*, 323, from the vivid account of Mladenowic of the trial and death of Hus (*Documenta*, pp. 237–324), a narrative which should be familiar to all students.

THE OCCUPATION OF OUR LORD.

THAT Jesus of Nazareth was by trade a carpenter (τέκτων) was accepted by the early Christian Church apparently without much inquiry, and then acquiesced in as a matter of little importance, or as one on which it was already too late to endeavour successfully to obtain reliable evidence. The spiritual mission of Jesus during the first centuries overshadowed and absorbed everything connected with the personality of the divine Man of Sorrows which did not contribute to quicken the sympathies and open hearts towards ideal beauty suffused with inward grace, offering itself up for the world's redemption. Jesus was poor, His reputed father was poor; the occupation of a humble carpenter in an obscure town in Lower Galilee met the necessities of the case. The trade of a carpenter was not under any ban, like that of a tanner, for example, which rendered the workman ritually unclean; and no social prejudice was raised by the presentation to the world of the God-man as a carpenter and the son of a carpenter. The description has been handed down for nineteen centuries, and even the Higher Criticism is content that the historical Jesus should have been a carpenter and a carpenter's son. It is late in the day to challenge the acquiescent spirit of centuries, though criticism is never perhaps too late if only suggestive of a new line of inquiry tending to modify, reversing perhaps, long-cherished opinion.

Our inquiry is necessarily confined within narrow limits. If Jesus was a carpenter, what influence had His trade upon His development? If not a carpenter, then what trade or occupation did He follow whilst preparing for His public ministry? A skilled workman of twenty years' standing who suddenly throws aside his tools and becomes a teacher cannot easily escape the use of certain technical expressions

of his craft: he will weigh and measure, apportion, construct, and act in the method and manner most familiar to his thought. As the gospel narratives extend over the whole public life of Jesus, they should yield some certain cue to the technique of His trade, occupation, or calling; and we are the more entitled to expect this result because the mind of Jesus was singularly receptive, and when He entered on His divine mission was teeming with images of familiar things. What was unknown to the common people found no place in His similitudes and parables. For instance, mining was unknown in Galilee, and there is no trace in the gospels that He had any acquaintance with the appearance of rich metalliferous deposits and the methods of winning them. The country was mainly agricultural, pastoral, and fishing, and in the towns visited by Jesus the arts and sciences were not very advanced, so the occupations open to an intelligent youth of poor parents brought up at Nazareth were limited—a small trader, a handicraftsman, an agriculturist, or fisherman seem to exhaust the catalogue of choice. In this case the first may be at once struck out, the idea of a small trader trading for gain being altogether repugnant to His after-revealed genius and purpose.

St. Luke and St. John are altogether silent as to the nature of the trade or occupation followed by Jesus after His return from Jerusalem and dutifully subjecting Himself to parental authority; but St. Matthew and St. Mark preserve statements in an interrogative form, intended to derogate from the pretensions of the new teacher; and these statements, "Is not this the carpenter's son?"[1] and "Is not this the carpenter?"[2] have been received as though they were statements of fact. It may be that the Nazarenes knowing Jesus from infancy were quite accurate in their descriptions; but as the gospels neither affirm nor deny them, we are at perfect liberty to treat them as *ex parte* statements. That St. Matthew and St. Mark report the

[1] Matt. xiii. 55. [2] Mark vi. 3.

scornful remarks of a hostile public does not necessarily imply affirmation. If Jesus was a carpenter and the son of a poor carpenter, there was nothing in the statement to wound their vanity or love; if Jesus was not a carpenter, they knew it, and faithfully chronicled what occurred for the purpose, perhaps, of showing how the multitude went wrong on trivial matters which they might be supposed to know about and quite within their comprehension, which the mighty spiritual things which they saw and heard and spurned were not. The Syriac (Peshito)[1] and the Greek texts agree in their rendering of the interrogative statements, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" and "Is not this the carpenter?"

The apocryphal gospels, if trustworthy, might be cited as corroborative testimony on a matter of fact; and though they may not be so relied on, they may be referred to as showing that in the legends which early crystallised around the infancy and youth of Jesus He appears as a carpenter, and no other trade or occupation is suggested. St. Justin the Martyr, whose means of information reached back to the apostolic age, parenthetically affirms the popular idea that Jesus was by trade a carpenter.[2] No serious doubt was expressed at any time when the statement, as one of fact, might be affirmed or denied;[3] and the Christian Church has been content from the first to regard Jesus as a

[1] For the purposes of this article I have followed the very close translation by Dr. J. W. Etheridge. (Longmans. 1846.)

[2] "And when Jesus came to the Jordan, being thought to be the son of Joseph the carpenter (*for He used to follow the employment of a carpenter when among men*, making ploughs and yokes, by which He taught us both the tokens of righteousness and activity of life), the Holy Ghost then, on man's account, as I have said, descended on Him in the form of a dove."—St. Justin the Martyr. Dialogue with Typho, p. 2, *Library of the Fathers.*

[3] Origen (*contra Celsum*) discredits the legend, saying that it was not written in any of the gospels which the Church received that Jesus was a carpenter—*ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελίων τέκτων αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀναγεγραπται.* Celsus had quoted certain scandalous statements circulated by the Jews with reference to the Virgin, and his indignation apparently carried him a little too far.

carpenter working in His father's shop at Nazareth until about thirty years of age.

The legends we possess respecting Joseph and Mary, and the infancy and youth of Jesus, are to be found substantially in the apocryphal gospels; the monkish "miracle plays" and "mysteries," once so popular in England, were founded on them, and the Christian Church, its repudiation of them as "authority" notwithstanding, has received ineffaceable impressions from them. The familiar picture of Joseph as an old man at the date of his betrothal to the Virgin comes from this source; and the descriptions of Mary before espousal as the child of prayer, the child of grace, the young servant of the Lord in the temple, have made themselves so felt in Christian art, that the "chaste mother of God" which spontaneously rises before us is but the ideal expression on canvas of "The Gospel of the Birth of Mary" and of the "Protevangelion." In the canonical gospels Joseph appears and disappears as a lay figure, necessary indeed, though of but little consequence, in the divine drama in which he takes a perfunctory part; and the lofty salutation, "Hail Mary!" of the angel Gabriel is the one indication of the inward purity and sweetness of the "blessed among women" for the inspiration of art genius in succeeding ages. The two Gospels of the Infancy of Jesus, so little known among Protestants, form the foundation of the *Golden Legend*, the *Lives of the Saints*, and other devotional works; so that among all classes of the Roman Catholic communion, the young especially, the early life of Jesus is full of humanity. In this way the uncanonical gospels have a permanent place in literature coextensive with the Roman Catholic Church. In the First Gospel of the Infancy is a circumstantial narrative of the youth Jesus at work with Joseph, and the document may here be admitted as evidence that, when written, a legend was already in existence that Jesus was a carpenter by trade. For any other purpose the document is worthless because of its utter want of appreciation of one dominant characteristic of the intellectual life of Jesus. The legend describes

Joseph as being "not very skilful at his carpenter's trade," and Jesus as reliant on His power to work miracles to make good the defects in their joint work.[1] When brought to the standard of the canonical writings the whole narrative stands condemned through its failure to indicate even the moral earnestness of the young disputant in the temple, who said to His mother, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business"; and later, "No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God"; and later still, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to My Father." Possessing such strong individuality, it was an imperative law of His nature to do all things well; and we cannot avoid the conclusion that had Jesus been trained a carpenter He would have been a capable worker in wood, however incompetent His father Joseph may have been. We therefore place the circumstantial narrative on one side, after having admitted it *de bene esse*, with the remark that its sole value to the critic is

[1] "And Joseph, wheresoever he went in the city, took the Lord Jesus with him, where he was sent for to work to make gates or milk-pails, or sieves or boxes; the Lord was with him wheresoever he went. And as often as Joseph had anything in his work to make longer or shorter, or wider or narrower, the Lord Jesus would stretch His hand towards it. And presently it became as Joseph would have it. So that he had no need to finish anything with his own hands, for he was not very skilful at his carpenter's trade.

"On a certain time the king of Jerusalem sent for him, and said I would have thee make me a throne of the same dimensions with that place in which I commonly sit. Joseph obeyed, and forthwith began the work, and continued two years in the king's palace before he finished it. And when he came to fix it in its place, he found it wanted two spans on each side of the appointed measure. And when the king saw it he was very angry with Joseph. And Joseph, afraid of the king's anger, went to bed without his supper, not taking anything to eat. Then the Lord Jesus asked him, What he was afraid of? Joseph replied, Because I have lost my labour in the work which I have been about these two years. Jesus said to him, Fear not, neither be cast down; do thou lay hold on one side of the throne, and I will the other, and we will bring it to its just dimensions. And when Joseph had done as the Lord Jesus said, and each of them had with strength drawn his side, the throne obeyed, and was brought to the proper dimensions of the place."—*First Gospel of the Infancy*, xvi.

its confirmation of the belief among the early Christians that Jesus was by trade a carpenter. Jewish historians give us no assistance; and Graetz, for example, having no independent sources of information, falls back on the gospels and refers to Jesus of Nazareth as "the carpenter's son."[1] The assertion that Jesus was a working carpenter until His baptism by John rests therefore on no sure foundation, and the only safe conclusion on the evidence is that *by repute* He was a carpenter.

Two of the gospels being silent on the subject, had St. Matthew and St. Mark, like St. John, ended the interrogation with the words, "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph?"[2] what answer would the Christian Church now be in the position to give to the question: What was the trade, occupation, or profession of Jesus? Putting legend on one side, it is obvious that an answer—if answer there is to be—must come from the gospels. The sayings, parables, and works of Jesus during a period of three years are before us. Both the earnestness and receptivity of the young teacher have been referred to as well marked intellectual qualities, and it is difficult to believe that a mind so earnest and receptive as His could have been employed for twenty years in any occupation of skill without in some degree being tinged by the technicalities common to workmen. The mind returns to its accustomed grooves all the more readily when face to face with great issues, and the tongue then clothes impressions in its accustomed forms of speech. Our Lord was constantly face to face with the unforeseen, and drawn into cunningly laid arguments to destroy His credit and His mission. What phrases, then, are there preserved in His most rapid utterances, what mannerism in His works and methods of performing them, which enable an inquirer without prejudice to say, This is how a carpenter would act, and might be expected to speak? The work-bench of a carpenter, with its cutting-tools, the rule, the square and compass, the plumb-line, the nice

[1] *History of the Jews*, ii. 153.

[2] John vi. 42.

adjustments of parts requiring careful measurements, a varied and accurate knowledge of timber, some knowledge of architecture, and all the technicalities in vogue amongst workmen, might be looked for at times to point an illustration or homily, or furnish a similitude and parable. "And which of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit?" is the one sentence, twice used in the gospels, which may be thought to have received its form from the carpenter's shop. The examples of the foolish man building his house upon the sand and of a wise man upon a rock, the expediency of counting the cost before commencing to build, the pulling down of houses in order to build greater, the building and garnishing of tombs, are observations on the conduct of men which leave no impression on the mind that the divine Teacher in using these illustrations possessed technical knowledge necessarily acquired in a particular trade. But for the texts in St. Matthew and St. Mark already cited, the suspicion would barely arise that Jesus possessed at any time a more special acquaintance with a carpenter's shop than any other man of His day in Nazareth. Twenty, fifteen years even, continuous occupation at a technical trade left, according to the gospels, no definite impressions upon a sympathetic, receptive, and original intellect of the first order. We may therefore try the inductive process from other standpoints—from that of an agriculturist, and from that of a sailor fisherman.

The gospels show that the mind of Jesus received its profoundest impressions from nature, and that He possessed so intimate and practical a knowledge of agricultural and pastoral life as to favour the assumption that His occupation from childhood lay in the fields. Illustrations of the spiritual life drawn from farm employment show technical knowledge and familiarity with the socio-economic conditions of the district. He referred, for example, to salt as a fertiliser, to measures for grain, to yokes for cattle; to ploughs, sowing and reaping, the management of fruit trees, and the clearing of the land from weeds. His mind moved

at times as in a charmed circle : when a man hid a treasure it was in a field, and the familiar bushel was not to be put to an improper use. Much of the eternal beauty of the gospels would be lost if the reeds and grasses, the lilies of the fields, the hen and chicken, the sparrows, the doves, the sheep and lambs, and all the pastoral idylls which had so firm a hold on the imagination of Jesus were to disappear. In Lower Galilee the agricultural and pastoral occupations of the people were constantly before His eyes ; so without taking any actual part in the work on farms or in vineyards, He would possess that intimate knowledge which as a teacher He so greatly needed. Living in Nazareth, Jesus may have been brought up as a carpenter, and yet have spent so much time in the mending of yokes, ploughs, and other implements on farms and vineyards, that during the whole of His divine career the imagery of the fields and the clouds was constantly upon His lips. But no act is recorded as having been performed by Jesus under sudden emergency, on impulse, or of set design which enables us to say, This was done in field, or stall, or vineyard in a manner showing technical skill acquired by practice. In the absence of authority the inductive process fails to suggest that Jesus was a skilled carpenter ; but if the choice of occupation is presumed to be between the carpenter's shop and the fields, the language of Jesus, subjected to the same process, greatly favours presumption in favour of the latter.

The canonical gospels yield more fruitful results when the third occupation set forth in this article is considered ; namely, that of Jesus as a sailor fisherman on the Sea of Galilee. The parable of the use of the drag-net (*σαγήνη*) and the manipulation of the catch shows so perfect a mastery of detail, that in one brief sentence a long and complicated process is described without one superfluous word. There is no uncertainty of touch in this masterpiece of condensed graphic description :

Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind : which, when it

was filled, they drew up on the beach ; and they sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but the bad they cast away.[1]

So conservative is the fishing industry throughout the world that every line in this picture is as necessary to-day for its completion as it was nineteen centuries ago. It does not, however, follow that Jesus was more than an intelligent observer of a daily operation, making use of His observations with the same mastery of detail as previously shown in the parable of the sower. The original genius of the divine Teacher among men must receive full credit, even if we sweep away with one stroke every presumption afforded by internal evidence that His sayings betray the slightest influence of any earthly trade or occupation upon His mind.

Is there, then, any evidence of trade or occupation setting its mark on the mental and physical development of Jesus? The gospels attribute to Him two qualities which have been overlooked, but which could not have been, humanly speaking, acquired without special and technical training, or, at all events, so much familiarity and practice as to amount to special technical training. Jesus was often on the sea, and was so much at home in a fishing-boat that He sometimes elected to address the multitudes on shore from one. On one memorable occasion He slept on board. St. Matthew and St. Mark narrate the event, but St. Mark with the more detail. The slight differences in the Greek and Peshito texts complement each other :

Mark iv. 35–38. (Revised Version.)	Mark iv. 35–38. (Peshito.)
And on that day, when even was come, He saith unto them, Let us go over unto the other side. And leaving the multitude, they take Him with them, even as He was, in the boat. And other boats were with	And He saith to them that day, in the evening, Let us pass to the opposite shore. And they sent away the assemblies, and took Him into the vessel, and other vessels were with Him. And there

[1] Matt. xiii. 47, 48 (R.V.).

Him. And there ariseth a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the boat, insomuch that the boat was now filling. And He Himself was in the stern, asleep on the cushion: and they awake Him.

was a great commotion and wind, and the waves fell upon the vessel, which was nigh being filled. But Jeshu on a pillow slept in the after-part of the vessel, and they came and raised Him.

The narrative is simple and without ambiguity. Jesus was asleep on a pillow, and was awakened by being raised. Only a well seasoned sailor, wearied with the fatigues of a busy day, would have slept soundly on board a fishing-boat after she was suddenly struck by the tempest and then, shivering in the blast, pitching and rolling and buried in green water. The movements of the boat, so distressing to a landsman, had, according to the narrative, no perceptible effect upon the wearied sleeper, *for He was accustomed to them*; and it was only when He was raised and addressed by a terrified invocation that the sense of something unusual overcame physical inertia, and He awoke. This is precisely the experience of mariners on board ship, who sleep calmly in their bunks during a tempest, but wake immediately on being raised, or shaken by someone, and warned of danger. The rhythmic motion of a ship at sea, even in exaggerated forms, produces so very different effects upon sailors and landsmen as to indicate the presence of certain physical conditions set up by continuous use.[1] That Jesus, pillowed on the stern of an open fishing-boat,[2] slept during a sudden

---

[1] Mariners are often poor sailors when on board small craft; and sometimes suffer greatly in home waters, after long ocean voyages, so sensitive are men even to slight variations in accustomed movements.

[2] The Greek distinguishes between πλοῖον (boat) and πλοιάριον (little boat), which the Peshito does not. The fishing-craft on the Sea of Galilee are termed ܐܠܦܐ and ܣܦܝܢܬܐ indiscriminately by St. Matthew, but ܣܦܝܢܬܐ only in the other gospels. These fishing-craft are high in the stem and stern, and their bulwarks so high that the Vulgate, following the Peshito, always speaks of Jesus "ascending" into the boat. In the British Museum are ancient terra-cotta models of this class of

squall until awakened by the unusual movement of being lifted up, is, on its face, evidence of physical effect following and consequent on customary occupation. In this instance the effects of habit or training are, when once indicated, remarkably well defined, and when they occur so pronouncedly it is usually found that the habit has extended over a considerable period.

That Jesus possessed technical knowledge as a deep-sea fisher and knew how to apply it is shown on two occasions; and the second, narrated by St. John, enables us the better to understand the first, narrated by St. Luke. The apostles Peter, Thomas called Didymus, the sons of Zebedee, and two other of the disciples had been out fishing all night and caught nothing. In the early dawn, when about two hundred cubits from the shore, they were hailed in the customary manner, but without knowing by whom:

JOHN XXI. 4–6.
(REVISED VERSION.)

But when day was now breaking, Jesus stood on the beach: howbeit the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. Jesus therefore saith unto them, Children, have ye aught to eat? They answered Him, No. And He said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the boat, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes.

JOHN XXI. 4–6.
(PESHITO.)

But when it was morning, Jeshu stood on the sea-shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jeshu. And Jeshu said to them, Children, have you anything to eat? They say to Him, No. He saith to them, Cast your net on the right side of the vessel, and you shall find. And they cast (it), and could not draw the net for the multitude of fishes which it held.

The versions harmonize, and the writer being himself a fisherman cannot be supposed to have made any technical

---

fishing-craft, in which provision is made for the ballast and nets amidships, and ample room allowed for the mending of nets on board—Matt. iv. 21, Mark i. 19. The merchant-ship (*ναῦς*) with boat (*σκάφη*) so realistically described in the Acts of the Apostles (chap. xxvii.) is not mentioned in the gospels.

error in his description. He did not know or suspect who the stranger was, but the language and manner of the stranger were those of a fisherman to fishers, and so confident were St. John and the rest of the crew that the stranger *from His point of vantage* on the shore could see indications of fish on the right side of their boat, that they let down their drag-net without hesitation or question, and enclosed a multitude of fishes. To be able to detect the presence of large bodies of fish in the water when there is no "breaking" of the surface is one of the fine arts of the deep-sea fisher's calling. The sea may be without a ripple, but there passes along a suspicion of a shade too subtle for the uninstructed eye to notice, and the practical fisher noting it from a sufficient elevation knows that fish are below the surface. On our Cornish coasts there are professional watchers who seem to know of the presence of fish by instinct. The uneducated eye fails to detect the slightest difference between the travelling shadow and the varied mottlings of wind and cloud and vegetable spore marbling the sea's surface, and yet it is upon the watcher's sure detection of this subtle variation of shade that the results of seasons' fishing in localities may depend. Those in boats pass over the fish without knowing it, for *there must be sufficient distance* between the on-shore watcher and the fish in the sea to enable him to detect the fish tint. When the Unknown stood upon the shores of the Galilæan sea under the tranquil dawn of a Syrian sky, and spoke in the language of the craft, the crew on board the boat knew that from His point of vantage, two hundred cubits off, He would be able to detect the presence of fish. There was no surprise. St. John, or any of the crew standing in the place of the Unknown, would probably have shouted a similar instruction: "Cast your net on the right side of the boat." The prompt and mechanical obedience of the crew to the order favours the presumption that the fishers on the Lake of Galilee were in the habit of receiving instructions from persons on shore as to the whereabouts of fish; and the narrative shows that Jesus possessed and exercised on this

occasion a technical skill only acquired after that long placid contemplation of the surface of the sea which forms so essential a part of a fisher's technical education.

If this display of technical knowledge stood alone, the suspicion might be induced that this was a happy guess favoured by chance; but the gospels contain two exhibitions of the same kind of skill displayed at long intervals, and narrated by two writers viewing the matter from very different standpoints. St. Luke (chap. v.) narrates that Jesus, who had been addressing the people from a fishing-boat whilst some of the disciples were washing their nets, suddenly gave an instruction to "put out into the deep and let down your nets for a draught"; and when this was done a multitude of fish was enclosed. From His position on board the light boat standing well out of the water, Jesus had noted the presence of a large shoal, and gave certain directions where to cast the net. The effect of this upon the mind of Luke, who was not a fisherman, is apparent; but John, who was a fisherman and was present on the occasion, does not mention the fact; and when he does narrate the subsequent event it is for the purpose of recording the historical presence of the risen Christ, which he does without expressing any surprise at the exercise of skill common to men accustomed to fish in the waters of the Galilæan sea. The gospels, therefore, when closely interrogated as to the possible, probable even, occupation of Jesus as a fisherman, yield the following results:

1. A general knowledge of the use of the drag-net and the manipulation of its contents after a catch of fish.

2. The sailor-like quality of being able to sleep on board a fishing-boat in a sudden squall at sea.

3. The faculty of being able, when properly placed, to detect the presence of a shoal of fish in the sea—a faculty which presupposes technical training.

That Jesus of Nazareth should have been a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee, or have passed so much time with the fishers on its shores as to have become a good sailor and good fisher, commends itself for acceptance in the absence

of direct reliable evidence, when we consider the intimate relations between members of the family of Jesus at Nazareth and Capernaum. Of the three occupations here considered, namely, carpenter, agriculturist, and fisher, that of carpenter, alone recognised by the Christian Church and sanctioned by tradition, has left the faintest trace on the mind of Jesus. An exquisite sympathy with nature and the people of Lower Galilee filled the mind of Jesus with pastoral images and everyday occupations; but there is in the gospels an absence of that specialised knowledge enabling us to say, This is the language or the act of one long accustomed to agricultural and pastoral work. When, however, on board a fishing-boat or on the sea-shore, we are able to recognise those *specialised qualities*[1] which in the ordinary experience of life are the results of occupation. It may well be that Jesus passed some time in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth, and was known as "the carpenter's son" and "the carpenter," also some time at farm places working at His trade and mending ploughs and yokes, according to Justin Martyr; but the results of critical inquiry are insignificant if we exclude a sea occupation by Him who promised to make of His disciples "fishers of men." The ancient drawings of fish in the catacombs and the *notarica* ΙΧΘΥΣ, now regarded as mystical charms among the early Christians, will possess a fresh interest for the Christian world if it is accepted as reasonably established that the Lord of Life was a fisher by occupation.

J. HENRY HARRIS.

---

[1] Dr. Strauss missed this point entirely in his *New Life of Jesus*. See Vol. II., sec. 78, "Sea Anecdotes."

THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS IN SPAIN.

ANYONE who has attempted to record current events with the conviction that they make for the rise or fall of a nation must have been painfully conscious of a disadvantage arising from their proximity. There is always a fear lest the picture should suffer, like a Chinese landscape, from a want of perspective. Collateral questions, incidental movements, until time has relegated them to their true position, loom large in the foreground, assuming the same importance as the main subject, instead of falling into the rear as secondary matter. In the midst of the rush and turmoil one is so liable to mistake an eddy for the current.

We doubt whether there is a thoughtful Spaniard who fails to recognise the existence of a crisis in the affairs of the nation. That symptoms of disease have forced themselves upon public notice may be proved by the significant fact that politicians of every school are coming forward, each with a sovereign specific guaranteed to restore health to the patient and establish the claim of the successful physician to the eternal gratitude of his client. Many of the proposed remedies are good in their way, yet all may be classed among palliatives rather than healing medicines. A remarkable and hopeful change, however, has lately been noticed in the trend of public thought. We may be prejudiced in favour of ideas in practical agreement with our own deeply rooted convictions, nevertheless we are but echoing the voice of many of the leading writers and profoundest thinkers of the day when we declare our belief that the social evils which are clamouring for redress are merely the external symptoms of the malady. The ailment itself, a terrible cancer which is sapping the strength of the sufferer, is the subordination to Rome of every interest—religious, social, and political.

This is a sweeping statement, but we propose to consider the subject impartially. In preparing material for this article we have consulted, in preference to characterised Protestants, priests and laymen who can scarcely be accused of any undue bias in the direction of Evangelical religion. Whilst differing on minor points, and especially as to the degree of reform considered necessary, their unanimous testimony has been in favour of emancipation from the papal yoke.

The subject is of more than local interest. It affects the very existence of Spain as a factor in the concert of European powers, and indirectly bears upon the religious freedom and prosperity of nations as widely differing in every respect from the one in question as Germany and England.

I.

An accurate diagnosis is an indispensable preliminary to the successful treatment of a complaint. Before attempting to estimate the value and prospects of the Reform movement, we are reluctantly compelled to enter into details, uninteresting, perhaps, to the general reader, but necessary to a clear statement of the case.

What are the bonds that this unfortunate country is endeavouring to burst? In England, the classic land of liberty, their nature is imperfectly understood except by the careful student of Church history. The jurisdiction of Rome is commonly supposed to be confined to matters of dogma, and limited in sphere to a tacit or avowed acknowledgment of papal supremacy on the part of individual adherents to the Roman Catholic Church. Such is far from being the case. The powers invested in the court of Rome —we speak of countries whose State religion is exclusively Roman Catholic—extend to all matters connected with the number and distribution of dioceses, the emoluments of prelates, the endowments of cathedrals and collegiate churches, the number of inferior clergy attached to the same, the recognition of religious orders, and numberless

other details, all of which are regulated by a papal "Concordat." The provisions of the treaty—for such it may be called—may at any time be violated in the interests of Rome without the direct intervention of the latter, but no modification in a liberal sense can be introduced without mutual consent. To suppose, then, that the Government of a Roman Catholic country can, by its own will and deed, give legislative sanction to measures curtailing the exercise of these extraordinary powers invested in a foreign court, is a fallacious idea which cannot be too openly exposed. Herein lies the strength and the weakness of Rome. There is no alternative between absolute submission and open defiance. Any alleviation of the burden imposed by a Concordat must either be in the form of a concession allowed by *parental* authority, or be interpreted as an act of insubordination, leading in the end to emancipation from Vatican control. Hence the special importance attached to Señor Pidal's mission as ambassador to the Pope in connexion with the decree of last September, relating to the reform or suppression of certain monastic orders. To this we shall have to refer later on.

Charles V. concluded a Concordat for his Spanish kingdom with Adrian VI. and Clement VII.; and a further Concordat was made by Clement XII. and Philip V. in 1737. This was ratified in 1851 between Pius IX. and Isabella II. The first article is the only one which, since then, has suffered any appreciable modification. "The Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion continues to be the only religion of the Spanish nation, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship." This, as will be at once seen, places in the hands of the Church the exercise of exclusive and unlimited authority. Without entering into diplomatic negotiations for a revision of the clause, the nation, in 1869, tacitly corrected this abuse of power by inserting in the Constitution the much debated eleventh article, whereby liberty of worship, under certain conditions, was conceded to dissenting Spaniards as well as to foreigners. Thus, during a time of extraordinary political agitation, when the fate of the Church

was wavering in the balance, was secured the Magna Charta of religious liberty.

The fifth article of the Concordat establishes the division and circumscription of dioceses, fixing a minimum allowance for the respective prelates; the third and fourth provide for the exercise of episcopal authority, conceding "full liberty" to the princes of the Church, whom "no one shall molest under any pretence"; whilst Articles 17, 22, 33, and 34 specify the number of canons to be attached to the cathedrals, legislate upon the constitution of the chapters in collegiate churches, fix a minimum stipend for these dignitaries, and assign sums for the maintenance of services and for the expenses of administration and pastoral visits.

So far we find little room for criticism, except on the broad ground that the Government has relegated to a foreign power rights and privileges which, assuming the necessity of a State religion, should be jealously guarded as its own peculiar prerogative. If, however, we look at the matter from the standpoint of a liberal Spanish Catholic, or from that of one of the vast host of inferior and underpaid clergy, the need of reform becomes patent.

Next to Italy, Spain is the country which possesses the largest number of episcopal sees in proportion to its inhabitants, though in Italy we believe the stipends are ludicrously small in comparison with Spain. According to the above-mentioned articles the country is pledged to maintain nine archbishops, with stipends ranging from £1,300 to £1,600 per annum, and forty-six bishops, receiving from £800 to £1,100, besides a Patriarch of the Indies (£1,500) and several suffragan bishops. In addition to these must be reckoned the immense number of deans, canons, and prebendaries; Toledo Cathedral alone possesses fifty-two. The duties of the beneficed clergy are exceedingly light, giving rise to frequent scandals and to the formation of rival factions in the chapters. In passing, let it be noted that cases of non-residence are of frequent occurrence, and that the arduous labours attached to the benefice are compensated by an annual vacation of three months.

The stipends of the upper clergy do not at first sight appear excessive; but for a true appreciation of the case the following facts should be borne in mind: (1) The amount fixed by the Concordat is a minimum; (2) the stipend is subject to no reduction by taxation, as in the case of the parochial and rural clergy; (3) the prelates enjoy the usufruct of palaces and gardens, in addition to a considerable income from property belonging to the diocese;[1] (4) the perquisites attached to the office represent a far larger sum than the actual stipend;[2] and (5) the expenses are comparatively trifling, and the charges of administration and pastoral visitation are provided for separately.

Even in the case of a rich and prosperous nation this heavy charge would be a severe drain upon its resources. What, then, must it be to a country overburdened with debt, unable to replace its lost fleet, with its monetary circulation depreciated by 36 per cent., incapable for want of capital and energy to develop its natural wealth, and to a people ground down by excessive taxation, wearied with long hours of toil, and driven to the verge of despair in the constant struggle against starvation? It is scarcely surprising that the *vox populi* should be raised in protest. The need of reform is urgent, and a revision of the Concordat in this particular would be an act of wise statesmanship on the part of the Church if it desires to retain any hold on the people. A precedent can be found in the see of Toledo, which formerly covered a wide extent of territory without detriment to the spiritual needs of the people. By an enlargement of the dioceses and the consequent suppression of those no longer needed, or their substitution by general vicariates, no inconsiderable sum of money could be liberated for other purposes, as, for instance, waiving for the moment the question of social reform, the restoration and

[1] The bishopric of Zamora is so rich in landed estates that the successive occupants of the see have all died immensely wealthy.

[2] The perquisites of the poorest diocese represent from £2,000 to £3,000 per annum. In Barcelona they are calculated to produce about £5,000, and in Madrid £7,000.

preservation of the cathedrals and public monuments, which constitute one of the chief attractions of the country, but which are being allowed to fall into almost complete ruin.[1]

Far different from the state of affairs in the higher ecclesiastical circles is the condition of the lower clergy. In justice let it be said that the whole burden of work falls upon this class. We hold no brief on their behalf, but are compelled to admit that neither the Government nor the Vatican has been splendidly liberal in dealing with the parochial, and especially the rural, clergy. In the large towns stipends are comparatively large, and the income from local sources by no means insignificant; on the other hand, in the country districts there are thousands of parish priests whose nominal income does not exceed £20 per annum. The "man in the street," looking at the matter *in cumulo*, considers only the large amount annually assigned to the maintenance of a cult with which he may or may not be in sympathy. On entering into details he would find that until he is prepared to cut the Gordian knot of Vatican control and its corollary, State subvention, the chief ground of complaint is the system which floods the country with twice as many half-educated priests as can ever hope to find employment.

When the supply exceeds the demand, the most elementary notions of political economy suggest the remedy; but Spanish bishops have hitherto failed to realise the injury done to the Church they represent by overcrowding the ranks of the priesthood. The whole system of seminary education needs revision. Young men are admitted indiscriminately, attracted in large numbers to a sacerdotal life by various motives, predominant among which is undoubtedly ambition. When the prescribed course has

[1] Since writing the above lines our views have received an unexpected confirmation in the fall of the belfry of Cuenca Cathedral, burying under its ruins several people, and threatening the destruction of the edifice. A petition for a small grant for repairs has for years been lying unheeded in the Government offices of Madrid. It is estimated that at least a million pesetas will now be required to repair the damage.

been gone through, one or the other of two evils results: either they are declared to be without a "vocation," and are dismissed in crowds after having sacrificed the most important years of their life without learning anything that can be of the slightest service to them in a secular sphere; or the newly-fledged priestlings are cast as jetsam upon the waves of society, unable to live on the daily allowance assigned by Government, and reduced not infrequently to beggary, before finding a haven in a modest curacy,[1]

Before leaving the subject of seminaries we may add that the curriculum in these institutions might advantageously be modernised. Olive Schreiner's ironical criticism of certain boarding schools, that they are conducted on the idea that "the less a girl has in her head the lighter she is for climbing," could almost be applied to the colleges for training priests. The course of studies is more than defective, it is antiquated in the extreme. No one can deny that there are men of considerable learning and ability in the Spanish Church; but they are men who have succeeded in spite of the régime, and cannot be considered as a legitimate product of the same.

Incidentally, let it be noted that the above-mentioned Articles 3 and 4 of the Concordat, by guaranteeing complete liberty to the higher clergy, are productive of much bitter feeling and strife between the bishops and their subordinates. Pastorals are exempt from suits at law, a bishop enjoying the invidious privilege of being allowed to calumniate his inferiors, whilst the injured party, tied hand and foot, is denied all means of redress. Moreover, a decree of Pius IV. excommunicates clerics who go to law against their superiors.

Hitherto, with a definite end in view, we have been stating

[1] An appointment as tutor to young children is a windfall to a priest with uncertain prospects; even the post of "nursery governess," *including the name*, is not to be despised. For a long time in the window of an important business establishment in the Calle de Alcalá at Madrid could be seen a card with the following advertisement: "Sacerdote joven se ofrece de institutriz"—"A young priest offers his services as governess" (*sic*).

the case almost exclusively as it appears to a liberal Roman Catholic, whether layman or priest, our object being to prove that the widespread feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest among the Spanish clergy of to-day has its *raison d'être* apart from questions of dogma. It would undoubtedly be more satisfactory, and inspire more confidence in the future of the country, if the movement were due to the awakening of a spirit of inquiry; yet we must not lose sight of the fact that the great charters to which England owes so many of her present religious privileges had their origin in large measure in a spirit of revolt against ecclesiastical tyranny, and political and social disabilities.

It will be well to regard the matter for a moment from a more general standpoint; for apart from the economic grievance mentioned in passing, the public takes little interest in questions affecting the internal administration of the Church. In approaching the subject of religious orders we come to the crux of the question.

In the year 1820 a large number of the monastic orders were suppressed by Act of Parliament; the same decree prohibited the establishment of fresh monasteries and convents, permitted the secularisation of "religiosos," and authorised the aggregation of religious houses containing less than twenty individuals. An outbreak of popular feeling in 1835 led to yet more radical measures, which resulted in the total suppression of all the remaining orders. No further legislation appears until 1851, when, as we have seen, the present Concordat was ratified. The twenty-ninth article deserves to be quoted in full on account of its direct bearing upon the present crisis:

In order that throughout the Peninsula there may be a sufficient number of ministers and evangelical workers at the service of the prelates for conducting missions in the towns of their respective dioceses, assisting the parish priests, attending the sick, and for other works of charity and public utility, the Government of H.M., which purposes in due course reforming and extending the colleges of foreign missionaries, will take the necessary steps, after consultation with the diocesan prelates, for the establishment, *where required* (the

italics are ours), of religious houses and congregations of the orders of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Philip de Neri, and another from those approved by the Holy See, which will at the same time serve as places of retirement for the clergy, for spiritual exercises, and other pious purposes.[1]

The next article legalises the existence of the community known as Sisters of Charity, as also of those orders of nuns which, to a contemplative life, unite the work of teaching and other charitable labours.

Here we have the case in a nutshell. According to the terms of the Concordat only three orders of friars, nuns engaged in teaching and works of charity, and Sisters of Mercy have a legal existence in the country, and even these are not at liberty to extend their sphere of operations and multiply their establishments at their own pleasure. But what are the facts of the case? Legality, in the sense of acknowledgment of civil law, is a non-existent term in the vocabulary of the Church, and religious orders, like the camel of the fable, require but a slight concession in order to obtain all the privileges if not the rights of proprietorship. The country to-day is covered with a vast network of convents and monasteries, and in the large centres of population scarcely a step can be taken without attention being arrested by some superb building of palatial dimensions, the residence of a community unrecognised by law, but tolerated by a Government either unwilling or incapable of resisting a manifest encroachment upon the liberties of the people. In Barcelona there are one hundred and eighty religious houses, many of them erected at a cost of several hundred thousand pounds; Madrid follows suit with an almost equal number; whilst Bilbao, Malaga, Seville, and other important towns reckon their convents by the score. One is tempted to apply to Spain the oft quoted words of Petronius: "The place is so densely

[1] The order not specified is commonly believed to be that of the Esculapians, but nothing is known with certainty. The ambiguity of the clause, as we shall see later on, leaves, perhaps intentionally, an open door for evading the terms of the compact.

peopled with gods (for *gods* substitute *Jesuits, monks, and nuns*) that there is hardly room for the men." As a matter of fact, this is the complaint heard daily, and echoed far and wide in the daily press: school teachers who have worked hard to obtain their certificates, manufacturers, tradesmen, and artisans are uttering the same lament—"No room to live." Comparatively few of the regular clergy live in cloistered seclusion. Mixing freely in social life, they constitute a direct menace to society; monopolising as far as possible the educational spheres, they threaten to perpetuate indefinitely the superstition and darkness of the mediæval ages; and engaging largely in trade, they not only compete in unfair conditions with the mercantile classes and mechanics, but drain the country of its resources for the aggrandisement of their several communities.

Take for instance the largest and most influential order, the Jesuits. The education of the middle and upper classes is almost entirely in their hands. The lads confided to their care are kept under their direct surveillance through all the stages from primary education to preparation for university degrees; and lest that should prove insufficient, and at a critical age they should lose their hold upon the politicians and leaders of society in embryo, the *padres*, looking with displeasure upon healthy exercise and innocent recreation, form young men's guilds under the the patronage of St. Louis Gonzaga. At these centres the protégés of St. Ignatius spend the greater part of their time in so-called devout exercises, and in reading insipid literature. One cannot but admire the zeal and tact of the propagandists, and if the plan resulted in an awakening and fostering of the spiritual life, and in the formation of noble characters, criticism would be disarmed; but it is not so. A feeble will, a glacial insensibility of heart and mind, and an ignorant fanaticism are the chief products of the system; and those who do succeed in throwing off the yoke almost invariably go the other extreme, and after spending years in the school of Loyola finish their course at the feet of Voltaire.

The watchword of the Jesuit fathers appears to be, "Not the *masses*, but the *classes*." To this intent their churches and oratories offer conditions of comfort and refinement rarely found elsewhere. The one exception to the rule—and this is really no exception, but a means to the same end—is in the case of domestic servants. A perfect system of espionage in the homes of wealthy adherents is necessary to the completion of the chain by which society is led captive at the will of the "Company." What need is there to wonder if, as so often happens, home life is destroyed? The husband and father, no longer master in his own house, is driven to the casino or café, and in the place where peace and joy should reign supreme are endured the horrors of civil war.

The other evil we have mentioned is entirely different, and presses rather upon the commercial and artisan classes. Fine needlework, lace, and embroidery are produced in the convents at no cost beyond that of the material, and offered at prices with which the most skilful and industrious workers can never hope to compete; and whilst commerce is subjected to restrictions and vexatious imposts which press heavily upon the petty tradesman, the religious communities, without contributing a cent to the municipal or national exchequer, manufacture chocolate, vermicelli, liquors, perfumery, cotton goods, and paper, possess printing and book-binding establishments, and compete in their respective trades with carpenters, bootmakers, sculptors, and metal workers.

Many are the evils afflicting Spain, impeding her progress, and threatening speedy dissolution unless frankly acknowledged, boldly faced, and attacked with energy. The greatest of these evils, and the root of all, is, without question, papal supremacy.

II.

Professor Huxley has somewhere said: "If there is no hope of a large improvement of the greater part of the

human family, I would hail as a desirable consummation the advent of a kindly comet which would sweep the whole affair away." Such mournful accents would awaken sympathetic echoes in the hearts of many Spaniards who regard with undisguised concern the condition of their country; yet in the state of public opinion there are favourable signs that inspire the "hope of a large improvement" as the final though not immediate issue of the conflict.

In the presence of a recognised danger the question arises, What is the best and most effectual way to combat it—by heroic measures, or slowly and diplomatically? In the case under consideration the former course is equivalent to a popular movement, followed perhaps by a period of upheaval; the latter policy requires wisdom and patience, combined with a pertinacity and moral fibre which, we greatly fear, may be looked for in vain in the present rulers of the nation. If the quickened pulse of the people can be taken as a reliable symptom, the crisis will be resolved, not by parliament, but by the entity commonly known in Spain as *Juan Pueblo*—the public. Our hopes are centred in the people rather than in their political representatives. Clericalism is not like the Spanish legislative body, corrupt and effete. Corrupt it may be, but in a totally different sense. It is a complex system, well organised, with ramifications extending in every direction, and with power to accomplish its purposes. The nation, on the contrary, as represented in the supreme council, reminds one of those plants which, having lost their vitality, are readily preyed upon by a host of parasites which complete the work of destruction.

The appearance of a strong agitation directed against the invasion of the Peninsula by monastic orders, coinciding with a similar movement in France, would naturally lead enthusiasts to enlarge upon the solidarity of the Latin races. We are disposed, however, to regard the crisis in Spain as independent of the latter, the concurrence in date being purely accidental. Nevertheless, the example shown by the neighbouring state is helpful and stimulating.

When, in the opening weeks of the present century, the popular writer and dramatist, Pérez Galdós, placed upon the stage a play exposing the wiles of Jesuitism, there passed over the country a wave of enthusiasm sufficient to surprise even those accustomed to the demonstrative character of the meridional races. There was nothing in the conception or development of the plot, nor in the literary aspect of the play, to cause it to stand alone as a masterpiece of dramatic art; but appearing at the psychological moment, it precipitated the floating thoughts and sentiments of the majority, and for months Pérez Galdós was the most popular man on the Peninsula. *Electra*, in spite of bishops' pastorals, denunciations from a thousand pulpits, and threats of excommunication for all who witnessed it, was represented throughout the kingdom amid scenes of delirious enthusiasm. The circumstance is interesting and important, not merely as an indication of a nation's thought, but as an instance in which the theatre, amongst a play-loving people, has wielded an influence, for a time at least, beyond that of the press or pulpit. *Electra*, beyond all doubt, contributed largely to the overthrow of Señor Silvela's cabinet, and the Liberal party came into power morally pledged to do something to restrict the growing power of the Jesuits and monastic orders. Meanwhile the Government was receiving petitions from important chambers of commerce, pointing out the anomalous position of the religious communities with regard to trade regulations and taxation, and the danger to which the commercial prosperity of the country was exposed, and urgently pleading for effective legislation on that point. The result was a decree, issued on September 19, allowing the orders a period of six months in which to prove their legal status.

No better instance can be given of the temporising character of Señor Sagasta's cabinet than in the selection of the ambassador to the Vatican. The nature of the proposed reforms called for a liberal-minded man, with the courage of his convictions, to carry on negotiations in Rome. Only in that way could the Government keep faith with the nation. Instead of adopting such a course, Señor

Pidal, a man of pronounced ultramontane views, was, contrary to all precedent, confirmed in the office he had held under the former ministry. The plea urged by the clerical organs, that he was a *persona grata* with Leo XIII. and Cardinal Rampolla, was, in the opinion of the majority, rather a disqualification. The result was what might be expected. Rome, whilst outwardly appearing conciliatory, remains *intransigeante*. At the expiration of the allotted term of six months the orders continued in their characteristic attitude of impassibility, frankly disclaiming allegiance to civil power, and acknowledging obedience only to the head of the Church. Yielding to the clamorous voice of the Liberal press, and to the respectful but energetic representations of the *Círculo de la Unión Mercantil*, the Government issued on April 10, as a sop to Cerberus, a circular addressed to the civil governors, requesting the said authorities to *invite* the religious communities to declare their legal position, and, if not authorised by the Concordat or by a special Royal Decree, to inscribe themselves *provisionally* in a register to be opened for that purpose in the offices of the provincial governors. An explanation given in the Cortes by the Prime Minister proves what most clear thinkers had already perceived, that there is no prospect of a solution from that quarter. Señor Sagasta's speech can be condensed into a few lines:

The differences of opinion existing between H.M. Government and the Papal See have not been satisfactorily settled. It has been generally understood that the twenty-ninth article of the Concordat excludes all religious orders with the exception of the two therein specified, and a third not expressly stated; all others being subject to the *Ley de Asociaciones*, according to which the civil authorities have the exclusive right of approving or disapproving their statutes and regulations, and of interfering in the inversion of funds. Rome objects that this version is incorrect, and that by the terms of the article are included not only the orders therein mentioned, but *all others which have in any way received the exequatur of Rome or the authorisation of the Spanish Government*. Given a difference of opinion between two powers [note the term], the only course open to H.M. Govern-

ment is to enter into diplomatic negotiations with a view to an amicable settlement.

There the matter rests, and we have no hesitation in predicting that the decree of September 19, 1901, and the subsequent circular will remain a dead letter, or serve to illustrate the proverb, ***Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus,*** for an amicable settlement between two unequal powers can only result in the submission of the weaker to the exigences of its rival.

Nor must the existence of the Carlist faction be left out of consideration. The nation is in constant fear of an uprising. During recent years the combative tendencies of Don Carlos's followers have presumably been kept in check by the recognition accorded by the Pope to the present dynasty, though we have reason to believe that, given the probability of establishing the Pretender on the throne, the sin of rebellion against papal instructions would weigh lightly on the Carlist conscience, knowing as they do full well that a successful issue would be immediately followed by absolution and a change of policy at the Vatican. In the meantime, Leo XIII. has only to hint at the possibility of countenancing the Carlists' pretensions in order to bring a recalcitrant Government to its knees.

There are only two ways open to Spain: to submit to papal domination and give up all hope of recovering prestige as an independent state, or to claim boldly the right of "home rule," with freedom to manage her internal affairs in harmony with the interests of the people. That the former course will be adopted by the present ministry, little doubt remains. But the voice of public opinion is making itself heard in the press, in casinos, and wherever the mercantile and working classes congregate, and it is difficult to believe that in this democratic age the people will long refrain from claiming their liberties. Our chief fear is that, through the supine indifference or vacillating policy of successive governments, the "great improvement" may be preceded by a period of revolutionary excess.

III.

Of late the question has repeatedly been asked whether there is any perceptible reform movement within the pale of the Church. Devotion to truth, wherever found, would lead us to welcome a Renaissance, though appearing in the habiliments of Rome. Judging impartially, however, we fail to discover any justification of the cheerful optimism which anticipates the dawn of a great revival within the papal institution. Signs are not wanting of a spirit of unrest and discontent; but the revolt, as already indicated, is against ecclesiastical tyranny. Except in isolated instances, doctrinal questions are seldom raised. Further, it is our honest belief that those words of Dr. Parker, "you reform institutions best oftentimes by remaining within them," cannot be applied to the Church in Spain. Any long continued presentation of unadulterated biblical truth is a manifest impossibility. A Spanish Savonarola would receive Savonarola's reward; not martyrdom, it is true, but its modern equivalent. Should a preacher arise clothed with the spirit of the great Dr. Constantino Ponce de la Fuente, who in the sixteenth century made the walls of Seville Cathedral resound as week after week he proclaimed the truths he had learned at the Master's feet, no status, learning, or eloquence could save him from official censure. The alternative of retractation would be severance from the communion of Rome.

It is also premature to build hopes upon the remote chance of a secession *en masse* from the ranks of the priesthood. A logical mind can readily perceive that in an organisation like the Papacy, the snapping of one link in the chain invalidates the whole hierarchal system; but when the mind is fettered by the scholastic teaching of the seminary, no stimulus is given to independent thought. Whatever may be the grievances of the lower clergy, whatever their laxity in minor matters, unless their faith has been undermined by scepticism, or the plain truths of

Scripture have by some means been revealed to them, the central idea of the Holy Catholic Church, *extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*, is ever present; and those words, of such fearful import to a Catholic, serve as an effectual deterrent to separation.

Sporadic cases of defection from the priesthood are not rare; the number of those who are in perfect sympathy with Protestant doctrine is still greater. The fear of social ostracism, together with the uncertainty of obtaining employment, hinders the latter from taking a step which requires a superlative degree of moral courage. Until the present crisis is resolved no one can foretell what the future of the Roman Catholic Church in Spain will be. If her day of power is declining, a new day of liberty and happiness for the country will ensue. As Jean Paul Richter says: "All the shadows cast by the setting sun point to the East, the place of the sunrise."

FRANKLYN G. SMITH.

DID ST. JOHN EVER LIVE AT EPHESUS?

THIS is more than a question of geographical or antiquarian interest. It is the pivot of the whole "Johannine Problem," one of the most far-reaching and momentous questions in New Testament criticism. If the apostle John never resided at Ephesus, if, as some maintain, he lived till the end of his days as a provincial Jew of Palestine, it is impossible to believe that he can have been the author of any of the books that bear his name—the Fourth Gospel, the three Epistles, and the Apocalypse; because it is an indubitable fact that everyone of these books had its origin in Asia Minor, and because all but the last are redolent with the atmosphere of Hellenic Christianity. On the other hand, if there is good reason to adhere to the traditional view of St. John's long sojourn at the capital of the Roman province of Asia, the crux of the apologists disappears.

After being debated in the schools intermittently for about a century, the problem has now reached an acute stage, and at the same time it has been thrust into the arena of public discussion. Professor Schmiedel's contributions to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, following soon after Harnack's important work on the Chronology of Ancient Christian Literature,[1] taken in conjunction with Mr. Moffatt's *Historical New Testament* and Professor Bacon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, have attracted the attention of a great number of people who had hitherto allowed the discussion to smoulder on without giving it a thought. There is nothing really very novel in Schmiedel's conten-

[1] *Die Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur.*

tions; they had most of them been anticipated by Keim, nearly forty years before.[1] But the new emphasis that has been given to them brings the whole subject up for reconsideration, especially as some details of significance have recently presented themselves as novel contributions to the inquiry.[2]

In the first place, when approaching this intricate question it is necessary to have clearly before us the grounds on which the commonly accepted opinion rests. Let me briefly recapitulate them. Eusebius gives it as an established fact.[3] He wrote his history early in the fourth century, and therefore he was as far removed from the time of St. John as we are from the days of Queen Elizabeth. But he had access to the great library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, most of the treasures of which were subsequently scattered to the winds. Moreover, since Lightfoot's masterly vindication of his knowledge, ability, and character for honesty,[4] followed by Harnack's searching criticism and consequent justification of much in Eusebius that had been previously treated as erroneous,[5] it is no longer reasonable to regard him as an untrustworthy authority. Surely it means much that this learned writer, the most learned man of his age, an immense reader, with multitudes of books at his disposal which have been lost to us, met with nothing to throw doubt on his conviction that the apostle John spent the later years of his life in Ephesus and its neighbourhood. Let it be admitted that Eusebius did not possess the trained critical faculty of a modern German professor—though his detection of a possible error in Irenæus's inter-

---

[1] *Jesus of Nazareth*, Vol. I., pp. 207–228 (English Translation).

[2] For the negative position see Schmiedel in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. "John, the Son of Zebedee"; Harnack, *Chronologie*, Vol. I., pp. 656 ff.; H. Holtzmann, *Einleitung in d. N.T.*, third edition, pp. 470 ff.; and Bousset, *Offenbarung Joh.*, pp. 33 ff.

[3] *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 31.

[4] Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, art. "Eusebius of Cæsarea."

[5] *Chronologie*, Vol. I., pp. 3–69.

pretation of Papias, to which I shall have to return later, shows that he consulted his authorities with an independent mind—still his immense advantage in knowledge counts for much on the other side of the scales. The "silence of Eusebius" only concerns the question of negative evidence. He cites his positive evidence. The chief witness is Irenæus, who lived in Gaul when he wrote his work *Against Heresies* (A.D. 180), but who had been brought up in Asia Minor among the local traditions of the apostle's residence there. The classic passage in which he gives an account of his early intercourse with Polycarp, of Smyrna, familiar as it is, calls for special attention, since it is at once the "palmary proof" and the chief centre of assault. It is necessary, therefore, to have the well known words before us. Irenæus is writing to a presbyter named Florinus, whom he has known in former years when they were both in the habit of listening to the teachings of Polycarp in Asia Minor, but who, now at Rome, has become a convert to the popular gnosticism of Valentinus. In the course of this letter we read :

For I saw thee, when I was still a boy, in Lower Asia in company with Polycarp, while thou were faring prosperously in the royal court, and endeavouring to stand well with him. For I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence ; for the lessons received in childhood [rather boyhood], growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it ; so that I can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life, and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people, and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And whatsoever things he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, would relate altogether in accordance with the Scriptures. To these discourses I used to listen at the time with attention by God's mercy which was bestowed upon me, noting them down, not on paper, but in my

heart; and by the grace of God I constantly ruminate upon them faithfully.[1]

This is the closest link in Church History between patristic and apostolic times. Irenæus has a clear recollection of Polycarp's accounts of his intercourse with St. John. The passage is of unique importance because it so plainly sets forth the writer's authority, and shows us what good right he has to speak on the subject of the apostle's residence in Asia. But it does not stand alone. Elsewhere Irenæus refers to sayings and doings of St. John which we know from this letter to Florinus he might well have learnt, and probably did learn, in part at least, from the apostle's personal disciple Polycarp. Thus he tells the story of John's meeting Cerinthus in the bath-house at Ephesus explicitly on the authority of Polycarp, saying:

There are also those who heard from him that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, exclaiming, "Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus the enemy of the truth is within."[2]

It is to be observed that Irenæus did not get this story at first hand from the Bishop of Smyrna. But his language implies that he had received it from more than one of the hearers of Polycarp, for he writes in the plural, "There are *those*," etc. It is quite in accordance with the character of the John of the Synoptics,[3] and also with the disposition of the author of the three epistles.[4] But whether we are disposed to accept this second-hand tradition or not, exactly as Irenæus gives it us, we must allow that it is based on the assumption of the apostle's residence at Ephesus. In another place Irenæus states that John wrote his gospel expressly to refute Cerinthus, whom he has located at

---

[1] *Letter to Florinus* (translated by Professor Gwatkin).

[2] *Adv. Haer.*, III. iii. 4.

[3] See Mark ix. 38; Luke ix. 49, 54.

[4] See 1 John ii. 4, 18, 22, 23; iv. 1–3; v. 10; 2 John 7, 10, 11; 3 John 9, 10.

Ephesus. We may demur to the statement, but we must allow that this also assumes residence in Ephesus.[1]

Then we have a curious statement of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, the very city in which the apostle is stated to have resided. Writing to Victor, bishop of Rome, about A.D. 196, on the dispute concerning the time for keeping Easter, he gives a list of the "great lights of Asia," in which the following passage occurs:

> And moreover John, who was both a martyr and a teacher, who leaned upon the bosom of the Lord, and became a priest wearing the sacred plate [πέταλον]. He fell asleep at Ephesus.[2]

For the moment we may pass by the singular statement about St. John's priesthood. The main fact to be noted is that Polycrates, who presided over the Church at Ephesus in the second century, states that the apostle had died in that city. There can be no reasonable doubt of the identification, because though the title "apostle" does not appear, and St. John is only called a "martyr," *i.e.* a "confessor," and a "teacher," we have the reference to his place in the Fourth Gospel as leaning "upon the bosom of the Lord."

After this it may seem superfluous to cite the necessarily weaker testimony of later writers, especially as, unlike Irenæus, Polycarp, and Polycrates, most of them do not hail from the neighbourhood of Ephesus. One more witness, however, we have apparently from Ephesus, though his statement is sufficiently startling. This is Apollonius, said to have been bishop of Ephesus.[3] Eusebius has preserved some fragments of his work against the Montanists, among which is the statement that "a dead man was raised by the divine power, through the same John, at Ephesus."[4]

---

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, III. ix. 1.

[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 24.

[3] On the doubtful authority of the writer of *Praedestinatus*, edited by Sirmond. See Canon Venables in *Dic. of Christ. Biog.*, art. "Apollonius."

[4] *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 18.

People who accept the narrative of Tabitha[1] as authentic history can scarcely be expected to stumble when reading of an incident in which precisely the same power is ascribed to St. John that is there ascribed to St. Peter. But for my present purpose the significant fact is that again, in the writings of a man who is located with some degree of probability at Ephesus, the apostle is said to have been found in that city. The beautiful story of St. John and the Robbers, which tells how the apostle went into the mountains to bring back a young man who had deserted the Church and joined a robber band, is first found in Clement of Alexandria, who wrote towards the end of the second century.[2] But Clement derives his information of earlier times from certain people whom he calls "the elders," a term which seems to point to men of a former generation, whose traditions he values, especially with reference to Asia Minor. Here, then, once more St. John appears in that same district. When we go farther afield, for instance to Tertullian in North Africa, we meet with the apocryphal story of St. John at Rome cast into a cauldron of boiling oil and miraculously saved from suffering a martyr's death.[3] Lastly, we have the apocryphal *Acts of John*,[4] followed by Isidore of Seville,[5] relating the legend of the apostle drinking poison with immunity. The interest of such baseless fancies is to be found in the contrast they afford to the sober statements that have come down to us from the earlier witnesses. By comparison the very sobriety of those statements is in favour of their genuineness. On that account we class with them St. Jerome's anecdote, though it is not met with till the fourth century, which tells how the old man whenever he was carried into the church would repeat the one exhortation, "Little children, love one another."[6]

When we draw all these lines of evidence together, and especially when we give due weight to the earliest testimony,

---

[1] Acts ix. 36–43. [2] *Quis. Div. Salv.*, xlii. [3] *De Praes. Haer.*, 36.
[4] Edit. Bousset, ix. [5] *De Ortu et Obitu Sanctorum*, lxxii.
[6] *Com. in Gal.*, vi. 10.

it is difficult to resist the conclusion that few items of ancient history have better attestation than the statement that in his old age St. John resided at Ephesus.

How, then, is it possible to rebut so solid a mass of evidence? The assault upon it is made in two ways: first, by undermining the evidence itself and bringing to light what are said to be flaws in it; and secondly, by adducing witnesses who are said to contradict it. Let us consider each of these lines of attack.

I.

The evidence for the commonly accepted belief in St. John's residence at Ephesus has been subjected to searching analysis with the result that fatal flaws have been said to be detected in it. The brunt of the attack has to be borne by Irenæus, as he is the chief witness on whom the apologists rely; and one *pièce de résistance*, the *Letter to Florinus*, is more particularly singled out for criticism. It is evident that if the current view of that writing were allowed to stand unchallenged the case for the defence would be unanswerable, for nothing could be more definite and explicit. How, then, is it attacked? In a fragment of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis—to the consideration of which I shall return later—that Father mentions two Johns, one of whom he evidently identifies with the son of Zebedee, as he names him in association with the other apostles, while he describes the other as an elder and disciple of the Lord. As we shall have to examine this passage somewhat closely, it is as well that we should have it before us in full. Taken from Papias's lost work, *The Oracles of the Lord*, and preserved in Eusebius, it runs as follows:

> But I will not scruple to give a place for you along with my interpretations to everything that I learnt carefully and remembered carefully in time past from the elders, guaranteeing its truth. For, unlike the many, I did not take pleasure in those who have so very much to say, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who relate foreign commandments, but in those [who

record] such as were given from the Lord to the faith, and are derived from the truth itself. And again on any occasion when a person came [in my way] who had been a follower of the elders, I would inquire about the discourses of the elders —what was said by Andrew, or by Peter, or by Philip, or by Thomas, or James, or by John or Matthew or any other of the Lord's disciples, and what Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say, for I did not get so much profit from the contents of books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice.[1]

One would think the fact that this passage plainly referred to two men of the name of John must be apparent to any unprejudiced reader. It has been maintained[2] that Papias is referring to one and the same man, the apostle John, in both places where he uses the name; but no valid reason can be given for so confusing a repetition. Now, it is asserted that Irenæus was in error when he described Polycarp as a disciple of the apostle John. It was the second John, "Presbyter John," as he has been called, whom Polycarp knew; so that what Irenæus heard from Polycarp has really no bearing on the question of St. John's residence at Ephesus. In order to support this contention two arguments are brought forward. The first is based on the idea of the extreme youth of Irenæus at the time when he had an opportunity of hearing Polycarp. He says that he was a "boy" at the time, and refers to lessons learnt in "boyhood"; and in another place he writes concerning Polycarp, "whom I saw in our early youth."[3] But Bishop Lightfoot showed that the Greek word rendered boy (παῖς) was used for persons who were no longer children;[4] and

---

[1] Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, iii. 39 (trans. by Professor Gwatkin).

[2] By Milligan, Riggenbach, Zahn, Salmon in Smith's *Dic. of Christ. Biog.*, art. "Joannes (444) Presbyter."

[3] ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ. Irenæus *Adv. Haer.*, III. iii. 4.

[4] Thus in the *Epistle of the Gallican Churches* Ponticus is described as παιδάριον ὡς πεντεκαιδεκα ἐτῶν (*Hist. Eccl.*, v. 1); according to Eusebius, Constantine describes himself as κομιδῇ παῖς (*Vit. Con.*, ii. 51), when he must have been thirty years of age; Polybius speaks of

though undoubtedly the language of Irenæus implies that he was but a lad when he saw Polycarp—he twice draws attention to the fact—it by no means indicates the period of childish ignorance. His reference to his recollection of that early time shows that he was perfectly well aware of what he had seen and heard.

In the second place, the force of Irenæus's statement is said to be reduced by the apparent fact that he made exactly the same mistake with regard to Papias which he is here suspected of making in the case of Polycarp. Irenæus described Papias as a "hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp."[1] But Eusebius argued that the words of Papias himself—in the passage which I have just quoted—are inconsistent with that notion. Dr. Abbott has recently supported Eusebius's contention very strongly; and there is a general disposition among scholars to accept its conclusion as final. The chief point lies in the change of tense, where Papias, after speaking of John and his fellow-apostles in the *past* tense, proceeds to mention two other men, Aristion and the presbyter John, in the *present*. He says that it was his habit to inquire "what *was said* by Andrew . . . or by John," etc., "and what Aristion and the Elder John, disciples of the Lord, *say*." Thus, it is contended, while Papias was contemporary with Aristion and John the Elder, he refers to John the Apostle as one who had died before his time. Hence it is supposed that Irenæus mistook Papias's personal knowledge of John the Elder for a personal knowledge of the apostle John.

But can we be so sure that the case against Irenæus is proved? Strictly speaking all the passage indicates is that

---

Flamininus as νέος κομιδῇ, "very young," because he is not more than thirty years old (xvii. 12). Referring to the passage in *Adv. Haer.*, III. iii. 4, Renan takes it to mean "un jeun grec d'une quinzaine d'années" (*L'Eglise Chr.*, p. 439); and Lipsius argues from Irenæus's use of the word "that the age of the πρεῖς will commence . . . say about the eighteenth year." See Lightfoot, *Apos. Fath.*, Part II., Vol. I., p. 432, note.

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, V. xxxiii. 4.

at the time of writing John the son of Zebedee was dead, while John the Elder appears to have been still alive. But the latter position is impossible. Harnack has shown that Papias's work could not have been written till the year 140 at earliest,[1] that it is to say, one hundred and ten years after the death of Christ. If Aristion and John the Elder were indeed personal disciples of our Lord, they must have been dead long before this. But Papias writes as though he were reciting in old age reminiscences of his habits of bygone days. Many years may have passed since he collected his information from the "elders." Therefore that may have been done during the lifetime of some few survivors of the generation of disciples who had actually seen Jesus. At that time the apostles may have all died, although Aristion and John the Elder may have been lingering on, representing a faint afterglow of the gospel times. This does not conflict with the possibility that still earlier, when quite in his youth, Papias may even have seen the apostle John. But, it will be objected, if this were the case, he would have been under no necessity to collect traditions at second hand. That objection, however, applies just as much to his relations with John the Elder. It is generally assumed that Papias was acquainted with this personal disciple of our Lord, as the elder from whom he derived several pieces of information. If so, how could Papias be under any necessity to collect information about this man at second hand, as he says he did? He made inquiries about the elder whom he is said to have met with in the earlier part of his life, though that man was living at the time, in just the same way in which he made inquiries concerning the apostle who was dead at the time. All that this shows is that in both cases the persons concerning whom he desired to obtain information were inaccessible to him, those of the first series by reason of their death, those of the second probably because of their distance from him. But if this does not forbid the belief that Papias had enjoyed

[1] *Chron.*, I. 357.

a measure of personal intercourse with the then living elder at a previous period of his life, why should it exclude the idea that he may also have had some personal contact with the apostle perhaps at a still earlier period? The fact that the apostle was dead at the time of the inquiries does not affect this point. There is therefore no proof that Irenæus made the mistake which Eusebius attributes to him.

But now, waiving this point, and granting for the sake of argument that Irenæus was in error with regard to Papias, it by no means follows that he is equally likely to have been in error with respect to Polycarp; because his relations with the two were entirely different. He is particular to tell Florinus how reverently and observantly he had listened to Polycarp, how well he had treasured up his recollections of the discourses that fell from that teacher's lips, and therefore how sure he is that he cannot be mistaken as to the apostolic tradition which he had received in this way. That is just the pith and point of his letter. But he says nothing of the kind about Papias. He represents himself as a devoted disciple of Polycarp. He says nothing to lead us to suppose that he was in any way a disciple of Papias. He does not even suggest that he had ever seen the man. As far as we know, he may only have read Papias's book, and may never have had any personal relations with him. In that case, Irenæus might easily fall into an error about the unknown author. If he did, that would be slight ground indeed for suspecting the accuracy of what he said about his own master, the teacher whose utterances he had listened to so attentively and retained in memory so vividly. If Dean Stanley had been found to have made some erroneous statement concerning some literary man whom he may never have met, would that be sufficient reason for distrusting the information he gives us about his honoured master, Arnold of Rugby? We have only to look the matter fairly in the face, to well weigh the significance of Irenæus's very explicit description of his relations with Polycarp, in order to see on how solid a foundation what he says about

the Bishop of Smyrna stands compared with the possibly very slight basis of knowledge about Papias on which we may suppose him to have made his remark about that Father.

And then, further, it should be observed that Irenæus's aim in referring to the relations of Polycarp and Papias with John are very different. He describes his memories of Polycarp for the express purpose of guaranteeing an apostolic tradition. Therefore, here the link of connexion with John is vital, is all-important. But when mentioning Papias he has no such end in view, and Papias's connexion with John is simply introduced in the most casual way as a descriptive fact that it may possibly interest the reader to know. In the one case we have a solemn appeal to precious memories; in the other a mere passing observation from which no conclusions are drawn. The cases are so entirely different in respect to the sources of information, the writer's aims, and his way of treating them, that we must not allow any possible error that may be detected in the one to cast discredit on the other. But if the testimony of Irenæus cannot be overthrown, it will take more solid evidence on the other side than has yet been forthcoming to outweigh it.

Let us now turn to our second witness, Polycrates of Ephesus. In his case the first difficulty lies in the curious remark that John "became a *priest*, and wore the sacred plate (*petalon*)." Of course if this were to be taken literally it could not be applied to the apostle. But then, neither would it fit John the Elder or any other Christian, for this sacred plate was part of the head-dress worn only by the Jewish high-priest.[1] Accordingly some have even ventured on the conjecture that John the Elder had really been high-priest in the temple at Jerusalem—an impossible supposition. Nor is it possible to believe that a man in the position of Polycrates, the head of the important Church at the capital of the Roman province of "Asia," could have fallen into so

[1] Exod. xxviii. 36.

huge a blunder as to have imagined anything of the kind. Since the Old Testament constituted the Scriptures of the early Christians, and was read every week in the assemblies for worship, Polycrates must have been familiar with it. The time is too early for any idea of the priesthood of the Christian ministry to have been intended; this did not appear till the third century. The only alternative is that Polycrates is writing in highly figurative language. There are several phrases in the fragment which Eusebius has preserved, from which we may conclude that it was his habit to indulge in the "florid-Asiatic style." The idea of the priesthood, even the high-priesthood, of Christians was not unfamiliar to the early Christians. Thus Justin Martyr writes: "We are the true high-priestly race of God."[1] Polycrates may have meant that the revered apostle went about with the marks of one who was indeed God's high-priest upon him. At all events, whether we can understand the phrase or not, the difficulty it occasions is not grave enough to invalidate the clear statement of Polycrates that John died at Ephesus, the very city of which this Father was bishop in the last decade of the second century. He tells us that he has been "sixty-five years in the Lord."[2] Then he must have been born at least as early as A.D. 130; Harnack dates his birth at A.D. 125, that is only about twenty-seven years later than the time Irenæus gives as the time of the death of John the Apostle (A.D. 98). It is difficult to think that a man so placed could have made so great a mistake as is attributed to him by those who deny that John was ever at Ephesus.

But now we come upon a curious coincidence. Just as Irenæus has been accused of confusing the two Johns in his account of Papias, Polycrates is charged with confusing the two Philips. In the New Testament we read of Philip the Apostle, and also of another Philip, one of the seven, and a noted evangelist. According to Eusebius's extract,

---

[1] *Tryph.*, 116. See Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 345.
[2] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 24.

Polycrates, speaking of the great lights of Asia, says: "Among these are Philip, one of the twelve apostles, who fell asleep in Hierapolis; and his two aged virgin daughters, and another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and now rests at Ephesus."[1] It is generally taken for granted that Polycrates must be referring to Philip the Evangelist, but mistaking him for the apostle, because we read in Acts, "This man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy."[2] Is it not too much to assume that Philip of Cæsarea in Palestine with four preaching daughters must have been the same person as Philip in the Lycus valley, because the latter had two unmarried daughters and one married daughter who lived a spiritual life? If, however, we concede this point and allow that Polycrates may have made the mistake with which he is charged, still the cases of John and Philip are by no means parallel. When writing about St. John, Polycrates was referring to a previous leader of the very Church of which he was bishop, in a sense his own predecessor; but Philip had lived in another town, possibly never visited by Polycrates. Then John was a more important apostle than Philip; and the various allusions to him in different writers show that, whoever he was, the John of Asia was a more prominent person than the Philip of that province. A writer of a later generation would be in greater danger of falling into some confusion of mind with regard to the more obscure person.

II.

I now proceed to consider the evidence that is adduced with the idea of showing that St. John could not have been residing at Ephesus as the common tradition of the Churches has affirmed. Here our first witness is Papias again. It does not go for much that this writer, in a passage already cited, places the apostle John in a list contain-

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 24. [2] Acts xxi. 9.

ing other apostles, most if not all of whom he had never seen, and even towards the end of that list. We might have expected that he would have spoken in a different way of John if he had ever had the privilege of meeting that one apostle. But then he treats Aristion and John the Elder in much the same way, although at all events he is supposed to have known the latter of these two. Again it is urged, supposing that Eusebius was right in arguing that Papias did not know John, is not that very remarkable, if Papias was a companion of Polycarp and yet Polycarp knew John? How can one companion have been a disciple of John, and the other not? Very easily, especially if they were not companions at the time of this discipleship. St. Paul laboured for some time at Ephesus, but he seems never to have visited Hierapolis, or Laodicea, or Colossæ, the three cities of the Lycus valley. Thus Papias and John may never have met, though Polycarp may have known John. Then at a later time Papias may have met Polycarp and the friendship between them have sprung up.

But now another passage seemingly of a more damaging character has been adduced. In a manuscript of the *Chronicle* of George the Monk, who lived in the ninth century, we read:

> John the Apostle after he had written his gospel suffered martyrdom, for Papias in the second book of the *Logia Kuriaka* says that he was put to death by the Jews, thus plainly fulfilling along with his brother the prophecy of Christ regarding them and their own confession and common agreement concerning him (alluding to Mark x. 38).[1]

The manuscript containing this sentence states further that Origen also, in his Commentary on Matthew, says that he has learnt from successors of the apostles that John had been a martyr. But nothing of the kind is to be found in Origen. Then Zahn pointed out that this passage attributed to George is only contained in one manuscript, while there are as many as twenty-seven manuscripts in which the

[1] Georgios Hamartolos, iii. 134.

sentence ends differently. Accordingly Lightfoot, resting on Origen's Commentary to which reference was made, conjectured that the passage ran as follows: "Papias says that John [was condemned by the Roman emperor (and sent) to Patmos, for bearing witness (to the truth) while James] was slain by the Jews." Harnack accepts this proposed emendation. Be that as it may, the case that rests on the feeble testimony of one manuscript copy of a ninth-century monk's writings must be considered to have broken down altogether, if it were not supported by other evidence. But now a startling fresh piece of evidence, adduced by de Boor in the year 1888, demands our attention. This is the document held to be derived from the *Chronicle* of Philip of Sidé, one of Chrysostom's deacons, about A.D. 430, which contains the following statement:

> Papias says in his second book that John the Divine (*i.e.* the apostle) and his brother James were slain by the Jews.

Thus George the Monk of the ninth century seems to be confirmed by Philip of Sidé in the fifth. He too ascribes what he asserts to the second book of Papias. There is no lost book of early Christianity that we could more anxiously desire the explorers of Egyptian tombs and Greek monasteries to discover than Papias's *Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord*. Meanwhile, since unfortunately we only possess a few small fragments of this work, we are left to many conjectures. In the first place, it is quite possible that the editor of George's manuscript who inserted the phrase in question may have been dipping into Philip's *Chronicle*, and there have found the statement ascribed to Papias. He would not have been the only editor who has ventured to copy out supposed quotations, taking them second hand without verifying his references.[1] Or of course there may have been a manuscript of Papias containing it which both of them saw and from which both extracted it indepen-

[1] St. John's title, "the Divine," at all events could not have been found in Papias. It did not appear before the fourth century.

dently. One thing I will make bold to say with positive assurance: when Papias's book is discovered, if ever that fortunate event should occur, the statement about John's martyrdom *will not be in it.* For see how the matter stands in the light of the voluminous remains of patristic literature. Nowhere throughout the whole range of this literature previous to the year 430, and then only in one obscure writer, is any acquaintance with it betrayed. The only tradition concerning the apostle which has been preserved in the Church is that which is based on the statements of Irenæus and Polycrates, to the effect that he lived and died at Ephesus in old age. Yet all this time Papias's work was extant and accessible. How is it, then, that nobody detected its contradiction to the popular tradition? The *Alogi* of the second century who denied the Johannine authorship both of the Fourth Gospel and of the Apocalypse would have found Papias a splendid witness in support of their objection to the popular notion if they could have laid their fingers on this passage. Yet we may be sure they did nothing of the kind, for not the faintest echo of such a procedure has reached us. We may go further. We know for certain that Eusebius was acquainted with Papias's work; the same may be said of Irenæus. How is it, then, that neither of these men refers to a statement that is so contrary to their own assertions about the later life of St. John? What is the meaning of this unbroken silence on the part of men who knew Papias and his work? It can only mean that they did not perceive in him a contradiction to the view they unanimously and unhesitatingly adopted. Or, if we allow any conceivable alternative, it must be that they treated Papias's statement with pure indifference as an obvious error not worth any attention. Now we may think what we please of their critical judgment. Still it cannot be denied that these men were possessed of sources of information that are inaccessible to us. Nevertheless all they saw and heard did not allow them to give this statement any lodgment in their minds, although, according to the hypothesis, they had it before them in a well known book.

Lastly, if in spite of all this we stand by Philip of Sidé and maintain that Papias must have said what Chrysostom's deacon attributes to him, what have we to face? A certain unsupported assertion of Papias. This was contradicted by his companion Polycarp, for we have seen that Irenæus's account of Polycarp cannot be brushed aside as of no account; and we have Polycrates and the other witnesses considered earlier. Why should Papias be accepted at the expense of rejecting all this testimony? Is he so great an authority? He was accounted by one who knew his work well "a man of little mind." We do not know that he was well informed about John. For those who hold that Eusebius was right in arguing that he did not know the apostle this remark should have double force. Surely here is but small ground on which to raise up a refutation of our tradition.

The remainder of the evidence adduced in opposition to the idea of St. John's residence at Ephesus is chiefly of a negative character. The most important witness is Ignatius. Until comparatively recently the dispute about the genuineness of the Ignatian letters had left so much doubt on the question that it was not possible to appeal to them with any degree of confidence. But Lightfoot's masterly vindication of the seven shorter Greek letters, agreeing with Zahn's conclusions, and accepted by Harnack, has brought them fairly within the arena of discussion as the authentic writings of the martyr bishop of Antioch. Now it is an acknowledged fact that these epistles are saturated with what we regard as Johannine thoughts and phrases, that is to say, with thoughts and phrases we meet with in the Fourth Gospel and the three epistles commonly attributed to St. John. Moreover, the date of the martyrdom of Ignatius appears to be fixed at between A.D. 110 and 117. After his arrest Ignatius was taken to Rome by way of Smyrna and Troas. At Smyrna he met Polycarp. Thus he passed through the district where St. John is said to have lived in his old age, certainly within twenty, possibly within twelve, years of the time of the apostle's

death, according to Irenæus. We may neglect the late tradition[1] that he was a disciple of John as of no account. Still, time and place would seem to concur in bringing him very near to the source of the Johannine traditions. Nevertheless, throughout the whole of his seven epistles Ignatius does not once name the apostle John. He refers to Peter and Paul, never to John. Even in writing to Ephesus, the very city in which John is said to have been living but a few years before, he does not mention that apostle, but goes back to Paul, fifty years earlier, saying :

> Ye are associated in the mysteries with Paul, who was sanctified, who obtained a good report, who is worthy of all felicitation ; in whose footsteps I would fain be found treading, when I shall attain unto God ; who in every letter maketh mention of you in Christ Jesus.[2]

This silence is certainly perplexing. But the following considerations may help to account for it : (1) St. Paul was the founder of the Church at Ephesus, a fact that must always have given his name weight there. The Paul who planted would seem more important than the Apollos who watered, even when that Apollos was himself also an apostle. (2) The reference to *treading in Paul's footsteps* in *attaining unto God* evidently points to the writer's approaching martyrdom. In this he would follow Paul who had preceded him to Rome, and there had suffered martyrdom. This was not the case with John. (3) Ignatius refers to St. Paul's epistles and their references to the Ephesians. It is likely that when on his journey to Rome he turned to the epistles written from the imperial city in prison, in view of approaching death, for his own encouragement. This would lead him to think of them when writing to one of St. Paul's Churches. (4) There is no reason to suppose that the position of John in the early Church was any way so important as

[1] It is first met with in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, and then only in Jerome's revision.

[2] Ignatius, *Ephesians*, xii. 2.

that of Peter, the chief apostle of the Jews, or Paul, the chief apostle of the Gentiles. Then the latest memories of John would be those of his extreme old age; and while Jerome's tradition about his being repeatedly carried into the church always to give utterance to the same simple, affectionate admonition, is very beautiful, it does not suggest great mental power. It is likely that the great name of Paul, looming out of the past, stood higher in the minds of later generations than the name of an apostle who had lingered on to the feebleness of extreme old age.

Further, it is in writing to the Romans that Ignatius mentions Peter and Paul together, saying, "I do not enjoin you, as Peter and Paul did."[1] Now here we must remember that certainly Paul and probably Peter had been to Rome. Ignatius is alluding to admonitions given to the Romans by these two apostles; when naming Paul he may be thinking of our New Testament Epistle to the Romans. The name of John could not have been brought in here, for that apostle had nothing to do with Rome. Besides, Ignatius had been bishop of Antioch, a city where Paul and Peter had been well known and where traditions of them would have lingered. John had no such connexion with Antioch. On the other hand, Ignatius had never resided at Ephesus, so as to collect the Johannine traditions of the Church in that city. It is natural that he should have referred to the two apostles who were best known in his own city, rather than to a comparative stranger.

The case of Polycarp's epistle may seem more difficult, if we are to regard its writer as actually a disciple of John, for, like Ignatius, Polycarp also is silent with regard to the name of John, though he mentions Paul three times.[2] But here also some of the explanations I have suggested in the case of Ignatius may hold good, especially the greater importance of Peter and Paul in the eyes of the Church. Then Polycarp is writing to Philippi, the seat of St. Paul's favourite Church. There is no reason to imagine that St. John ever visited

[1] Ignatius, *Romans*, iv. 3.

[2] Polycarp, *Philippians*, iii. 2, ix. 1, xi. 3.

that Church. Polycarp had good reason to remind the Philippians of their great founder and friend. If in doing so he was silent about another apostle who could only have been known to them by name, is the omission altogether inexplicable? Surely it is most natural and reasonable.

The next name in Schmiedel's list of witnesses whose silence is adduced in proof that St. John was never at Ephesus is that of Justin Martyr. This is simply amazing. I am utterly at a loss to fathom the reasoning that can have led to its appearance. In the very article where this occurs Schmiedel states that Justin Martyr ascribed the Apocalypse to John the Apostle. That is an obvious fact which nobody can deny.[1] But it is equally beyond question that the Apocalypse belongs to Asia Minor, the region of all the "seven churches" therein addressed. Then to assign it to the apostle John is to imply that the apostle had been in Asia Minor. Therefore the testimony of Justin Martyr must be carried over to the other side, and he must be claimed as a witness in favour of the Ephesian residence.

The next witness whose silence is appealed to is Hegesippus. But we have only fragments of his writings; we do not know what he may have said about St. John in the bulk of his book which has been lost; nor do we know that he would have had any occasion to mention the apostle's life at Ephesus at all.

Another witness supposed to be adverse is the *Muratorian Fragment*, a portion of a canon of Scripture probably written at Rome towards the end of the second century, which represents John as in company with Andrew and other disciples and bishops when it is decided that he shall write the gospel. But the story is so thoroughly legendary that no weight can be attached to it.

Lastly, St. Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders in Acts is said to exclude the possibility of St. John's residence at Ephesus. We are told that "those who were to come into the Church at Ephesus after Paul's departure would assuredly not have been designated as evil wolves if the

[1] See *Tryph.*, 81.

apostle John had been his successor there."[1] This objection assumes that the speech is not genuine, and attributes it to the writer of the Acts; it assumes, further, that the book was written after John had taken up his residence at Ephesus. Even if we allow these two assumptions, is it fair to describe John as Paul's "successor" without noting that some years must have passed between the times of the two apostles at Ephesus? Many evil influences may have crept in during the interval. St. John denounces "antichrists" who might very well correspond to St. Paul's "wolves."

Thus striking as the adverse evidence is made to appear when it is simply stated in mass, no sooner do we proceed to analyse it than it begins to crumble to pieces. Even if there are points in this adverse evidence which strike us as somewhat forcible, if indeed some of the objections appear to be unanswered, still we must not regard these objections by themselves as though they constituted the whole case. What are we to say to the positive evidence which we were examining in the first instance? This too must be reckoned with. We must weigh the two kinds of testimony one against the other. Here is no room for a compromise, the favourite English way of evading a difficulty. It is a question of "yes" or "no." If the answer is to be negative, then the whole of what was written in the early Church on the subject was based on a pure delusion, was concerned with nothing better than a phantom. After all, perhaps the strongest argument against this negative conclusion is Wendt's, when he says, "How has it come about, that here in Asia Minor a circle of Christians existed, among whom the disciple whom Jesus loved, who had leaned on His bosom, was the object of special interest, of special devout reverence? This question finds its simplest answer if we hold the tradition of the Asia Minor residence of the old apostle John to be correct."[2]

WALTER F. ADENEY.

[1] See Acts xx. 29.

[2] *Das Johannesevangelium. Eine Untersuchung seiner Entstehung und seines geschichtlichen Wertes.* 1900.

THE BETTER EDUCATION OF THE MINISTRY.

EIGHTEEN months ago an article appeared in this REVIEW on "The Higher Education of the Ministry." That article was written *à propos* of the movement initiated in the year 1899 for improving the system of the Wesleyan Theological Institution. The subject has been under the consideration of a Special Committee—indeed of a series of special committees and sub-committees—during the last three years; and this long gestation may be expected to bear some fruit in the shape of definite proposals for reorganisation to be submitted to the Conference of 1902. The present is therefore a fit opportunity for recalling the attention of our readers to this important question, and for laying before them some of the chief considerations and possibilities which have been in the minds of those actively engaged upon it. The problem has proved to be one of peculiar difficulty and complexity, reducing the committees at one time or other almost to despair; and it will not be surprising if an even longer period of inquiry, and perhaps of experiment, should be necessary before the Church's plans for the training of her ministry are settled on a basis completely satisfactory and permanent.

In the former article we approached the subject from the outside, discussing it as it is involved in the general educational advance of the times, and as a common problem with which all the Churches of the country are concerned. We indicated the points of resemblance and difference between the system of training adopted by the Methodist Churches and those prevailing elsewhere,—the peculiarities of the Wesleyan Institution having, as we showed, an intimate connexion with the ethos and history of the

Wesleyan ministry. We touched upon the present position, financial and educational, of the four colleges, disclosing what are, in our judgment, the serious and indeed distressing defects which attach to the existing order of things. We ask our readers to be good enough to turn back to the former number of the REVIEW, for January, 1901, by way of introduction to this continued examination. In order to make the bearing of the forthcoming plans perfectly clear, it will be necessary to dwell a second time, and in greater detail, upon the features of the situation before us, and to show more distinctly the drawbacks and disabling circumstances under which the educational work of the Institution labours as it is now conducted.

When the Institution was first opened, a little more than sixty years back, nothing further was contemplated than a two years' course of study, for accepted candidates for the ministry of inferior education. Along with Methodist doctrine and constant practice and oversight in preaching, English grammar and history, logic and rhetoric, the rudiments of Latin and Greek, with Hebrew in a few select instances, formed the staple of the Institution teaching. Young men of tolerable attainments were then, and for many years afterwards, drafted into active service at once; and the Institution provided schools well suited to drill and polish the large number of raw recruits, full of zeal and piety and native power, whom the country circuits sent up to reinforce the ranks of the preachers, and to imbue them with the tenets and spirit of a working evangelical theology. No system of national education then existed; and while the middle classes were advancing in culture, and an educated laity was making its influence felt in the demand for a higher standard of knowledge and refinement in the pastorate, the body of our people were not exacting in this respect and were apt to be suspicious rather than otherwise of "college-bred" men. All the while the calls of home and foreign fields were urgent, "the harvest plenteous and the labourers few"; men were "thrust out" into the circuit work who greatly needed college discipline, and those who

went into the Institution were commonly "thrust out," as alas! in many instances to this day, after a brief and hasty preparation and so soon as they were barely presentable.

The Church was working under the pressure of an arduous campaign; the newly enlisted were sent to the front at the earliest possible moment, in order to keep the regiments up to fighting strength. No thought could then be entertained of a full curriculum, of a mature and thorough preparation for the life-work of the Christian ministry. Methodism, it was understood, was not a learned Church; its mission was to the multitude; its schools of the prophets were no "colleges," nor their tutors "professors"; and it became almost a watchword that their business was "not to breed scholars, but preachers." Stress was especially laid—indeed, it continues to be laid—upon the moral and disciplinary as distinguished from the scholastic life of the Institution. The residential plan, uniformly adopted, has given opportunities for cultivating the religious fellowship and for nourishing and educating the spirit of comradeship, which are the true life of Methodism, for developing that staunch brotherhood of the ministry which is almost unique in its kind, and which has conserved our unity throughout the exciting conflicts and severe strains of the last fifty years. The Theological Institution was well and wisely planned for its primary ends; and it has, in the main, excellently fulfilled them.

But our lot is cast in times very different from those of our grandfathers, the founders of the Institution. Popular education, however crude in its present stage and disappointing in some of its results, has made a vast and pervasive change in the conditions of the Church's work; it has diffused a mental atmosphere and awakened a spirit of questioning and a reflective temper even in the most retired rural districts, which had a comparatively limited range in the days of the early Methodist preachers. Of recent years the work of Methodism, under the impulse of the Forward Movement, has received large and fruitful development in the great cities; and the centre of gravity of the

Church, with that of the whole life of England, has shifted in this direction,—to those busy centres where thought is keenest and social questions are most acute, where the intellectual as well as the material competitions of life are most strenuous, and where the heaviest demands are made on the powers of heart and mind in the leaders of the Church.

The influence of Methodism itself, contributing so largely to raise the social and intellectual level of what are called the "lower classes" of the country, has given birth in its own children to tastes and powers which breed inevitable discontent with the style of things in public ministration that satisfied their fathers,—a discontent which it would be a sin against charity to set down to mere spiritual degeneracy and loss of faith. The Methodist community has taken its full share in the nation's advance in material resources and general culture. Our special constituency belongs to those ranks of society which have made the greatest strides in prosperity during the last few decades, and which are availing themselves most freely of modern educational facilities. More than others of the Free Churches, the Wesleyan Methodists have themselves entered into this great field; the Wesleyan schoolmaster, whether serving the Denominational or the Board school, in many quarters is almost as conspicuous and, possibly, in some instances quite as influential a person as the Wesleyan minister. Our elementary, secondary, and high schools have given us an important place and a responsible interest in the training of the country. They provide for our ministry hearers whom we have taught to expect the best and highest things from their religious teachers. Unless our spiritual keeps pace with our intellectual and æsthetic culture, unless our Theological Colleges in particular are equipped and served with an efficiency to match those of the secular professions, the interests of religion are bound to suffer; in the opinion of many well qualified to judge, those interests are gravely suffering from this disadvantage at the present time. A zeal for education which remains

indifferent or illiberal toward the highest and most sacred branch of education, namely the training of the Christian ministry, is suicidal in any Church; for it means the educating of the laity to despise the ministry.

Within the same period religious thought has undergone a revolution, in a great measure silent and gradual, but far-reaching in its effects, the full significance of which our children will realise better than ourselves. Natural science and historical research have tested the foundations of Christian belief, and have irresistibly modified and in some respects transformed its methods of teaching. Biblical criticism—a name scarcely heard in British theological schools sixty years ago, or known as a perilous innovation of German neologians—has come in like a flood, changing the entire landscape and threatening to sweep down the fabric of dogmatic faith. Our Commentaries, our Manuals of Doctrine, our Bible Dictionaries have had to be re-written; the Bible itself, in text and translation, has been "revised." Not merely in the general conditions and temper of the age, but in the peculiar exigencies, the unprecedented perplexities and hazards of current Christian learning, urgent reasons have come into existence for an advance in the training of the Wesleyan ministry and for the provision of a powerful staff in its colleges—a provision to be calculated on a scale altogether different from that fixed in the day of small things and limited aims, and of comparatively undisturbed theological tradition, in which the Institution took its rise. These are not the easy times of "dogmatic slumber," when Horne's *Introduction*, for example, contained the sum of biblical learning, and when a well arranged and well-worn scheme of doctrinal definitions and proof-texts furnished the young divine with an ample framework for his pulpit exercises, and met fairly enough the intellectual demands of his ministry. The long-settled questions of the faith once delivered to the saints are reopened; every inch of the theological domain is contested, and the positions most securely won are challenged from new quarters. There are no servants of the Church

who hold just now a more anxious post and one less to be envied—none have greater need to entreat, "Brethren, pray for us," or require greater patience and consideration—than theological professors and biblical tutors. If they stumble or miss the way, as harassed and over-driven men are apt to do, the injury and trouble will not be theirs alone.

In one respect, to be sure, a great change has by degrees come about in the conduct of the Institution. Its student constituency is not only much larger, but very much more various than it was during the first period of its history. Then only the most needy probationers were sent for training; and their being so sent was considered something of an infliction upon them—a delay and unfortunate necessity, holding them back from their proper work. Now the rule is that every young preacher shall pass through the Institution, even though he be an Honours graduate; his admission there is felt to be, with the rarest exceptions, an opportunity and privilege, the almost indispensable gateway to his vocation. The original two years' course has been extended to three for the ordinary student; and the Special Committee will recommend that *four years* should hereafter be the normal term. This lengthening of the student's course, and the demands of the advanced scholars now put under theological tuition, have multiplied the burdens of the staff. When it is stated that the weekly teaching hours of the classical tutor are to-day half as long again as those of his predecessor of thirty years ago, this fact will give some indication, though scarcely a sufficient idea, of the increased labour now incumbent in this department.

The London University provides a valued Degree in Arts, which has attracted the legitimate ambition and tested the powers of a considerable number of theological students in our own and other Churches for a generation past. Now that under its new constitution degrees in Divinity are added to those in the other Faculties, giving to that great foundation for the first time the character of a "Universitas Studiorum" in the proper sense, it is likely that the Wesleyan colleges will be

drawn into stricter connexion with the University, and with the higher educational work of the country at large. Indeed, the Richmond Branch of the Institution, which has been ably and zealously represented in the matter by Dr. Agar Beet, is now officially recognised as a part of the (teaching) University of London, and is committed to the responsibilities—in respect of its curriculum, its staff equipment, and the level of its studies—which a university status entails in point of honour and public esteem, if not by way of formal regulation. The establishment of provincial universities, already effected at Birmingham and contemplated at Manchester and at Leeds, is likely to raise before long the question of incorporation in the case of the other three Branches of the Institution. These circumstances all tend to complicate and diversify our collegiate work. In the college best known to the writer there are, for instance, out of its full complement of thirty-eight students, seven who are found at one stage or other of a university degree course. These seven men belong to three different universities, and they are bent upon pursuing four quite distinct and separate sets of subjects, in Arts, Literature, or Divinity. What kind of a tutorial staff would be required properly to teach these seven men alone—to say nothing of the other thirty, to whom of course the main attention of the tutors must be given? The task is absurdly impossible; exceptional cases of this sort are met by the unsatisfactory aid of general direction and occasional inspection. Our best scholars must be left largely to themselves, and have to work as private students within the colleges,—or to resort to tutorial helps outside. Not to speak of other evils attaching to this disability, it lowers our self-respect.

The cardinal fact to be considered in estimating the work of these colleges is that quite *two-thirds* of their students have received in boyhood no more than an elementary education,—many of these in inferior village schools. Some of them have in the interval built very creditably for themselves upon this foundation; but most

have been so preoccupied in business and Church duties that their school-training has been but scantily improved up to the time of their appearance as candidates. No high educational bar has been or is likely to be placed at the gate of the Methodist ministry; our Church recognises that God's call to the preacher's office comes to men in all ranks of life, and it draws from a large reservoir of ability which any severe test of this nature, imposed at the outset, would close against it. The rudiments of a higher culture—in Latin and Greek Grammar, Mathematics, English Literature, Logic—remain to be acquired at the Institution, which is therefore largely occupied in doing the work of a secondary school side by side with the proper work of a theological college, while there is added to this the work of a university college in Arts, necessary in the case of a certain proportion of our men.

Now let anyone acquainted with modern education, and with the style of staff provision and the distribution of labour that prevail in other fields of scholastic work, look at the way in which the Institution is manned; let him only compare, if he be a Methodist, the tutorial arrangements of the Normal Colleges of Westminster and Southlands (where the course is of but two years' duration and the students in training—all being King's Scholars—are pretty much upon a level) with those existing at Richmond or Headingley, and he will pronounce that the Institution is furnished in its several Branches with a *skeleton* staff, with a body of teachers that bears no reasonable proportion to the work proposed and necessary to be done. It is perhaps an extreme, but it is no very extravagant thing to say, that the position of some of our tutors resembles that of drudging ushers in an ill-found private school, who are expected to teach all the sciences to boys of all ages and attainments. At the same time it must he remembered that the tutors are Methodist preachers, who cannot allow themselves to become mere schoolmasters or college lecturers. They have their duties to the pulpit; and service is expected from them outside the Institution walls, which some of them

render freely and widely—one need only point in evidence to the out-going and in-coming Presidents of the Conference. Such men cannot serve the Church at large to the extent that they are called to do, without taxing time and strength heavily. This demand, though it may not be taken formally into account as a regular incidence of tutorship, constitutes nevertheless a serious item in the facts of the case, and should weigh with those who wish to make a just and generous provision for the service of this department of Methodism.

It is necessary to ask whether our ecclesiastical leaders, and the Methodist public generally, have grasped and laid to heart the fact, that notwithstanding all the changes of the times, the immense development and the aggravated and crucial difficulties of biblical study, the reform of education and the multiplication of teachers and differentiation of Faculty in every branch of secular learning, the Theological Institution staff, with the exception of the one additional tutor precariously retained at Didsbury, remains to-day in number precisely what it was in 1847? This being so, it is manifest that there are *large arrears of progress* to be made up. It is no slight modification, by way of a second assistant tutor or the like, that will meet our necessities, but a very considerable change and reinforcement must be effected if the Institution is to be brought up to the level of the times. We have multiplied our establishments from two to four, our tutors from eight to seventeen, in these sixty years; but the four are no stronger than the original two; they have only the old machinery to apply to a mass of work far more laborious and complicated than that for which it was designed.

The residential plan of the Institution involves what is relatively a large outlay. In the Presbyterian and some of the leading Congregational colleges the students lodge outside at their own charges, and the funds of the Church are devoted substantially to teaching purposes. With ourselves the case is otherwise; out of the £14,000 annually spent on the Theological Colleges (including Richmond,

which depends upon the Foreign Missionary Society)—this total sum, by the way, being less than half of the yearly turnover of that noble charity of the Children's Home—something like £9,000 are absorbed in the maintenance and establishment charges, and in incidental expenses, so that only a fraction remains for strictly educational use. Whatever the faults of the Wesleyan Theological staff, expensiveness is not among them. On this ground at least it may challenge any body of collegiate teachers in Christendom, except perhaps the Roman celibate professoriate. The colleges of the United Free Church of Scotland, whose students approximate in number to our own, devote a revenue of some £10,000 almost entirely to their teaching staff, and to the up-keep of the educational plant. This staff it may be observed, amounting to about twenty tutors and including in its number a notable proportion of the most brilliant Christian scholars in Britain, has none of the preparatory school-work to do which falls to ours. Their professorial chairs have been specifically endowed by generous donors interested in the promotion of this or that branch of sacred learning—a class of benefactors in which English soil has never been prolific,[1] and in which Wesleyan Methodism, with its munificence toward other objects, has so far been altogether sterile. The policy of such specific endowments is doubtless open to question; but within certain limits, it has proved to be sound and wise, resting upon a strong natural instinct that has operated in all the great public foundations through which the higher life of the community finds expression and is conserved from one generation to another.

The northern students are aided toward their maintenance and college fees by the numerous *bursaries*, within the reach of every poor scholar "o' pairts," that are a characteristic feature of Scottish higher education, and supply a ladder by which the humblest village lad, relying on his native hardi-

[1] The late Cecil Rhodes has just supplied a splendid exception to the ndifference shown towards education by the magnates of English wealth.

hood and thrift, may reach the prizes of the university. We have no such assistance to offer; and the burden of self-support during college years cannot be thrown upon our candidates, who are drawn from the rank and file of the people and can bear only in rare instances the cost of training. Nor can we abandon the residential discipline, which is vital to our system, and is indeed the strongest and best part of it, making it on this account the envy of other Churches. But we must recognise the unavoidable cost which this principle entails. It is not high policy, after all, to stint the scholastic in favour of the domestic life of students, and to cut down the teaching staff to a bare minimum for the sake of multiplying establishments of a small and manageable size, and of spreading their influence over a wider area. The maintenance and the education of our divinity students constitute expenses so distinct in principle and so clearly separate, that something perhaps might be gained by throwing the burden of the former mainly on the public collections, since these appeal to the multitude of our people whose sons the young men are; while the charges for their education might seem to have an especial claim upon the wealthier members of the Church and congregation from whom subscriptions and donations are solicited. If it be held that high education is undesirable in a Methodist preacher and that Christian scholarship belongs to that wisdom of the world which is "foolishness with God," then we had better close our colleges at once and divide the Institution Fund between, say, the Home Mission and the Chapel Building Funds; but then we must begin by disowning John Wesley, and the apostle Paul himself. This is eminently a case in which the thing that is worth doing at all is worth doing well.

Amongst the chief desiderata that have occupied the Committees of the last three years are the following:

1. The necessity of providing a proper curriculum for non-classical students. The Greek Testament is held to be a *sine quâ non* in all cases. This rule is sufficiently severe

for men, possibly twenty-five years of age or older, who have meddled at school with none but their mother-tongue and have no native bent for languages. Students entering college in this position, with so much besides to learn in three years, find it a hard task to gain a grammatical mastery and a real working knowledge of the Greek of the New Testament; in saying this we are not in the least disparaging a class of candidates whose worth we have good reason to know, and who fare somewhat badly as things are. One is obliged to confess that a student may come to the classical lecture-room *too late*. The addition of Latin and Hebrew to biblical Greek in such cases induces mental indigestion, to be followed by a rejection of the unassimilated matter with loss and discomfort to all concerned. In undertakings of this nature, "the half is often more than the whole." The discipline of the classical tongues is the finest in the world, where it *takes*; but if it awakens no congenial instinct and is met by no true receptivity on the learner's part, then it has failed in its educative purpose and precious time and strength have been spent to an unfruitful issue. An alternative English course, carefully planned and complete for its own purposes, should be open to men of this particular calibre; but such a course implies *an alternative set of teachers*. The classical tutor and his assistant cannot be serving, each of them, in two different class-rooms at the same time, teaching in one series of classes Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and in another series of classes English, History, and Logic. As the case stands they are compelled to put to classical subjects men who with greater advantage would be led to other fields, or to multiply classes and subjects of instruction beyond their powers of effective teaching. Between these evils they make the best choice and the most judicious mixture that circumstances allow. In any college including students of the type above described, there should be one tutor of experience whose main strength is given to the English Language and Literature, to History and Philosophy, and who lays him-

self out especially, though by no means exclusively, for the benefit of the less classical, or non-classical, men. This necessity is acknowledged in the following resolution of the Special Committee :

That every student be taught the Greek Testament ; and that arrangements be made for the special instruction of such students as are not recommended by their tutors to take Hebrew or Latin, in the English Bible, English Literature, History, Philosophy, and kindred subjects.

2. A second requirement, forced upon us by the modern conditions of scholarship, is thus affirmed in the Committee's Report :

That in view of the increasing need of specialisation in biblical and theological studies, arrangements be made as soon as possible for the appointment of tutors to devote themselves respectively to Hebrew and Old Testament studies, to Greek and New Testament studies, and to Church History and Patristic Literature.

The realisation of this object has weighed for a long time past on the hearts of all amongst us who care for sacred learning, and who believe that Methodism has a duty to discharge and a debt to pay to the Church universal upon this score. It was the dream of such men as the late Mr. Hellier and Drs. Geden and Moulton. The only approach to the desired specialisation at present made exists at Didsbury, where one tutor takes charge of "Biblical Literature and Exegesis," another of "Classics and Mathematics," —which latter office (itself a curious hybrid in the way of title,—a kind of "cook-housemaid's" place in pedagogy) includes in point of fact Philosophy and English as well. So far are we removed from the ideal of the Committee, that at Richmond, Headingley, and Handsworth a single tutor, with his assistant, is charged with all the functions above enumerated. Other Churches have long recognised that the Old and the New Testaments, with their widely distinct tongues, form separate departments of learning. The ablest scholar, of the most iron industry, will acknowledge

that to be a real expert in both these worlds of erudition, and to keep pace with the movements of research and criticism in both at once, are things beyond his power. With the Presbyterians the division of the two biblical areas is an axiom. Their Hebrew professorships date from the seventeenth century. How long is Methodism to wait till it shall take its place in this province of the work of God? As matters are, its students depend on the Drivers and Cheynes, the Davidsons and Robertson Smiths of other Churches; they have to watch in admiration or dread while the masters of Semitic lore work their will upon the Old Testament. We do not undervalue the contributions made by Methodist Hebraists—Dr. W. T. Davison chief amongst them—to the literature of the subject; sound and original work, searching and thoroughly competent and sagacious criticism in this department, issue from our press. But those who have done the most are most conscious how little it is by comparison with what the crisis calls for, and with what might be done by men who could make the Hebrew Bible their life-study and bring to bear upon it their full strength and devotion, as the leading Old Testament scholars of other communions are enabled to do. To bark at the heels of the Higher Critics is not an exhilarating nor a very profitable employment. The establishment of Hebrew and Old Testament "chairs" would not of itself secure to a Church great and wise masters of Israel in this field; but it would at least give us the means of finding such men and putting them to their proper work, if the Head of the Church lays this vocation upon any amongst ourselves.

New Testament criticism and exposition form a vocation equally devouring in its interest to the advanced student and teacher, if not so remote from the common highway of scholarship as that of the specialist in Hebrew. The ground which New Testament science covers is even more keenly contested; here stands the chief citadel of our faith, the Holy of holies, in the testimony of the Evangelists and the record of apostolic teaching. No man nowadays will count for a first-rate New Testament scholar unless he is

prepared to say, "This one thing I do." Surely with its great constituency and its demonstrated wealth, with its responsibilities as the second Christian community in England and its place in the van of the Evangelical forces, with the passionate loyalty of its people to the written word of God, our Church may afford a handful of men to be set apart to the service of the two Testaments in their original tongues. In all humility we ask whether £5,000 is an adequate or worthy sum to devote to all the purposes of scholarship and teaching involved in the training of the Wesleyan ministry at the present day?

3. To the other points of improvement indicated in the Report of the Special Committee we must advert more lightly. The paragraph last quoted alludes to "Church History and Patristics" as branches of learning that need, along with "Hebrew" and "Greek Testament studies," some definite provision in our staff arrangements. Those who are alive to the religious controversies of the day and aware of the skill and persistence, supported not unfrequently by consummate learning and imposing authority, with which Romanist and Anglican teachers address themselves to the educated youth of the Free Churches, will appreciate this part of the Committee's proposals. They understand how imperative it is that our rising ministry should be instructed on Church questions and armed to defend their flock from priestly aggression. Not that Church History and Patristics are ignored at our colleges as things are. The former heading figures on the time-tables under the theological tutor's name, and the latter of recent years under that of the classical and biblical tutor; but both in a slight and partial way. These subjects need the full recognition and regular attention which they are likely to receive when they become the specific charge of some particular tutor; the theological tutor, it may be noted, is officially responsible for "Systematic Theology" alone. It has been suggested that the House-Governor, if he could be relieved by suitable assistance from the burdensome details of domestic business, might properly undertake Church History, a subject akin to

the topics of "Pastoral Theology and Church Organisation" on which he already lectures to excellent purpose.

In our opinion, almost as much importance attaches to *Apologetics*, which is distinguished from Systematic Theology in well-appointed schools of divinity, and differs from the latter very much as an art from a science, and as defence from construction. If some lecturer of suitable gifts could be found to serve the four colleges, giving a two months' course at each in turn, this necessity might be met without taxing the attention of the students or the funds of the Institution too severely. When the fourth year, which must be largely devoted to Theology, is added to the present term, the theological tutor will inevitably find himself overburdened and might welcome relief afforded in this shape. This observation, however, lies beyond the purview of the Committee's Report.

4. A further desideratum, which seems to many of grave moment, and has been earnestly pressed upon the Connexion by the Rev. S. E. Keeble, of Manchester, is the study of *Sociology*,—a subject lying apart from those previously discussed, yet not unconnected with present-day Apologetics. The Committee, while listening with sympathy to Mr. Keeble's appeal, thought it premature to make any recommendation on the subject; but it will not be forgotten. Whether we adopt or reject the theories advocated under the name of "Christian Socialism," the movement is one which the Church has to reckon with; far-seeing Anglican leaders, like Bishop Gore and Canon Scott Holland, have grappled boldly with its difficulties, and have awakened the interest of the younger clergy in its discussion and practical treatment. Sociology is a new and somewhat tentative science; but it is growing out of its crude beginnings; and its study, wisely conducted, would be a proper terminus to the course of logic, psychology, and ethics, which the Institution now attempts. But here, again, we want in the teacher the specialist and enthusiast! Christian ministers in our large towns will find themselves at a loss without some exact knowledge of

economic and industrial questions, of the laws of social progress, of vital and criminal statistics and the principles of their interpretation, of the problems agitating the minds of the intelligent artisans all over Europe and in which lie the springs of discontent and revolution. To some students topics of this nature, systematically handled, might supply a mental discipline and stimulus which Hebrew conjugations and Textual Criticism do not happen to impart. Possibly, if ministers were more familiar with these matters and more in touch by study as well as sympathy with the wants and thinkings of the labouring multitude, we should not have so much occasion to grieve over our empty churches in crowded city quarters. College and cottage need to know each other.

We have now sketched an ample programme for the fourth year of studentship, which the Special Committee will ask the Conference to grant. The added term will be an idle boon without a strengthened teaching staff. We think that the theological course should be considerably extended in the direction of Church History and Apologetics; that the present "classical" curriculum must be bifurcated, and a distinct course on an English basis provided for men who are not of linguistic aptitudes; that the study of English Literature on the one hand, of ethical and kindred subjects on the other, should be greatly developed, while the Biblical Languages must still hold a leading place in our plan of tuition and should be treated as distinct faculties. In the Branch of the Institution with which the writer is best acquainted, the proportion of hours allotted by the college time-table to various subjects is as follows:[1] To Theology, in several branches, 18 per cent.;

[1] This analysis, it must be observed, relates to the work of the *tutors*, and the hours of teaching devoted by them to their several subjects. The theological classes, which are discriminated mainly by years of studentship, are fewer but larger in numbers than those in other departments. Hence the analysis of the time-table from the *student's* point of view would turn out differently. He spends, on the average, 25 per cent. of his lecture-room hours on Theology, and about 30 per cent. on Scripture; but the fractions vary for different sets of men.

Scripture (including Hebrew, the Greek Testament, Biblical Criticism, and Exegesis, etc.), 34 per cent.; Classical, or Patristic, Greek and Latin, 18 per cent.; Philosophy (Logic, Ethics, Psychology), 12 per cent.; English Grammar, History, Literature, 7 per cent.; Mathematics, 3 per cent.; Methodist Polity and Homiletics, 3 per cent.; leaving 5 per cent. of the time of tuition for minor and accessory matters, —Elocution, Singing, Hygiene, etc. It is evident where the strength and the weakness of our educational scheme lie, and at what a disadvantage those students are placed who are not blessed with appetite and capacity for classical pursuits.

We turn now from the diagnosis of the case to the remedies and schemes of improvement proposed. Three alternative plans are logically possible:

(A) The Conference might determine to make each Branch of the Institution complete in itself, furnishing each with a staff sufficient for the four years of training now contemplated, and for all the necessities specified in the Committee's Report. This would demand a staff of five tutors at the least, and a probationer assistant, with the addition possibly of a lay secretary or clerk in the House-Governor's office—raising the total teaching staff from seventeen (or more strictly, four governors and thirteen full teachers) to twenty-four, the outlay being correspondingly increased. When it is remembered that three years ago the "extra" tutor at Didsbury was all but sacrificed to save expense, and that the Institution balance-sheet has shown for some time a yearly deficit, the reception which Connexional financiers give to speculations of this sort does not need to be described. Amid signs of noble liberality in many other directions, one sees no disposition to loosen the Church's purse-strings freely for this object; "the Lord's bankers" give no indication that they will honour a draft upon them to any such extent.

Or (B) the establishment costs might be reduced by *concentration*; three well-equipped colleges, it is argued,

with a staff of eighteen tutors, might be maintained more economically than the present four. This plan has been considered, and decisively rejected. It is a debatable question whether the building of the fourth—or even of the third—college was ever necessary; whether it would not have been wiser thirty or twenty years ago to extend and build up the existing foundations; whether it would not have been possible and safe, with our excellent system of government, to increase the number of students under one roof or to distribute them in several houses on the same college establishment. The writer, after more than thirty years' experience of Methodist students and of collegiate life, is of the affirmative opinion on these points; he holds that in the abstract it would be our best plan even now to reduce the four Branches of the Institution to three—northern, midland, and southern—with six tutors a-piece. But we must bow to accomplished facts. There the four colleges are! the youngest of them twenty-one years old; each with its traditions and Connexional prestige; each with its army of old students for jealous champions. Let anyone of them be threatened, and all local Methodism is up in arms! Only a desperate emergency would induce the Conference to enforce such a sacrifice on any of the districts concerned. At the present time, moreover, the ministry is rapidly augmenting its numbers; and it is thought likely that in a few years three comparatively large colleges would be filled to overflowing. Perhaps, if they looked into the matter, the Districts which take so much local pride in the Institution and set store by its services, might ask themselves whether this attachment should not take some more solid and practical expression than it has done hitherto, and whether the regions in which the several colleges lie might not worthily distinguish themselves by rendering exceptional aid to the Institution Fund in its present straits. We venture this last remark with great diffidence, and in no censorious or complaining spirit.

It soon became evident that the "policy of concentration" referred to the Special Committee by the Conference of

1899 would not be entertained; the Connexional sentiment pronounced inexorably against it.

(c) The Special Committee was finally driven to the third, and very difficult, alternative of "reconstruction," since reinforcement upon the present basis and concentration on a narrower basis turned out to be alike impracticable. It seeks to co-ordinate the colleges and distribute amongst them, as far as possible, the variety of work to be done. The leading principle of the new proposals is thus laid down:

"This Committee is of opinion that some method should be adopted of bringing the four Branches of the Institution into closer association for the purposes of tuition. With a view to the gradual accomplishment of this close association of the colleges for educational purposes," the Report goes on to "recommend,—(*a*) that the course of study at the several colleges be so arranged as more fully to meet the cases of candidates of different attainments; (*b*) that in the allocation of candidates due regard be had to the principle of sending men to that college whose course will best meet their special needs."

The Report further suggests, in the way of differentiation, that at one college classes should be provided for men "likely to matriculate" or working at a further stage of the "University course in Arts," while other colleges should cater for the new Divinity course of London University; one of them, seemingly, is expected to give specific attention to the non-classical students and to furnish a curriculum calculated for their benefit.

These opinions and suggestions, arrived at after protracted discussion, have not crystallised as yet into a detailed working plan; but they settle the basis and general lines of the reconstruction in view. The drawback attaching to any scheme of distribution is that of separating different sorts of students, and limiting that free intercourse in college comradeship of men of various tastes and antecedents which has helped to produce the unique *blend* of the Methodist ministry. This danger may in part be obviated by the circulation of certain classes of students which is fore-

shadowed; such transference from college to college will have its inconveniences, but it may bring its compensations; and it should not involve any real danger under a college system so uniform as our own, and with tutors who know how to work together in the strict co-operation and close confidence of Methodist preachers.

A scheme was suggested for securing the ends desired by turning the four colleges, as they stand, into *two* for teaching purposes; by combining Richmond and Handsworth, Didsbury and Headingley, in such a way that one of the two in each case should be made a *First* and the other a *Further* College, the students being drafted forward ordinarily in a body, at the end of their first or second year according to proficiency, while candidates of higher education would enter the Further College at once. This plan, or something very like it, is found practicable elsewhere under similar conditions; it would go far to double the teaching power of the existing staff; but it did not find favour with the Committee, and some other method of combination, less drastic and disturbing, will have to be devised, if the resolutions of the Committee be adopted by the Conference. Some increase of the staff will be necessitated by any plan of the kind, though not nearly so large as would be required to make each college self-contained and complete for all purposes. The Committee advises "that, as a step in this direction, the staff of the three other colleges be raised to the level of that of Didsbury."

One thing is now certain, that matters cannot remain where they are. The educational machinery of 1840 or 1850 will not serve the uses of the twentieth century. The question of the training of the Christian ministry is one to which the Church may well be called upon to devote its best wisdom and full strength; one in which at this time it must earnestly seek to know the will and counsel of its Divine Head. Nothing more important could claim the attention of any Conference. Education is at this moment the critical problem for the English people, and for the English Churches. The other

day, in a "Special Report on Educational Subjects" presented to the Government, the following incisive statement appeared: "We cannot afford to put up with second-rate education. We need the very best educational system in the world. The very existence of the empire depends on *sea-power* and *school-power*." *Mutatis mutandis*, the same thing may be said of Methodism and its preaching ministry. Next to the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost, we are persuaded that our Church progress, and our very existence in the future opening before us, will turn upon nothing so much as upon the *school-power*, that is now so imperfectly supplied and defectively organised in the rearing of the Wesleyan ministry.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

NOTE.—To avoid misunderstanding, it may be said that, while the writer of this article is permitted by courtesy to quote the Report of the Institution Committee now ready for presentation to the Conference, the views he expresses appear simply as his own, and pretend to no official character or imprimatur.

THE BIBLE IN ENGLISH.

SOME RECENT VERSIONS AND EDITIONS.

1. *The Holy Bible.* Two-Version Edition. (Oxford University Press. 1899.)
2. *The Holy Bible.* Linear Parallel Edition. (Philadelphia: Holman & Co. 1898.)
3. *The Holy Bible.* Newly Edited by the American Revision Committee. (New York: Nelson & Sons. 1901.)
4. *The Twentieth Century New Testament.* (London: Horace Marshall & Son. 1901.)
5. *The Modern Reader's Bible.* Edited by Professor RICHARD G. MOULTON. (New York and London: Macmillan & Co. 1896–8.)
6. *The Century Bible.* (Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack. 1901.)
7. *The Temple Bible.* (London: J. M. Dent & Co. 1901.)

IT is now about thirty-two years since the first steps were taken towards a revision of the so-called Authorised Version of the English Bible. In 1881 the New Testament was published, and the Old Testament in 1884. Thus the complete work has been before the public during the whole lifetime of those who are yet in their youth; the more important portion is just attaining its majority. This may be therefore a fitting time to take note of the prospects of the Revised Version, in regard to public favour, and to notice also certain aids to its more intelligent use, as well as some alternative versions.

In his preface to the beautiful "Two-Version Edition" of the Bible, the Bishop of Gloucester, who was himself the Chairman of the New Testament Revision Committee, mentions one hindrance to the use of the Revised Version as consisting in the difficulty of giving adequate attention to the variations of rendering, as between the two versions, except by turning continually from one volume to the other, or, if a parallel edition be used, by forfeiting the advantage of marginal references. There is little doubt that, not only students, but those also whose business it is to read the Scriptures in public, require to be kept aware of the differences of translation, if they are to make the most of their opportunity. For purposes of study it is highly important to be able easily to recognise the progress that has been made in the more exact ascertainment of the meaning of God's word; and when that same word of God is rehearsed before the people, it adds much to the effectiveness with which its meaning is rendered, and allows the better of an occasional comment calling attention to a necessary change, when the old and new versions are both present to the attention of the one upon whom this duty devolves.

But probably there are some who, for quite another reason, may be glad to avail themselves of a volume which provides for the alternative use of either version of the English Bible. This, however, leads us conveniently to notice here the varying reception accorded to the Revised Version by students, and by the people generally. Some have hailed it with unqualified enthusiasm; many still oppose it with the stubborn *inertia* of unreasoning prejudice and sheer traditionalism—even as, for a full half-century, the older version was also opposed in its day; and others, with full acknowledgment of its many excellences, yet do not yield it an unchallenged supremacy. No really competent judge would hesitate to admit its immense superiority to the translation of 1611 in regard to accuracy; but it has been urged, on the other hand, that many alterations are needless, that in other cases the altered rendering has not

retained the literary quality of that which it supersedes, and that frequently idiom is neglected for the sake of literalistic accuracy. These contentions would be disputed by the staunch advocates of the new version; but the very fact that they are maintained by not a few who are nevertheless convinced of the necessity of revision, and who therefore welcome the present Revised Version in spite of its alleged defects, is a *primâ facie* argument in favour of their possible truth. And those who hold to the justice of these contentions may be glad of the help afforded by such a work as the "Two-Version Bible," which makes it comparatively easy to give the preference, in actual reading, to one or other of the versions, as may seem good to the reader.

Let us take as an example, almost at random, Psalm xlviii., which serves fairly well as an illustration of the unnecessary character of many of the changes. In the first verse we read, "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised," altered by the Revisers, as we see by a glance at the margin, to "Great is the Lord, and highly to be praised." Now, if the words "great" and "high," or their derivatives, were so used elsewhere in the same psalm that some importance attached to the distinction, the change might be desirable; but this can hardly be maintained. Therefore it seems a pity to alter the familiar phraseology for no good end; nay, not only is absolutely nothing gained to the sense, but, with the use of the word "highly," there is a slight sacrifice of idiomatic force, the older being the more easy and natural expression in English. In the latter part of the verse we are asked to substitute "his holy mountain" for "the mountain of his holiness," with no very appreciable gain to the meaning. As regards the expression in the second verse, "beautiful for situation," altered to "beautiful in elevation," though the Revisers certainly intended to convey a more definite idea by the substituted phrase, it is doubtful whether this phrase does really convey the idea intended, or at least whether it expresses that idea very happily. "Rising aloft in beauty"

has been suggested as a rendering by one eminent authority—an expression both picturesque and precise. Part, at least, of this meaning is better indicated, although only part, by the older translation. Either "beautiful in its elevation" or "beautiful for elevation" would be better English, though "elevation" is not the best word. Certain other changes, hardly defensible on the score of necessity, may be mentioned without comment. In the third verse, "God hath made himself known" is substituted for "God is known"; in the fourth, "the kings assembled themselves" for "the kings were assembled"; in the fifth, "they saw it, then were they amazed," for "they saw it, and so they marvelled"; also, "they were dismayed, they hasted away," for "they were troubled, and hasted away"; in the sixth, "trembling took hold of them there" for "fear took hold upon them there"; in the seventh, "with the east wind thou breakest the ships of Tarshish" for "thou breakest the ships of Tarshish with an east wind"; in the ninth, "we have thought on thy lovingkindness" for "we have thought of thy lovingkindness"; in the tenth, "as is thy name, O God, so is thy praise," for "according to thy name," etc.; in the eleventh, "let mount Zion be glad, let the daughters of Judah rejoice," for "let mount Zion rejoice, let the daughters of Judah be glad." These are all the alterations that are made by the Revisers, with the exception of a detail of punctuation in the first verse, and—a very great exception, which has everything in its favour: though this applies to the whole Psalter—the metrical arrangement of the psalm. For some of the changes more might be said than for others; but, waiving the question of the necessity or expediency of making some or all of these changes in the Revised Version itself, we may well question the wisdom of perpetually distracting the attention of a congregation by such divergences from the older version, which alone is still used by the majority, when in so many instances the real meaning is hardly affected in the slightest degree. The use of a two-version edition makes it easily possible to give the amended trans-

lation, whenever it is important enough to be noticed, but otherwise to leave the as yet more familiar renderings undisturbed; and in this way the minds of the people will be better prepared for an eventual change of version, than by a process which, through an exhibition of the gratuitous character of many of the alterations, may arouse a feeling of resistance, and so delay, rather than hasten, the time of settlement.

The Two-Version Edition published at Oxford has all the advantages claimed for it by the Bishop of Gloucester in his preface, and is moreover produced in the very best style of that publishing-house, so distinguished for its high-class work. But though every detail of change is indicated in the margin with unfailing accuracy, and by paying attention at the outset to certain simple instructions the reader may be put in the way of reading practically both versions at once, yet where the changes are numerous, and the margin is therefore crowded, the process requires greater care, involving more time, and this for purposes of public reading would be so inconvenient as to be perilous. In view especially of this latter consideration, it is a great pleasure to be able to call attention to a work, perhaps little known as yet to English readers, also produced in the very highest style of binding and typography: the "Linear Parallel Edition" of the Bible, published by A. J. Holman & Co., Philadelphia. This also is a two-version edition, but on an entirely different plan. The text is printed, in bold, clear type, across the whole width of the page, with the exception of an outer margin for references; and wherever there is a variation between the two versions the rendering of the Authorised Version is given in an upper line, that of the Revised Version in a lower, both in smaller type than the matter which is common to both. Thus the alterations are seen actually at a glance, without any occasion for scrutiny in another part of the page; the most ordinary care will suffice for reading one version or the other, or for blending the two, in regard to any given variation; and for one who would have this liberty in the

public reading of the Scriptures the "Linear Parallel Edition" affords the means, with absolutely no risk to the reader, and no possibility of embarrassment.

For the sake of making the plan of the work perfectly clear it may be permitted to reproduce a portion by way of specimen, the more so as the work itself is not so readily accessible for reference as if it were published in England; and this time the sample shall be one in which the changes, though slight, are such as to affect the real meaning, and may therefore be made with advantage in public reading.

Isaiah XL. 1–8.

1. Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God.
2. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.
3. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.
4. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain:
5. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.
6. The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field:
7. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass.
8. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.

It will be evident, from this example and the former, that, whereas for ordinary public use it might be well to ignore all, or most of, the emendations in the psalm, and to follow those in the latter extract; yet with a Bible-class, on the other hand, it would perhaps be desirable to direct attention to every change, whether adopting it or not; while again, in some circumstances it might be better to avoid even the

desirable changes in such a portion as the one quoted from Isaiah, seeing that in no case would the truth be compromised by such avoidance, and harm might be done by even the slight unsettlement of untutored minds involved in bringing before their attention a question for which they would be totally unprepared.

We cannot wisely ignore the fact that this is, in many ways, a time of transition in regard to the understanding of the Bible. There must be no abatement in the quest of the truth, whether as regards those matters that come under the survey of what has been, rather inaptly, called the Higher Criticism, or respecting those questions, of not "lower" importance, that deal with the accurate presentation of the veritable text of Scripture. It is of momentous concern to the whole human race that we should know both what God has said, and, so far as we may, how He has said it. By no possibility can the fullest knowledge of the truth be otherwise than beneficial. But in certain important regions of inquiry much is yet uncertain, so that to accept premature conclusions might prove ultimately to be regression rather than progress; and in any case, to force the knowledge of experts on the attention of those who, only partially apprehending it, would as likely as not misapprehend, would be a proceeding the reverse of beneficial. What is needed is, continued patient research on the part of those who are pioneers in expert inquiry; patient study on the part of those who can follow, more or less intelligently, in the way thus opened; and equally patient instruction and education of the people generally, and especially of our young people, in all well ascertained results.

In addition to the two volumes already mentioned, as serviceable alike for those who would themselves study the Bible more intelligently, and also for the public presentation of God's word in such a way as may be best adapted for that purpose in these days of transition, there is a useful series of beautiful little books now issuing from the press, nearing its completion for the New Testament, and intended

to cover the whole range of Scripture, entitled *The Century Bible.* As the separate volumes are noticed from time to time in the pages of this REVIEW, it is not necessary here to do more than call attention to the general character of the work in connexion with the object of this article. This, also, is a two-volume edition of the Bible, and in its own way serves that purpose admirably. There is, first, an introduction to the particular book of the Bible included in any volume; then an analytical table of contents; then follows the text, complete according to the Authorised Version, but arranged in proper literary form, with marginal annotations indicating the topics of paragraphs; and then the Revised Version of the text, with a subjoined commentary, covering on the average from two-thirds to three-quarters of each page. The advantages of this plan for private use and for Bible-classes are obvious, though of course it would not serve the same public purpose as the volumes before described.

Another series may be mentioned in this connexion, though again on a different plan: the *Temple Bible,* in dainty volumes, with introductions by experts, and brief notes at the end; the text, which occupies the principal and central space, being in this case also arranged according to the requirements of literary use. The series is under the general care of a chief editor, as is the *Century Bible,* and this secures unity of aim and method throughout the whole work. But comparatively little help is to be gained here towards any correction of the text (which is that of the Authorised Version), this seeming to lie aside from the general aim and scope of the series.

In that incomparable work, published about six years ago, *The Literary Study of the Bible,* Professor Richard G. Moulton says, "The Bible is the worst printed book in the world." And this he explains by going on to say:

No other monument of ancient or modern literature suffers the fate of being put before us in a form that makes it impossible, without strong effort and considerable training, to take in elements of literary structure which in all other books

are conveyed directly to the eye in a manner impossible to mistake.

That defect perhaps no one living has done so much to remedy—at least for English readers—as Professor Moulton himself; partly in the volume just referred to, which is a very treasure-house for those who would read the Bible with all the light that consummate literary skill can throw upon it,—followed as it is now by that smaller work, *The Literature of the Bible*, which presents substantially the same results more briefly and in popular form,—but chiefly by that masterpiece of Bible-editing, *The Modern Reader's Bible*, in which the principles expounded in the previous work are applied to the whole of Scripture, as arranged according to the canons of literary propriety. This work (including three books of the Apocrypha) extends to twenty-one choice little volumes, of which the only drawback, for practical purposes, is the omission of any indication (save in a comparative table, at the end) of the conventional division into chapters and verses, which, whatever its evils, is absolutely necessary now for reference; and the insertion of the requisite notation, in small type, might easily have been accomplished without detriment to the literary effect. It is to be hoped that the publishers will some time see their way to the issue of a one-volume edition, with the improvement suggested, and then this will stand alone as *facile princeps* among the many improved editions of the Bible in English.

Let us take, as an illustration of the value of Dr. Richard Moulton's work, the Book of Job, which, more perhaps than most, needed this sort of editing. In the twenty-first chapter we have, to all appearance, one continuous speech on the part of Job. But as presented in this edition we find, in the sixteenth, nineteenth, and twenty-second verses, interruptions to Job's argument on the part of Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar respectively; the manifestation of which, in the printing of the poem, adds greatly to the interest of the reader, while it contributes also to the readier understanding of the course of thought. Then again, after

the twenty-sixth verse, there is a note of attempted interruption on the part of the others, which helps to interpret the two following verses. Nor is this mere conjectural exegesis, but, as the author argues in his notes, the arrangement as thus presented is strongly supported by those metrical considerations upon which the whole work is so largely based. Perhaps we may be allowed to reproduce the concluding lines of the dread dialogue with Jehovah (xlii. 1–6), as making matters yet more plain.

JOB:

I know that thou canst do all things,
And that no purpose of thine can be restrained.

VOICE OUT OF THE WHIRLWIND (*retreating*):

Who is this that hideth counsel without knowledge?

JOB:

Therefore have I uttered that which I understood not,
Things too wonderful for me, which I knew not.
Hear, I beseech thee, and I will speak.

VOICE OUT OF THE WHIRLWIND (*more distant*):

I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me.

JOB:

I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear;
But now mine eye seeth thee:
Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent
In dust and ashes. [*The storm ceases.*

The Book of Psalms gains almost incredibly from the arrangement adopted in *The Modern Reader's Bible.* For that arrangement is not merely metrical in the sense in which the Revised Version, as commonly printed, may claim to be metrical, in that and other parts of Scripture; its further division of the text, beyond the bare indication of linear parallelism, into stanzas of varying length and structure,

according to the principles so amply expounded by the author, adds in many instances very greatly to the proper understanding of these Hebrew poems. In some cases the metrical conditions suggest a slightly amended rendering, although amounting perhaps only to a different punctuation. For example, Psalm viii. is taken as an instance of the Envelope Figure, in which the central thought is enclosed, as it were, by the idea presented at the outset, and repeated at the end. Thus, instead of the opening of the psalm consisting of three lines, it should be regarded as consisting only of two, identical with the two lines at the close :

> O Lord, our Lord,
> How excellent is thy name in all the earth !

The intermediate portions will then be found to consist of four quatrains, and the first will begin thus :

> Thou, who hast set thy glory upon the heavens,—
> Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou established strength,

—though Professor Moulton, in order to retain the exact form of words, reads :

> Who hast set thy glory upon the heavens, etc.

—strictly grammatical, but rather laboured in its construction. Taking this as the structure of the psalm, we are led to interpret the first quatrain, in which the development of the one central thought begins, as meaning, "Out of man, who is, as it were, no more than a babe and suckling in comparison with the world he is to govern, hast thou established strength of rule," etc. Similarly, the structure of Psalm xxiii. is a "modified envelopment," with three intermediate quatrains. The "Song of the Thunderstorm," Psalm xxix., is a striking poem, with five triplets, and opening and closing quatrains. Psalms xlii. and xliii. constitute one poem—"Exiled from the House of God"—of which each

of the three parts consists of an identical refrain (see R.V., marginal note to xlii. 5):

Why art thou cast down, O my soul?
And why art thou disquieted within me?
Hope thou in God:
For I shall yet praise him,
Who is the health of my countenance,
And my God.

So the very structure of Psalm xlvi. requires the insertion of a lost refrain after the third verse, identical with that of the seventh and eleventh verses. It is impossible, within our limited space, to do more than call attention to Psalm lxxvii., arranged in sextets, simple and modified; to Psalm xc., with its luminously interpretative structure (and to the yet more striking exposition of the same in the author's larger work on the general subject); to the suggestive unification of Psalms ciii. and civ., as a double poem, the two sections constituting respectively a "Hymn of the World Within" and a "Hymn of the World Without"; to some of the helpful titles assigned to the psalms in this edition, as for example, in the case of those constituting "The Hymn Book of the Pilgrims" (or "The Songs of Ascent," cxx.–cxxxiv.): "The Exile's Cry," "The Lord thy Keeper," "Salutation to Jerusalem," "A Prayer of the Despised," "The Exile's Song of Deliverance," "Mount Zion: A Pilgrim Song," "Seedtime and Harvest: A Song of Deliverance," "Toil and Home: A Family Song," "Home Life: A Family Song," "Litany of Afflicted Israel," "A Cry out of the Depths," "The Quiet Soul," "Dedication Hymn," "A Song of Unity," "Benediction of the Night Watch"; and to the manifold typographical aids to the better reading of this precious portion of Scripture.

The complicated dialogues of some parts of the prophetical books are largely unintelligible without such help as *The Modern Reader's Bible* affords. There we have Isaiah xxxiii., for example, thus arranged:

THE PROPHET (*beholding in vision*).
(Verses 1 and 2.)

ISRAEL.
(Verse 3.)

THE PROPHET.
(Verses 4 to 6.)
(*Then a comment: Behold, their valiant ones cry without: the ambassadors of peace weep bitterly.*)

ISRAEL'S AMBASSADORS.
(Verses 8 and 9.)

GOD.
(Verses 10 to 13.)
(*Then a comment: The sinners in Zion are afraid; trembling hath surprised the godless ones.*)

SINNERS IN ZION.
(Part of verse 14.)

THE GODLY IN ZION.
(Verses 15 to 24.)

Another very striking example is in the latter part of Jeremiah viii., where the change of speakers is sevenfold within the compass of about nine verses, this rendering it simply impossible that, as ordinarily printed, the prophecy should convey any adequate significance of its import. Or again, who would suspect that one single verse of Hosea (xiv. 8) is a dialogue in four parts: "(EPHRAIM) What have I to do any more with idols? (THE LORD) I have answered and will regard him. (EPHRAIM) I am like a green fir tree. (THE LORD) From me is thy fruit found." But the riches of this work, as regards both the Old and the New Testament, are inexhaustible.

Professor Moulton's work, which we have been tempted by its intrinsic importance and interest thus to consider at length, though unique in its arrangement, yet, as regards the text, is mainly a reproduction (by permission) of the Revised Version. In regard to this fact, however, it is

necessary to bear in mind one important qualification: wherever they seemed to the editor preferable, the marginal alternatives have been adopted in place of the text. Thus we have what is presumably an improved revision of the Revised Version—for the application of the rule requiring a two-thirds majority before a change could be effected often relegated to the margin a reading or rendering which the greater number of the Revisers approved. To take one book of Scripture as affording a sample of these changes: in the Epistle to the Hebrews we read "a Son" for "*his* Son" (i. 2), "established" for "built" or "builded" (iii. 3, 4)—with the initial letter of "His" in capital type (verses 2, 5), "Where" for "Wherewith" (iii. 9), "out of" for "from" (v. 7), "which" for "whom" (v. 11), "full growth" for "perfection" (vi. 1), "tasted the word of God that it is good" (vi. 5), "the while" for "seeing" (vi. 6), "*is*" for "*was*" (ix. 4), "covenant" for "testament" (ix. 16, 17), "in" for "by" (x. 10), "jealousy" for "fierceness" (x. 27), "that ye have your own selves for a better possession" (x. 34), "the giving substance to" for "the assurance of" (xi. 1), "architect" for "builder" (xi. 10), "the Christ" for "Christ" (xi. 26), "all encumbrance" for "every weight" (xii. 1), "is admired of many" for "doth so easily beset us" (*ibid.*), "Endure unto chastening" (xii. 7), "put out of joint" for "turned out of the way" (xii. 13), "whether" for (the first) "lest" (xii. 15), and again (xii. 16), "a palpable and kindled fire" (xii. 18), "than Abel" (xii. 24). This is sufficient to show that the work under review is not only a new presentation of the literary form of the Bible, varying so greatly in its various parts, and requiring to be well studied in this respect by those who would the more thoroughly apprehend the meaning of the several books of Scripture; but also a distinct and valuable contribution to what many must be tempted to desire, in order that the Revised Version may be available as our accepted English Bible, namely, *a Revised Version amended in the light of twenty-one years' experience.*

There are some, no doubt, who would still prefer an

entirely new translation. One of the books on our list—*The Twentieth Century New Testament*—may be regarded as an illustration of what competent scholarship, the co-operation of several workers, and the allowance of adequate time for the work, are able to produce, in these days, when the translation is undertaken entirely *de novo*, and the Scriptures are rendered into modern everyday English. It cannot be said that the results, from this particular point of view, are altogether encouraging. Who would care to have to read, in that inimitable passage, Revelation vii. 9–17 :

Next in my vision I saw a vast throng, too great for any one to count. It was composed of men of every nation and of all tribes, peoples, and languages. They stood in front of the throne and in front of the Lamb, robed in white, and holding palm branches in their hands. And they are crying aloud—

"To our God seated on his throne and to the Lamb is our Salvation due."

Round the throne, the Senators, and the four Creatures, were standing all the angels, and they prostrated themselves on their faces in front of the throne and worshipped God, saying—

"Amen. Blessing, praise, wisdom, thanksgiving, honour, power, and might be ascribed to our God for ever and ever. Amen."

Then one of the Senators, addressing me, said, "Who are these robed in white? and from where did they come?"

"My Lord," I replied, "you know."

"These," he said, "are they who have come through the Great Persecution; they washed their robes white in the blood of the Lamb. And therefore it is that they are before the throne of God, and are serving him day and night in his Temple; and he who is seated on the throne will shelter and protect them. Never again will they be hungry, never again thirsty; nor will the sun smite upon them, nor any scorching heat; for the Lamb that stands in the front of the throne will be their shepherd, and will lead them to life-giving springs of water; and God will wipe away all tears from their eyes."

This is a fair sample, alike of the strength and of the weakness exhibited in the new translation. In some

respects it is very interesting; certain passages have considerable piquancy and the charm of freshness. It is always evident that, on their own chosen lines, the translators are masters of their work—indeed, sometimes one is tempted to covet a felicitous rendering for permanent adoption in an accepted English Bible (see some notable instances in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel). The volume, in any case, has a special value for reference, or for occasional use; and in its literary presentment it will compare not unfavourably with the Revised Version. But as a substitute for the latter it cannot sustain any claim, nor probably have its promoters any such ambition.

For, as a matter of fact, what is required for permanent use is not a colloquial but a classical Bible. Nor, indeed, for their best uses, should versions be too modern in style. It is true that all, or nearly all, of the component parts of Scripture have been modern once, both in the original and in translations. But perhaps we may venture to say that, generally speaking, there is this distinction to be observed: any portion that has been new, whether as first produced or as first rendered into another tongue, has come to the people concerned as a new and present message, rather than as an abiding record of God's truth; whereas only as they have attained some degree of age have the utterances, say of prophets and apostles, come to be regarded as sacred writings, such as should serve for a permanent enshrinement of God's declared will with regard to man. The Law was once the living message of God through Moses—afterwards it was regarded as the Standing Book of God; the prophecies of Isaiah and others were not Scriptures like the law until later days; nor did the epistles of Paul become a part of the Bible till after his time. And, in like manner, while the word of God in (say) the Fijian language was new to the people, it was chiefly a powerful instrument wielded by living men in the wonderful evangelization of that people; but age will give the more classical standing appropriate to the "bible" of a settled Christian community. The *Twentieth Century New Testament* might be very

potent in the religious awakening of certain people wholly ignorant of religious teaching; but a more Christianly educated community will prize a Bible with the flavour of long-past years.

We come now to the consideration of what probably fulfils the various conditions that must be realised in the ideal English Bible more nearly than any other existing work in our language, namely the "American Standard Edition" of the Revised Version, published only a few months ago by the American Revisers, through Nelson & Sons, of New York. In their Preface these Revisers say that, during the joint labours of the English and American Committees, it was agreed that in all points of difference the English companies, as the initiators of the work, should have the decisive vote, but that, by way of compensation, the American preferences should be published as an Appendix in every copy of the Revised Bible for fourteen years. For the same period the American Committee pledged themselves to sanction no alternative edition of the new version. It was hoped by them that ultimately many, or most, of their preferences, if approved by scholars and by the general public, might be adopted into the English edition. But, the English companies being disbanded, this issue seemed unlikely; and therefore the American Revisers, who had continued their organisation, have been engaged during the whole interval, but more particularly since the expiration of the fourteen years, in preparation for an eventual recension of the English revision. The endorsement of their preferences, by both British and American scholars, has encouraged them to proceed to publication.

The new work, however, is by no means a mere amalgamation of the readings of the Appendix with the English text: that would have been easy. The Appendix itself, which had been prepared in haste, and in which the differences were reduced to a minimum for the sake of conserving the unity of the revision as far as possible, needed careful reconsideration. Much the larger part of the preferences approved by a two-thirds vote had been suppressed,

in the hope of an eventual amalgamation of results; but these the American Revisers have now felt themselves at liberty to recall from their suppression.

As regards the Old Testament, the ancient memorial name of God—although misspelt Jehovah, because of the invincibly established, if mistaken, usage of many generations—is allowed its rightful place; nevertheless those who may still think it too Hebraic for frequent use are quite at liberty to substitute the more familiar "Lord," either in private reading or in public. Then again, "Sheol" is uniformly so rendered, and not partially, as in the English Revision. Certain linguistic details are modernised, as the substitution of "who" for "which" in regard to persons, of "are" for "be" as an indicative, the omission of "for" before an infinitive, etc. In addition to the embodiment of a considerable number of the suppressed preferences, the American Old Testament Company have returned in many instances (though these alterations partly coincide with the former) to the readings of the Authorised Version. They say:

> While in some cases the older readings, though inaccurate, seem to have been retained in the English Revision through an excessive conservatism, in others they have been abandoned needlessly, and sometimes to the injury of the sense and the sound.

(Perhaps the reader will mentally compare this statement with our contention in the earlier part of the present article.) They adduce, as a few of these many instances of return to the older version, Exodus xx. 4, 13; Leviticus xix. 22; Psalms xlviii. 1, civ. 26, cxiv. 4, cxvi. 11; Proverbs xiii. 15; Amos vi. 5. In a few cases they have departed from their previous recommendations. One very important class of alterations adopted by the American Revisers should put to shame the stubborn literalism which will persist in retaining expressions that, to an English ear, are indecencies. In the American Revision changes are very properly made for the sake of euphemism. But one almost despairs of common

sense in this country, since it is still thought necessary to render some of the old Hebrew modes of speech identically, when their equivalent is all that the most scrupulously faithful translation can properly demand. Furthermore, the American Revisers have introduced certain translations differing from those of the English Revised Version, and not required by either the expressed or suppressed preferences of their original Appendix. In those cases they have exercised great caution, and have taken fully into account the recent revised versions of the German, French, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian Bibles. They instance Deuteronomy xxxii. 14 ("Butter of the herd, and milk of the flock, With fat of lambs, And rams of the breed of Bashan, and goats, With the finest of the wheat; And of the blood of the grape thou drankest wine"); Judges v. 20 ("From heaven fought the stars, From their courses they fought against Sisera"); Isaiah xxx. 32 ("And every stroke of the appointed staff, which Jehovah shall lay upon him, shall be with the sound of tabrets and harps; and in battles with the brandishing of his arm will he fight with them"); xxxv. 8 ("And a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for *the redeemed*: the wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein"); Hosea xi. 2 ("The more *the prophets* called them, the more they went from them: they sacrificed unto the Baalim, and burned incense to graven images"); Micah i. 6 ("Therefore I will make Samaria as a heap of the field, *and* as places for planting vineyards; and I will pour down the stones thereof into the valley, and I will uncover the foundations thereof"). It may be said, also, that there is a new and select set of marginal references to parallel and illustrative passages, these occupying a central column of the page. The paragraph divisions and the punctuation have both received much attention.

By way of illustrating the unobtrusive, but very real, improvement which has been made by the American Revisers, we may instance two passages, from the Old and New Testaments respectively; and for clearer exhibition

of the differences they may be set side by side. First, let us take a passage from Isaiah, xlii. 1–4 :

ENGLISH REVISED VERSION.

Behold my servant, whom I uphold ; my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth : I have put my spirit upon him ; he shall bring forth judgement to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench : he shall bring forth judgement in truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgement in the earth ; and the isles shall wait for his law.

AMERICAN REVISED VERSION.

Behold, my servant, whom I uphold ; my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth : I have put my Spirit upon him ; he will bring forth justice to the Gentiles. He will not cry, nor lift up his voice, nor cause it to be heard in the street. A bruised reed will he not break, and a dimly-burning wick will he not quench : he will bring forth justice in truth. He will not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set justice in the earth ; and the isles shall wait for his law.

Here are fourteen changes, slight, but not trifling, none of which, it may be remarked,—for this indicates the extent of subsequent reconsideration,—is to be found in the list of American preferences published by the Revisers in 1884.

Our second passage shall be from the Gospel of Matthew, xxvi. 26–29 :

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it ; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat ; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it ; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat ; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.

Here, in the same number of verses, are only two alterations, one of them (not indicated in the list of preferences) being obviously intended to bring this Gospel into harmony with Luke, where the English Revisers have translated "poured out," although for some occult reason they have rendered the very same word "shed" in both Matthew and Mark. It is to be regretted, indeed, that the American Revisers did not take the opportunity of giving a less ambiguous rendering, instead of "Drink ye all of it"—which it is exceedingly difficult for anyone to read correctly: such a translation, for example, as that of the *Twentieth Century New Testament*, "Drink from [or, of] it, all of you." But this at least indicates that the American Revisers have dealt very cautiously and tenderly with the original revision.

The New Testament Company have perhaps been somewhat more conservative as regards changes not under consideration in the original revision; but otherwise they seem to have followed upon much the same lines as the Old Testament Company. And what they say, in concluding their Preface, will be the verdict of many competent judges throughout the English-speaking world, as regards the entire work:

> The present volume, it is believed, will on the one hand bring a plain reader more closely into contact with the exact thought of the sacred writers than any version now current in Christendom, and on the other hand prove especially serviceable to students of the Word.

It is a noble work, destined to become the accepted Bible of the majority of the Anglo-Saxon race; and we are tempted to wish that it might be adopted as the one final Revised Version (for this century at least) of the English-speaking world.

THOS. F. LOCKYER.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL AND THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS.

The Immortality of the Soul. A Protest. By JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1901.)

IN his volume on *The Last Things*, published in 1897, Dr. Beet expressed his dissatisfaction with the accepted doctrine of the Church on man's future, especially as regards the ultimate destiny of the impenitent. He did not find it possible to take refuge in the competing doctrine of a final recovery of all sinful souls, or in the more limited hypothesis of a probation after death for certain classes. Nor would he commit himself positively to the theory of the Annihilationists. He was in quest rather of some kind of fourth answer to the solemn question of the fate of the wicked. His sympathies appeared to be on the side of the doctrine of conditional immortality. His reasonings pointed to that as the conclusion which had most to favour it, both in Scripture and in the nature of things. The trend of his book was unmistakably in the direction of the theory of extinction. But he was restrained from accepting that theory and teaching it as the authoritative solution of the problem which he, with many others, finds so dark and difficult, by its want of distinct inculcation in Scripture.

In the present volume he returns to the question, and attaches himself again to the position stated in the earlier publication. There is little or nothing indeed in this book which was not given in the prior and larger volume. In the new book, however, he puts some things in a sharper and more precise form, and directs our attention more

definitely and with more concentration of purpose to the question of the immortality of the soul. He had dealt with that subject also in his former work, and quite in the same way. He pursues it further here, however, and makes it the centre round which his entire argument moves. He calls his book a *Protest*—a protest against this particular dogma of the *Immortality of the Soul.* He seeks to convince us of the unreasonableness or the unwarranted excess of what he calls the "traditional belief" on the subject of the final issues of life by showing it to be founded on a mistaken conception of man's nature or constitution. He speaks of the doctrine of man's natural or inalienable immortality, meaning by that the indestructible existence of the human soul, as a purely philosophical notion, a thing derived not from the Bible but from Plato. He describes it as an "alien" doctrine, and not only so, but as a dangerous doctrine. He confesses that in one form or other it has subsisted "during long centuries," and has been "almost universally accepted as divine truth taught in the Bible." He admits further that until recent times it has been "comparatively harmless." But he regards it as foreign to the Bible "in both phrase and thought," and as "now producing most serious results." Only by clearing our minds of it entirely can we get at the genuine mind of Scripture on man's destiny. Once let us see that the doctrine of man's natural and inherent immortality is not a doctrine of Revelation, and great things will result. Theology will be ransomed from unworthy inconsistencies, entangling confusions, and exaggerated deliverances. Relief will come to multitudes of perplexed souls. Hesitating minds will be conciliated and persuaded. Christian truth will shine with the attractive light of a new reasonableness. And the dark side of man's future, which for long centuries has been made all too dark by the general teaching of the Christian Church and the popular religious belief, will have a more tolerable aspect.

We should indeed have unusual cause for thankfulness if these large promises were made good, and if the conclusion

to which the book carries us were found to be of such magnitude and such fruitfulness. But we cannot say that this is the case. Dr. Beet's final position is a comparatively narrow one, and the importance of his volume lies in its drift rather than in its distinctive tenet. The general treatment of the subject is slight, far too slight at most points. The exegesis is very careful and precise on the side of all grammatical and lexical resource. But it lacks much on the historical side, especially in the faculty for reading particular statements in the light of the modes of thought and forms of belief lying behind them. There is also a readiness to dispose of difficult and contested questions much too easily.

One conspicuous instance of the last is seen in the summary which is given of the Egyptian ideas of the future life. In something like four short pages Dr. Beet disposes of questions on which the greatest experts in Egyptology find themselves unable to speak decisively even after the studies of a lifetime. The composite character of the Egyptian beliefs as they have come down to us; the account that has to be taken of the possibility of the incorporation of different, if not discordant, ideas into the *Book of the Dead* as we have it; the things that go to indicate that the Egyptian people had a doctrine of the lot of the unrighteous which implied their continuous existence; the singular anthropology that underlay the theology; their peculiar views of *life*, the *soul*, the *self*; the distinctions between the *Ba*, the *Khu*, the *Kâ*, etc.,—these and other things which make the question of the Egyptian faith so complicated have little or no regard given them, and the conclusion is reached by a leap that "in all ancient literature . . . the phrase *every soul immortal*, or phraseology equivalent, is found only in the school of Greek philosophy, of which Plato is the most conspicuous representative."

There is also, we feel, not a little misapprehension and exaggeration in the way in which the whole position is stated, particularly as respects the point to which the strength of the volume is given. Even if all that is said about the

dogma of the immortality of the soul were accepted as just and true, the case would remain precisely what it was before. The biblical doctrine of man's future is entirely independent of the Platonic dogma or any other philosophical proposition, and the ancestral doctrine of the Christian Church on the subject of the final issues, though it may have been illustrated and enforced by the Greek doctrine, and at times unduly mixed up with it, is by no means founded upon it. Its roots lie elsewhere. We must add that Dr. Beet does not always apprehend quite fully and clearly either the systems of thought that he expounds or the opinions that he criticises. This may be due to the brevity of his statements. But his representation of the Platonic philosophy on the subject of the future life is certainly far from adequate, and some of the modern scholars whose views he notices would have considerable difficulty in recognising themselves in the descriptions which Dr. Beet gives of their reasonings and conclusions. Dr. Laidlaw, for example, would be somewhat astonished, we should imagine, to find the argument of his *Bible Doctrine of Man* used as it is here, and himself credited with having "anticipated" the teaching of a volume which runs so much in the track of the doctrine of conditional immortality as only to stop short of it by a step.

Anything that comes, however, from so experienced a pen as that of Dr. Beet deserves to be received with respect and considered with care. Let us see, then, what his objections to the ordinary view amount to, what precisely it is that he offers as a better answer to the most solemn questions of the end, and how he leads up to his conclusion. We are anxious not to misunderstand him. We feel how important it is that his views should be justly stated, and how unfortunate it would be if incorrect or over-charged representations of his position should become current. We shall give his case, as far as possible, therefore, in his own words, and we shall use the statements of the larger treatise, where that seems desirable, in illustration of those of the smaller and later treatise.

Dr. Beet's great difficulty is with the traditional doctrine of the continuous existence and penalty of the unrighteous. It is essential to notice how he expresses that doctrine. It is not less important to look carefully at the reasons which he gives for not accepting it, and the grounds on which he regards it as a serious obstacle in the way of faith.

In his book on *The Last Things* he says that, "since the latter part of the second century, until recent years, the prevalent belief and teaching of the Christian Church has been that the doom pronounced on the day of judgment will be endless suffering," and that this has been "accepted as the teaching of the New Testament." He adds that "this popular belief has received subtle support from the equally prevalent doctrine . . . of the essential and endless permanence of the human soul and of human consciousness." In like manner in the present volume he speaks of the doctrine in question as "the traditional doctrine of the endless suffering of the lost," and connects it in the same way with the dogma of the immortality of the soul. "To the pictures of actual suffering found in the New Testament the traditional teaching of the Church has added," he says, "the assertion that the suffering will be endless"; and again he adds that "this addition is a necessary consequence of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul unconsciously borrowed, as we have seen, from Greek philosophy."

This is how Dr. Beet habitually presents the doctrine of the Church, and if this were the whole case with respect to that doctrine, it would not be easy to speak of the difficulty felt by Dr. Beet as other than a natural difficulty and a serious one. But, however it may have fared at the hands of theologians from time to time, however it may have been expressed in popular speech, and from whatever extreme and exaggerated forms of statement it may have suffered, this is neither the whole doctrine nor the primary and most essential element in it. We do not admit that this is the one way, the one adequate and necessary way of reading it. To make it simply a case of *endless suffering* is to take an entirely superficial view of it and to throw it out of pro-

portion. So stated it is made to appear as the case of a punishment decreed from without, a torment imposed and continued by mere will. And in point of fact it is as an *infliction* that Dr. Beet thinks of it. He speaks of the penalty, as he understands it, as one "no one of us would inflict on the vilest offender." He speaks of the difficulty of believing that God "will inflict on the wicked a punishment which will perpetuate evil in the form of suffering, and in some sense of sin, for endless ages after the purpose of mercy has been fully accomplished." He denies that "endless torment" can be said to be "an inevitable result of man's sin," because "inevitable sequences are linked together by the deliberate purpose of God." So that, "if endless torment be the punishment of sin, it is because this doom was selected by a God of infinite love."[1] Thus to Dr. Beet the question is one of a punishment inflicted from without, and the implication is that it has no inherent ground. But this is to deal with the question in a very partial way, and to put that first which in reality is second. What we have to look at is not any particular offence or offences against the divine law, to which God attaches a punishment which in respect of its duration might seem out of relation to the measure of guilt. The matter at issue is not this or that sin, but a determinate condition of sinfulness. The question is one primarily of the possibility of a permanently sinful character, with the consequences of a permanent harvest of penalty.

But let us look more closely at the objections which Dr. Beet urges against the ordinary doctrine. He puts them in the strongest terms. In his former volume he denies that there is any clear teaching in the Bible to sustain that doctrine. He admits that in the Epistles of Paul and Peter and John, and also in the Fourth Gospel, there is "important teaching about the doom of the lost, implying actual suffering." But he finds "no statement or indication of its actual duration," and he attaches great significance to the

[1] *The Last Things*, pp. 207—209.

"silence" of these writings on the subject. As to the Synoptists, he tell us that, though our Lord speaks of wailing and gnashing of teeth, He never speaks of that as without end. He says that punishment "does not necessarily imply continued consciousness." He does not allow that such terms as "eternal" and "for ever" are terms of absolute meaning. And he thinks that the dramatic pictures of the Book of Revelation form no sure basis for "accurate doctrine."

But he has also other difficulties of a more positive kind. One of his strongest objections to the current doctrine is that it implies that "sin and misery will be as enduring as goodness and blessing," and that "human consciousness will continue for ages on ages in endless succession after it has become an unmixed evil." He holds it impossible to harmonize the accepted doctrine of an enduring retributive future with the character of God. He even goes the length of pronouncing the attempts made at such a reconciliation "wholly irrelevant and indeed frivolous," and declares it "useless to say that the existence of evil around us is equally inconsistent with the love of God."

He does not seem to be much in sympathy with those profoundest thinkers to whom the *existence* of evil has always appeared to be a greater mystery even than the *continuance* of evil. Nor has he much respect for the accumulated Christian insight and experience which has its witness in the constant teaching of the Church along the ages.

"The prevalence in the Church of the theory before us," he says, "has little weight. The subject was never discussed in the undivided Church, nor was it formulated in the ancient creeds. The philosophy of Plato was the noblest school of thought in the ancient world. From him Augustine and others learnt the doctrine of the immortality of the soul."

A surprising account, truly, to offer of the attitude of the ancient Church to the things of the end. Is it meant that the ancient Church did not believe in the immortal existence

of man as such in distinction from the brutes, and that it did not come to think of the unrighteous as continuing in existence until Augustine brought it under the spell of the Platonic philosophy ?

And if Dr. Beet has small respect for the constant belief of the Church, he has as little regard for the ways in which great thinkers like Bishop Butler deal with the alleged difficulties of Revelation. The method of analogy, which others have found so pertinent and helpful, does not seem to appeal much to him. "Comparisons with other difficulties," he says, "in the way of some doctrines of the Gospel, or of Natural Theology, are equally irrelevant." And he brings his argument to a point by affirming that "the endlessness of torment, excluding a further end to be gained, differentiates this doctrine from all others, and places it in a solitary depth of improbability or apparent impossibility." Strong and confident words certainly; but words which at once beg the question by assuming the exclusion of a "further end" (and who is to limit the Holy One of Israel or measure His purposes ?), and prejudice the issue by making it a case only of torment from without, not of will and character within.

In the later volume Dr. Beet abides by these positions in all essential points. He puts the problem that forms the foundation of his objections in the same limited and inadequate way, and looks at it only in its secondary aspect. He insists also with equal urgency on the moral argument. "Not only against the endless torment of the lost, as our fathers taught it," he says, "but against any form of endless suffering, or of an endless prolongation of an existence which is only a helpless consciousness of utter ruin, the moral sense of thousands of intelligent and devout men and women is in stern revolt." It seems to him futile to say that we are incapable of estimating the "evil of sin and the punishment it deserves." The doctrine in question is judged to have no moral authority over us, because it does not gain the "homage of our moral sense." Our whole conception of what God is he holds to be in

protest against it. It cannot be made to harmonize "with the infinite love, or even with the justice of God."

Here, then, we have the difficulty which Dr. Beet sees standing so intractably in the way of the ordinary belief. These are the terms in which he expresses it again and again with the utmost strength of phrase. He seeks relief from it, but he does not find that relief in any of the competing or supplementary theories in which it is usually sought. He cannot fall back on the doctrine of a universal restoration. For he sees that the New Testament clearly teaches that "some men will be finally excluded from the happy family of God."[1] To assert that all men will at last be saved is, in his opinion, to go beyond Scripture, and even to contradict it. The theory is an appeal to the infinite power and the infinite love of God. But he points out that all around us we see things permitted by God, notwithstanding His infinite power and love, "which no human father would permit," and which we ourselves should not permit had we the power. Nor can he commit himself to the theory of a probation beyond death, both because there is "no reliable indication of it in the Bible," and because "a further probation involves a possibility of further failure." Nor, again, can he find rest in the supposition that the suffering of the condemned may pass at length into unconsciousness. That, he says, is but a "human attempt to remove a difficulty which the New Testament leaves unsolved," and the support which it finds in certain biblical metaphors is doubtful, and in any case insufficient to establish it.

In view of all this, and still more in view of the general tenor of the arguments which we have given much in Dr. Beet's own words, and which all readers must feel to bear so strongly in the direction of conditional immortality, we might expect our author to conclude frankly and decidedly in favour of the theory of ultimate extinction—the annihilation of sinful souls by the positive act of God,

[1] *The Last Things*, p. 212.

or the dying out of such souls by the process of inevitable inherent decay. But Dr. Beet does not persevere to the end of the course on which he has been travelling, because he does not find this theory of final extinction explicitly taught in Scripture. He takes refuge, therefore, in the *unrevealed*. He restates the teaching of the New Testament in this way. He admits that, according to it, the human race is to be separated at the Judgment into two classes, between which there is an "impassable barrier"; that the punishment of the wicked is described as "ruin, utter, hopeless, and final"; that our Lord Himself teaches, according to the record of the Synoptists, that "the lost will suffer acute and continuous pain"; that the same is implied when Paul and others teach "that retribution will be according to works"; that "consciousness of endless and glorious life forfeited through our own inexcusable folly and sin involves remorse and mental anguish beyond conception"; and that "the word pictures of the Synoptist Gospels and the Book of Revelation do but delineate a necessary inference from teaching permeating the entire New Testament." Further, he confesses that "of this acute suffering the writers of the New Testament see no end," and that they do not "teach anything which logically implies that it will ever end." But on the other hand he thinks they do "not go so far as expressly and indisputably to assert the endless permanence of these ruined and wretched ones, and the consequent endlessness of their torment." Here he pauses, therefore, at the *unknown*. All our theologies must come at last to that. But in the present case the question is whether the *unknown* is reached a stage before Revelation itself warrants or requires, and whether it is not had recourse to in a way seriously affecting the whole Scripture view of man.

This, then, is Dr. Beet's position. Stated by itself and taken apart from the general argument of his work, it may not appear to amount to much or to depart very seriously from the ordinary view. But, if we are to understand its worth and appreciate its tendencies, we must look at the

way by which the author leads up to his conclusion. And of this we must say, in the first place, that there is much to excite surprise in Dr. Beet's treatment of the belief in a future life, in respect of the construction which he puts upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the extraordinary influence which he attributes to it. That doctrine is the centre of his whole argument. He puts his case as if the whole theology of the Church as it touches the nature of man and the retributive issues of his life had been in bondage to that philosophical dogma, and as if under the malign influence of that tenet the real doctrine of Scripture on the subject of man's destiny had been misunderstood for all these centuries.

But surely this is an exaggerated and indeed a mistaken statement of the case. We are at one, of course, with all that Dr. Beet says of the Platonic dogma as a form of thought that has no place in Scripture. The Bible certainly looks at things in another way, and uses very different terms. It does not commit itself either to the Platonic dogma or to any other speculation of the schools, but follows the humbler way of practice and experience. While its concern lies so largely with man's nature and with man's future, it has nothing like a precise psychology, nor does it pause to pronounce on such questions as that of man's natural or conditional immortality. It keeps itself aloof in a remarkable manner even from philosophical ideas which might seem to lie very near it. That this is its way is a commonplace among theologians now at least. Christian theology no doubt has too often entangled itself in an unhappy fashion with the peculiar tenets and terms of great schools of philosophy. But it is a work of supererogation to write a whole book with the view of convincing us of something which all scientific theologians recognise.

But apart from this irrelevancy and needless expenditure of argument, Dr. Beet fails singularly in his appreciation of that Platonic doctrine, of which he makes vastly too much, and of other types of philosophical definition. So far as the Greeks and other ancient peoples had the belief in a

future life of some kind, they stated it in terms either of the popular conceptions of the time or of the dominant philosophies. The popular beliefs and elaborated dogmas of which we have the record in the History of Religion and the History of Philosophy were simply so many forms in which utterance was given to the conviction that man is not like the brutes that perish, but survives death, and has a continuing existence. This was the essence of one and all of them. The forms were many and various. Sometimes, as in the Heroic age of Greece, and in different types of Semitic faith, the form assumed was that of a belief in the existence of man as a shade in Hades. Sometimes, as in the case of Pindar, it was that of a belief in a *hereafter* of a profoundly moral and retributive order for righteous and for unrighteous. Sometimes, as in later Hellenic thought, it became the elaborated doctrine of an immortality of soul alone. In the different types of Indian, Persian, and Egyptian faith it appeared as a belief in transmigration, in a series of heavens and hells, in the continuance of the power of men's deeds, and the like. But whether they ran in terms of an immortality of soul, a persistence of Karma, or what else, these various ideas or doctrines were simply so many forms in which the sentiment or instinct that is in the heart of man came to utterance; so many ways in which a belief which is in Scripture as it is in the human soul, and which makes the real essence of all theologies dealing with the last things, expresses itself—the belief in the enduring life of man and the persistence of character.

There lies the real value of the Platonic argument. It did not *make* the eschatology of the Church. It was simply one particular illustration and confirmation of what theologians found in Scripture, and philosophers discovered in the mind of man. The doctrine of immortality, as it was reasoned out by Plato, had its peculiar form, but it was not an "alien" doctrine, as Dr. Beet calls it, in the proper sense of the word, if one looks to the essential meaning of the doctrine and not simply to its peculiar expression. Plato himself does not regard it as a purely philosophical notion

in the sense that Dr. Beet has in view. It is his way of construing the truth that man lives after death, and will be judged, and may suffer enduring penalty as he may bind himself in the fetters of an enduring evil will and enduring corrupt affection. The soul, he tells us, takes nothing with her into Hades but "education and nurture." The evil affections of the soul, injustice, and the like, he sees, do not "waste and consume the soul." Even with Plato the essence of the question lay in what *character* is. And the question with us is not whether Scripture teaches the Platonic dogma in the bare sense of an immortality of the soul which alone Dr. Beet sees in it, but whether it teaches that human character, or the personal, responsible life of man is anything else than enduring—is capable, in short, of being snuffed out or of extinguishing itself.

The account, again, which Dr. Beet gives of early Christian writers as witnesses to his peculiar view, and to the condition of Jewish belief, is open to serious criticism. His contention is that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in the sense of its essential permanence, is confined to Greek thought; that it did not exist in any school which influenced Jewish faith; and that it has "no place in the teaching of Christ and His apostles." This may be true so far as concerns the particular Platonic phrase, *the soul immortal*; but it is not true of the idea expressed by that phrase. The idea or doctrine certainly appears in the peculiar Jewish literature the influence of which is seen in some measure in the New Testament itself. Only it appears there for the most part in the form of a belief in the continuance of the *man* as such, in most cases apart from the Platonic depreciation of the body. It is seen in forms most closely resembling the Platonic ideas in books like *Wisdom*, and in the writings of Philo. But it is also stated or implied in the more distinctively Jewish form in such writings as *Judith*, the *Book of Enoch*, and others. We see something of the beliefs of the Jewish people in the New Testament itself, and we know from Josephus how the Pharisees and the Essenes thought of the things of the

end. It is beside the question to say that the Jews were indebted to Plato or other Greek thinkers. The important point is that when our Lord and His apostles taught, this belief in the immortal life of man had its place among the Jews.

Dr. Beet contends that the earlier Christian writers did not think of the soul as immortal; that this idea does not appear in their writings till the close of the second century; and that it owed its position in Christian theology in reality to Augustine who followed Plato. But this is to overstate the case. It is true that often the earlier writers simply used the terms of Scripture itself, and were so far indefinite. It is true also that in the literature in question the word "immortality" is sometimes used, as we ourselves often use it, in the sense of a *blessed* immortality. But there is more than this in these writers. Dr. Beet himself admits that in Irenæus, Tatian, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Origen, etc., the doctrine of the immortal being of man, and even the more precise ascription to him of an immortal soul, are affirmed. This is important, for it takes us a good way back. But we can go farther back still. The very inconsistencies which Dr. Beet finds in these writers and in those of earlier date might have suggested that there was something else to take into account. There is something, and it is a consideration of importance. It is the distinction between an immortality that is absolute and an immortality that is gifted. What these writers in most cases had in view is precisely what Dr. Beet fails to see—the assertion of the eternity of the world and the eternity of souls *a parte ante*. What they had to oppose was the idea of an immortality independent of God, an immortality that was not created, or, as they sometimes phrased it, not begotten. The negative statements made by them have to be read in the light of this. They do not necessarily mean that the immortal life which man received as a gift from his Creator was a life less than immortal in the strict sense of the term.

Justin Martyr is a case in point. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* we find the old man saying of the soul that "it is

not its own characteristic to live as it is God's," and of those who "have not appeared worthy of God" as being punished "as long as God wishes them to exist and to be punished." On the other hand, the same interlocutor expresses himself thus: "I for my part assuredly affirm that no souls whatever die; for then this would be truly a blessing to the wicked." Justin himself, too, on the one hand, describes the good as destined to become immortal (ἀθάνατοι), incorruptible (ἄφθαρτοι), and incapable of pain (ἀπαθεῖς); and on the other hand speaks of the punishment "in everlasting fire"; of the wicked as "sent to the judgment and condemnation of fire, to be punished unceasingly"; of God as sending the "bodies of the wicked in eternal sensibility (ἐν αἰσθήσει αἰωνιᾷ) with the wicked demons into the eternal fire." He also contrasts Plato's idea of retribution with the Christian in these terms:

Plato said that Rhadamanthus and Minos would punish the unrighteous that came to them, but we say that the same thing will take place, but Christ will be the judge, and they will be with their souls in the same bodies, and that they will be punished not, as he says, a thousand years only, but with an everlasting punishment.

But we must look, however briefly, at the Scripture argument as it is presented in this book. And the first thing that suggests itself is that Dr. Beet demands too much of Scripture. He proceeds on the principle that there must be specific inculcation before we are entitled to accept anything as Scripture doctrine. So he requires chapter and verse and distinct statement before he will accept the doctrine of the immortal existence of the unrighteous. But this is not the way of Scripture. It is not a dogmatic manual. It does not deliver so many doctrinal propositions. It does not pause to assert or to prove the existence of God, but it shows us God acting. It does not *state* the doctrine of the Trinity or that of Providence, or that of man's freedom or that of man's constitution, in precise and definite form, but leaves us to construct these doctrines on the foundations which it lays; and in furnishing us with these foundations it

proceeds by appeal, by practical teaching, by the unfolding of ideas in relation to life and duty.

But it must further be said that the whole treatment of the Old Testament is inadequate. It is not only that the interpretation of this or that text is open to doubt, as is the case, *e.g.*, with Daniel xii. 2. That passage, which has so important a place in the development of Old Testament belief on the subject of the future life, is surely dealt with in a quite extraordinary way when the contrast between the lot of the one class of the risen and the other, between the awaking to "everlasting life" and the awaking to "shame and everlasting contempt," is taken to refer in the former case to real and blessed life in the subjects themselves, but in the case of the latter to effects produced on others than the persons themselves. But not to say more of such *tours de force* in exegesis, Dr. Beet misses the real attitude of the Old Testament to the doctrine of the future life of which man is the heir. It has no philosophy of man. Its ideas of *soul* and *self* are not those of modern times. Its terms *heart, soul, spirit, mind*, etc., are all broad, popular terms. Its special point is that it looks on man as a whole, in the unity of his corporeal and mental being. It keeps the middle way between the Homeric notion of the bodily life as the real, substantial life, and the Platonic conception of the uncorporeal as the real life and the body as only the shackle of the soul. It is the *man* himself, the living man, that passes into Sheol at death. It is the man in the unity of his material and immaterial being that continues to exist there. And the doctrine of the Old Testament which begins at that point, gradually enlarges into the conception of a risen life, a life at God's right hand, a life of moral award after the judgment, for the man as such. Nothing is effected, therefore, even if it were proved that the Old Testament has no doctrine of an immortality of soul, unless it were also proved that it does not regard the *man himself* as continuing to exist. Dr. Beet recognises the importance of the doctrine of the image of God in man. But he does not appear to see how much that means and how far it carries

us. It means that man's being was created a copy of God's being in finite limits—a free, personal life. Does the Old Testament contemplate this personal life, this being that bears God's image, as a thing that may come to an end, as a thing capable of extinction like the life of the brutes, or destined to cease to exist unless a new element is introduced into it? Does it not contrast man's life all through with that of the brutes that are doomed to perish, and represent it as essentially different from that in origin and in end? And does it not do all this without drawing distinctions between righteous and unrighteous?

There is also much to remark upon in the exposition which Dr. Beet gives of the teaching of the New Testament. He admits, indeed, that there are some passages which suggest the idea of an endless, conscious retribution for the unrighteous. But he belittles these, and does his best to empty the most solemn words of the New Testament on this subject of their proper meaning. His task is a difficult one. For he has to recognise that these passages do certainly convey the idea of a retributive future, and express the finality of the moral decisions of this life. He has also to acknowledge that the terms *perish, die, destroy*, and the like do not necessarily or naturally mean extinction, but express the view of utter ruin. And he does not himself accept the idea that evil passion necessarily wears out the soul. So that we may infer that the possibility of impenitent souls ceasing to be, on which he rests, is the possibility of an extinction that comes by God's act. But he endeavours to adjust the most definite and solemn declarations of retribution to his peculiar view by affirming that the penalty may continue while the subject himself may not continue, or that punishment may be eternal while the punished one may cease to be. He disposes also in the usual way of the testimony of the word *αἰώνιος*, asserting it to mean simply "age-lasting," and arguing that, because it is applied at times to such things as the Levitical institutions, it means no more than *indefinite* when it is used of the penal awards of the end. But he has to discount the application of the word to

God, His purpose, His kingdom, etc., and he forgets that while most words have a secondary and modified sense, that does not negative their primary and more definite meaning. He fails to see that in point of fact when, either in Greek or in English, the words *eternal, everlasting*, and their cognates are applied to such objects as the hills, the Jewish ordinances, and the like, it is because for the time being the mind conceives these objects to be what the terms naturally express. He does not take into account the view of things which is given in the significant words recorded by Mark, in which our Lord speaks of one as "guilty of an eternal sin." Naturally he has considerable difficulty with the description of the two awards in Matthew xxv. 46. He thinks that annihilation would be to all intents and purposes an *eternal punishment*, and that this takes the basis from the argument drawn from the solemn and definite declaration made by our Lord on the results of the decisive Judgment. But surely if "eternal life" is a life that endures and of which the righteous are conscious, "eternal punishment" is a punishment which endures and of which the unrighteous are conscious. Is it possible, it may well be asked, that Christ in this passage, or in any other, could have used modes of speech open to the most serious misunderstanding, or could have uttered in the same breath words intended to convey in parallel cases ideas so essentially different?

There is much else that might be noticed in Dr. Beet's book. He sees, for example, the significance of Christ's appeals and the far-reaching meaning of the worth which He attached to the soul or life. But he does not see how difficult it is to suppose, in view of these things, that our Lord regarded the *soul* or *life* as liable to become extinct. He recognises also how certain it is that the Bible proceeds on the idea of the survival of man. But he argues as the advocates of conditional immortality usually do, that there is a wide difference between *survival* and *immortality*. But if survival after death is taught, the presumption is that it is understood to continue. The burden of proof lies with those who challenge this. They have to

show that a gift of life which survives the shock of death and carries man's living into the world of the future is in any case to come to an end there. But where is the proof for this? Where, in particular, is the kind of chapter and verse proof which Dr. Beet demands for other things?

Dr. Beet's theory may not seem to differ much from the accepted view of the Church. It is only at one point that the divergence appears, and it may not seem to be of more than secondary importance. In reality the two views lie far apart. For they imply very different conceptions of what man is. Every possible doctrine, indeed, of the other world and its conditions must confess that at last it reaches the unknown. Had Dr. Beet's protest been against the introduction of metaphysical ideas of duration into the question, had his appeal to the unrevealed meant that in the last issue we must acknowledge how little we know what time is and how much less we can understand what eternity is, had he simply warned us once more that all our conclusions must be taken with this *caveat*, we should have been at one with him. But his contention comes to more than that. It means that we must read the words of Scripture in one way with reference to the future lot of the righteous, and in another way with reference to the future of the unrighteous. It means that while we must think of the life of the good as permanent and changeless in the other world, we have no right on the ground of Scripture to speak of the life of the evil and impenitent in the same terms. This is to alter our conception of man's nature, and to make it not merely morally but essentially different in two distinct classes of men. It brings us very near the idea that it is by a constitutional change man is made the possessor of a life that is certain to endure. Dr. Beet does not say that, but strives to distinguish his position from that of the pronounced Conditionalists. But the drift of his argument will seem to most to be in that direction. What he does say is that the eternal life of the believer rests on grounds independent of the particular term *eternal* or *everlasting*, in so far, *e.g.*, as he is a citizen of a kingdom of which it is said "there will be no

end," and that it is "still further removed from all possibility of doubt by the immortal life of Christ Himself, which His human brethren will share." But this latter explanation points rather to the importation of something into the nature of men; and as to the former, it is enough to say that if a limited sense is claimed for the words *eternal, everlasting*, and the like in this connexion, it is not easy to see why such phrases as "without end," "there will be no end," which are also applied to things that are only relatively endless, should have their absolute sense.

Dr. Beet's conclusion most resembles that stated by Mr. Clement Clemance in his volume on *Future Punishment*, published in 1877. But there is a difference. As Mr. Clemance puts it, to affirm annihilation is to distort Scripture; to affirm universal restoration is to oppose Scripture; to affirm the ending of punishment is to fall short of Scripture; and to affirm its endlessness is to go beyond Scripture. But Dr. Beet's argument inclines much more distinctly and logically towards the theory of extinction. He compares the ordinary doctrine of the Church more unfavourably with the counter doctrine. He holds that neither the doctrine of eternal retribution nor that of annihilation is definitely taught in Scripture; but he looks on the former as having much against it otherwise, and on the latter as having much to favour it. He also makes a more positive application of the possibilities of the *unknown*.

Mr. Clemance regards the duration of future punishment as a matter left indefinite in Scripture. But he gives prominence to the fact that "God has not revealed an end." If there is a limit, it is not disclosed to us. All is to be left by us, therefore, in the hands of a God of supreme wisdom, righteousness, and goodness. In place of making what he calls "the hard and positive affirmation of endlessness" Mr. Clemance would have us rather say that, "though we do not affirm there is no limit, we do affirm there is no revealed limit." But he acknowledges that the "punishment of the unrighteous is unending so far as God's disclosures go," and also that "the intensity and duration

thereof will be according to perfect righteousness." And he adds a sentence which has the true note of reverent sobriety as well as discernment:

"When we know," he says, "that neither vindictiveness nor excess can ever be rightly predicated of the sufferings of the lost, when we know that even endless punishment means endless dealing with guilty men according to perfect equity, we confess we have more respect for the very stoutest assertors of that theory than we have for some who seem as if they might call Almighty God to the bar of their little reason and tell Him how He ought to treat His creatures."

There is nothing like this in Dr. Beet's statement of the case, nothing that goes so near the heart of the question and the final refuge from its confessed difficulties. He makes large allowances in abatement of certain of these difficulties on the ground of our ignorance and our inability to measure things. We cannot object, he thinks, to the doom of the lost as unjust, because "of no one case are all the facts before us," as he expresses it, and because we "know not the greatness of the sins which will be punished by exclusion from the glory of God, and therefore cannot compare the sin and the punishment." This is more in the line of Butler and Pascal and the great thinkers. Had Dr. Beet followed this line when dealing with the question of the duration of penalty as in dealing with that of its nature, he might have seen that the relief which he seeks lies beyond the point at which he stops.

S. D. F. SALMOND.

The World of Books.

I. THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS.

The Spiritual Mind. By Robert Henry Roberts, B.A., formerly Principal of Regent's Park College, London. Edited by his Son. (London : Hodder & Stoughton. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

THE author, when laid aside by illness, set himself to compare Scripture and ecclesiastical standards of doctrine, and this volume is the result. Generally speaking, it is an argument for Christian individualism in the judgment of doctrine as against traditionalism. The work was left incomplete and partially unrevised. The style is colloquial and lively. There is plenty of freshness and vigour of thought. The true judge of doctrinal truth is found in the spiritual man of 1 Corinthians ii., to the exposition of which above a hundred pages are devoted. With this is compared the actual course which the development of doctrine took in the Church from apostolic days to the present. In the main the discussion takes the form of a criticism of the Roman and the Anglo-Catholic theory in the light of Church history. The Roman theory is disproved by the mistaken judgments and deep-seated materialism of that Church. The latter is examined in Dr. Gore's presentation of it in his works on Roman claims and the nature of the Christian ministry. The faults and sins of Church Fathers and Councils are vigorously canvassed. Much, no doubt, might be said on the other side. Still, there is only too much ground for the author's far from complimentary judgments. This seamy side of the Church's life only becomes serious in view of the high claims made by the theories of infallibility and apostolical succession, to which it is fatal. As a discussion of one side of Church history the work is full of valuable argument and suggestion. It is very much like a

reductio ad absurdum of the lofty theories on the other side, as well as a justification of the views held by Nonconformists. The result of the exposition of 1 Corinthians ii. is thus stated: "The spiritual are first converted believers; then believers who have, so to speak, attained their majority, entered into possession of the full capacity of their matured powers; and lastly, believers into whom, according to this capacity, the Spirit of God hath streamed." A standard of this kind would act as a winnowing-fan. J. S. B.

The Conflict of Truth. By F. Hugh Capron. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

The purpose of this work is as bold as the working out is able. The purpose is nothing less than on the basis of Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy, which is accepted in its entirety, to construct an argument for religion. Hitherto, it is said, the two have been regarded as irreconcilable. The author challenges this verdict. His admiration of Spencer's teaching is unqualified. "The first complete system of philosophy that the world has ever seen is not yet fifty years old." The plan of discussion is very elaborate. After a preliminary discussion in six chapters, the second part in fifteen chapters argues for the harmony of Religion and Science as to the Physical Life, and a third part in eight chapters deals similarly with the Spiritual Life. Everywhere the author discovers analogy ("homology"), not discord. Many of the parallels drawn are most striking, and all are original and able. The knowledge of science and the ability displayed, alike in refutation and advocacy, are very great. The argument is on similar lines to Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, but carried out with far greater elaboration of detail. The style is admirably clear and strong. At the same time, the careful reader will find much that rather invites debate than commands assent. In a preliminary chapter on "Interdependence," for example, freedom is summarily dismissed, and we have discovered no qualification of this conclusion. "Using the terms 'freedom' and 'dependence' in their natural and widest senses, no truth is more certain, or more universal, than this—that the most degrading of all conditions is freedom, the most ennobling is interdependence." This is sufficiently startling. How such a dictum is reconcilable with religion is not stated.

"Interdependence" is a new name for necessity. Such teaching, we fear, is inevitable where the science of material things is the guiding light. J. S. B.

Report of Fulham Conference on Confession and Absolution, 1901–2. Edited by Henry Wace, D.D., Chairman. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 3*s.* net.)

The Conference, held at the instance of the Bishop of London, was on the lines of the former Conference on Priesthood and Sacrifice. If the object was to bring the two sharply divided schools nearer together, the amount of success was not great. In truth, there was less room for mutual approach than in the former case. Two points of agreement were found to the effect that John xx. 22, 23 applies to the whole Church, not to the apostles merely, and that the Anglican formularies permit confession in certain circumstances; but the practical outcome of such agreement is slight, inasmuch as the extreme party hold the ecclesiastical usage, on which private confession is based, to be binding on the Church. "On the practical question there was a deep divergence of opinion in the Conference." We are glad to see that the Evangelical members did not attempt to minimise the divergence. The almost infinite shading of opinion that exists on the question of sacramental grace does not obtain here. The Conference will render valuable service in signalising the dividing chasm. As we might expect, Lord Halifax stood for the extreme Romanising views on every point. There are several extended statements, which bring together valuable information: Dr. Moberly's account of mediæval doctrine, Mr. Drury's exposition of the teaching of the Anglican formularies, Mr. Benson's discourse on the right administration of absolution. We heartily wish that Dr. Swete's share in the Conference had not been confined to one brief utterance.

J. S. B.

The Formation of Christian Character: a Contribution to Christian Ethics. By W. S. Bruce, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 5*s.*)

Gradually, if but slowly, a valuable literature on Christian ethics is being produced; and this instalment of a systematic treatment of the subject by Dr. Bruce is welcome. On the

literary side the writing is a little slovenly; and the effect of the book, especially amongst the classes which it is most desirable to reach, would be increased if the author would follow closely the advice and the example of Horace. By character he generally means the "moralised self"; but in one or two cases the word stands for genius or reputation, and Wellington and Burns are cited as instances of its possession. Phrases in which worth is asserted to be valuable, and realise is used in the sense of recognise, do not dispose the reader to give absorbed attention. A more serious defect is the disfavour with which apparently the author regards Christian mysticism. He rightly condemns Tauler in the interest of a keen sense of moral responsibility. But the last sentence in the book is a misquotation of St. Paul, who wrote, "I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me," and who was quite aware that the earthly crown of Christian discipline is a condition of such negation or extinction of self that "no longer I [live], but Christ liveth in me." To deny mysticism its legitimate rights in the training of a regenerate man is to bring him up to the portals of God's sanctuary, but to bar his further approach.

With these two limitations, and an occasional thinness and brevity in the discussion of such subjects as heredity, the book may be strongly commended to preachers, who will find it rich in suggestions, and to lay readers who are in search of a work that, whilst not overtaxing their powers of attention, will supply a sane and reasoned statement of the relation of Christianity to personal character. The treatment is historical in a single chapter, logical and practical elsewhere. Beginning with the psychological elements of character, the writer passes quickly into the sphere of Christian thought, and traces in turn the influence of sin upon the character, the deliverance and power that are found in Christ, and the cultivation of mind, heart, and will under Christian conditions. A classification of the virtues follows, with a skilful attempt to show the relation of freedom to habit, and of the Holy Spirit's action to freedom. Evangelical in tone, and exhibiting alike the soreness of the needs of man and the adequacy of the resources of Christianity, the book is both devout and stimulating; and it will be interesting to notice how Dr. Bruce applies its conclusions in the further work, upon which he is already engaged, of the right operation of Christianity from personal centres amid the various correlated aspects of social life.

R. W. Moss.

Religio Laici. A Series of Studies Addressed to Laymen. By H. C. Beeching, M.A. (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 6*s.*)

Mr. Beeching's arguments are aimed at current prejudices as to religious questions, and as to the position of the Anglican clergy. His views will not be popular with all his readers. He does not hesitate to say that in his *Lawlessness in the English Church* Sir William Harcourt's "sentiments towards the clergy seem to be those of angry contempt, and his vocabulary of vituperation is unrivalled." He is persuaded that if the cases where illegal rites or ceremonies have been used were investigated, it would be generally found that the "motive power has been supplied by laymen, with their strong sense of logic, their imperious will, their very scanty and partial information on the law of the Church and the history of the particular usage, and their very profound contempt for any view of the question but their own, not least for that of the Ordinary." On "The Church and Elementary Education" Mr. Beeching has his own clear-cut opinions, which he knows how to expound and defend. His answer to the strictures of Mr. Gosse and Mr. Leslie Stephen on Izaak Walton and Donne is masterly. "Christianity and Stoicism" is a really valuable discussion, and the papers on the English Church and its clergy will repay the study both of Churchmen and Dissenters. The book deals with questions of pressing interest in a way that compels attention, and the writer never lacks the courage of his convictions. Mr. Beeching's choice quotations and references make his papers delightfully instructive, even to those who cannot always accept his verdicts.

The Things Above. By George G. Findlay, B.A., D.D.

The Great Symbols. By W. J. Townsend, D.D.

The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to Timothy and Titus. By R. Martin Pope, M.A.

(London: Charles H. Kelly. 2*s.* 6*d.* each.)

Professor Findlay's volume belongs to the "Helps Heavenward" series; Dr. Townsend's and Mr. Pope's to the "Books for Bible Students." Publisher and editors have good reason to be proud of the volumes. *The Things Above* lifts the mind and heart into a purer atmosphere; it shows how earth and heaven are

bound together in all holy living. "He who lives for this world, destroys the very world for which he lives. The sunshine fades, the great winds cease to blow, music and colour die from the world when religion fails; 'the promise of this life departs,' in the wake of 'the promise of that which is to come,' whenever godliness decays." Professor Findlay writes with rare felicity of phrase, as well as depth and beauty of thought. "The Lord Jesus Christ is a supremely interesting personality," however, is an expression that somewhat jars on us, though it seems ungracious to complain as we rise refreshed and lifted up from a perusal of this golden book.

Dr. Townsend deals with *The Great Symbols* of the Old Dispensation in a way that cannot fail to throw light on the Bible and to reveal Christ in its types and sacrifices. There is no straining after effect, no extravagance, no grotesque interpretation, but sober and reverently the meaning of the sanctuary, the ark, the cherubim, the high-priest and his vestments is unfolded. There is much to learn from every page of this book, and nothing to unlearn.

Mr. Pope's notes on the Pastoral Epistles were prepared for a class of young students reading the letters in Greek. We are not perplexed with varying interpretations. Mr. Pope gives that which he has found most satisfactory, and carries our judgment with him. He is never obscure, and students will gain real help from his notes on words and passages. Anyone who glances at the discussion of the Faithful Sayings, or at the comments on 1 Timothy iii. 16, 2 Timothy ii. 20, will see the sterling merits of this volume. Local preachers will find it singularly profitable, and will reap quite a harvest of suggestion for their sermons.

Words of Faith and Hope. By the late B. F. Westcott, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Durham. (London: Macmillan & Co. 4*s.* 6*d.*)

This is a collection of thirteen fugitive pieces, sermons, and addresses, which were found amongst Dr. Westcott's papers, tied up and docketed, "Overflow of Lessons from Work." They are not connected by any unity of subject, but include such diverse matters as a speech on co-operation, a sermon to miners, and more than one bit of delightful mysticism. All are welcome as memorials of the great man who composed them, and exhibit at once his supreme qualities and their

defects. Most attractive of all is a series of three addresses, written at long intervals, and designed for very different audiences—a call, a suggestion, and an opportunity for disciplined life. The discipline is unlike that needed in any previous age, a matchless combination of energy and humble love, of real aloofness with social devotion, such a mastery of self and circumstance that in fact as well as in profession God is all. A life, based on sacrifice and fashioned by the service of every faculty, is the need of the day, with specifically "a family life of marked frugality by those who can naturally command all the resources of material enjoyment." These are things to read and think about; and he who thinks may be prompted to try a still more excellent way. R. W. Moss.

The Glory and Joy of the Resurrection. By James Paton, D.D. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Paton's object is to bring out more clearly apostolic belief and teaching on the Resurrection. The witness of the Gospels is first given, then we pass to the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline Epistles, St. Peter's First Epistle, the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. The testimony is so clearly stated, and its significance so well brought out, that the volume should prove a real aid to faith. Dr. Paton rightly regards "belief in the resurrection of Jesus as the direct and final test of all genuine Christian fellowship." He shows that the belief is the soul of apostolic preaching. "Has it ever struck those who doubt or deny the resurrection of Jesus to consider how much of this book (the Acts of the Apostles) would remain if that central fact were eliminated?" The way in which the great argument in 1 Corinthians xv. is developed and lighted up will be helpful to many. The book is a valuable contribution to the literature of a vital subject.

After the Resurrection. By Alexander McLaren, D.D. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 5*s.*)

The sermons on the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection, which form the first part of this volume, are very tender and suggestive. Dr. McLaren seems to pierce to the heart of the subject, and to bring out its lessons for to-day in a way that few living preachers can imitate. He is a master of exposition, but he also knows how to put his hand on the springs of human

thought and feeling, and to claim life in all its fulness for his Master. There is much to treasure up and ponder over in these sermons.

The People's Bible Encyclopædia. Biographical, Geographical, Historical, and Doctrinal. Edited by C. Randall Barnes, A.B., A.M., D.D. Illustrated by nearly Four Hundred Engravings, Maps, Charts, etc. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

This is the best popular Encyclopædia on the Bible that we know. It contains 1,236 pages with double columns, and engravings, maps, and charts carefully selected to illustrate the text, and is sold at the modest price of seven shillings and sixpence. The articles are of necessity condensed, but they are all the more serviceable for people with scant leisure. No one can glance at such an article as that on "The Canon" or on "Baptism for the Dead" without seeing the value of the work. The account of "The English Bible" is another article that has greatly pleased us, though we do not agree with the writer that Wyclif's and Purvey's translations are quite independent of each other. One of the best articles is that on "Palestine," which gives an admirable account of the geography, geology, soil, climate, scenery, productions, history, and present condition of the country. We can confidently recommend this book to those who wish to understand their Bible and to have a single volume encyclopædia for constant reference.

Patristic Study. By H. B. Swete, D.D. (London: Longmans. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge has published nothing for which young students will be so grateful as this little manual. It supplies an outline of Patristic reading, with hints as to the books best worth studying, and the best editions of those books. The estimate of each Father's position as a theologian or preacher is just what a beginner needs, and the chapter entitled "Courses and Methods of Patristic Study" gives a view of the progress of doctrine from the period of the Apostolic Fathers down to the time of Leo and Gregory which ought to be read and re-read. The book is so clear, so fresh, and so full of matter that it will be of immense service to Patristic students.

On page 99 for 328 read 428.

Religions of Bible Lands. By D. S. Margoliouth, M.A. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1*s.* net.)

Professor Margoliouth divides his subject into three sections: Semitic Religions, the Religion of Egypt, the Religion of Persia, and gives a mass of information as to the beliefs and worships of Bible lands which greatly aids in the understanding of the religious ceremonies of the Jews. We have found this little manual delightful reading. The reverence paid to the dog in the religion of Zoroaster was extraordinary. No crime was so terrible as the killing of a water-dog. It was felt that no house on earth "could subsist without the shepherd's dog and the house-dog. The dog came very near receiving divine honours."

To Whom Shall we Go? By Charles T. Ovenden, D.D., Rector of Enniskillen. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

This examination of the difficulties presented by unbelief is just the book to put into the hands of an honest doubter. Dr. Ovenden discusses the extent and limit of our knowledge, the evidence of mind in creation, the Resurrection and kindred subjects in a way that fixes the attention and at once wins a candid and unprejudiced reader's sympathy. In his second part he deals with providence, prayer, the Second Advent, free thought, and obedience. The chapters are short, and the book is so full of knowledge and good sense that it may be trusted to make its own impression on its readers.

The Great Saints of the Bible. By Louis Albert Banks. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 5*s.*)

Mr. Banks preached these sermons on Sunday evenings in the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Cleveland, Ohio. He begins with Abel, and ranges through the Old Testament and the New, lighting up old stories with many a modern instance. He is American in taste and style, but he keeps close to his main purpose, to build up a holy character and "win the people to the Christian life." The sermons are easy to read and full of illustrations.

The Century Bible. "Thessalonians and Galatians." Edited by Walter F. Adeney, M.A. "Corinthians." Edited by

J. Massie, M.A., D.D. "Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians." Edited by G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D. (Edinburgh : T. C. & E. C. Jack. 2*s.* net.)

One of the best volumes of the *Century Bible* is "Thessalonians and Galatians." Professor Adeney's Introduction, which covers one hundred and thirty pages, deals with every question of date, objects, and readers of the Epistles in the most careful way. He shows how the Thessalonian Church was thrown into a state of agitation inimical to sober work and the healthy development of the graces of Christianity by its feverish anxiety as to the Apocalypse. The reaction from such expectations threatened to be perilous. "There is no collapse so desperate as that of inflated enthusiasm when the bubble is pricked." The argument for South Galatia as the region to which St. Paul's letter was sent is clearly stated, and objections are duly weighed. The notes are very valuable and helpful.

Professor Massie's is an altogether workmanlike and satisfactory volume. The notes are compact, but they grapple honestly with every difficulty ; the Introduction deals with the history of the city, with St. Paul's visits, and the discord and division of the Church. Dr. Massie thinks that there must have been an intermediate letter between what we call the First and Second Epistles—"one of greater stringency, probably of greater brevity and concentration, directed exclusively to the point at issue" between St. Paul and the Church. For a brief commentary nothing could be better than this.

Mr. Martin's volume is one of unusual interest. The Introductions are excellent. Old facts are freshly stated and set in new lights. The notes are clear and judicious, and much matter is packed into brief space. This is a volume that will sustain and increase the reputation of the *Century Bible*.

The Temple Bible. (Dent & Co. 1*s.* per volume net.)

Dr. Herkless has edited the "Hebrews" and the "General Epistles" in the *Temple Bible* with much learning and judgment. He cannot accept 2 Peter as by the same hand as the First Epistle, and thinks it borrowed largely from Jude.

"Numbers" has been edited by G. Buchanan Gray, who accepts Bishop Colenso's criticism of the figures in the book, and thinks that avarice and hypocrisy have been attributed to Balaam on the strength of later traditions. He therefore

refuses to accept Bishop Butler's estimate in his famous sermons. The itinerary of the Book of Numbers is pronounced to be post-exilic. On these points Mr. Gray will not satisfy many readers, but the arrangement of this volume is very helpful.

"The Earlier Pauline Epistles" (Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians) have been edited by Professor Vernon Bartlet. The Introduction is a masterly summary of the facts about the Epistles and their readers, and the notes are as good as the Introduction. The pictorial frontispiece in each volume of the *Temple Bible* is a great attraction.

A Preacher's Library, by J. S. Banks (Kelly, 1s.), is a new edition of a little handbook that has already made its reputation as a wise and safe guide both in theological and general reading. Mr. Banks has recast his pamphlet and rewritten it, and preachers will find here hints as to books and editions which will often save both time and expense. "In regard to theology, as to other subjects, limitation of reading is the best course. Of all things to be avoided indiscriminate reading is the chief. The best books need and repay frequent reading. Hasty is almost as useless as indiscriminate reading. If possible, a student should read systematically on a definite subject." Professor Banks has done real service to students by this booklet.

Is there a Religion of Nature? (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1s. 6*d*.) consists of three lectures given last January by the Rev. P. N. Waggett in St. Paul's Cathedral. They deal in a broad and philosophic spirit with the notion that science may do the work of religion. Mr. Waggett shows that science is not opposed to religion, but that it cannot become man's sole guide for individual conduct and for social progress. Strong sense in strong words will be the verdict on his lectures. Mr. Crisp's little book on *Christian Doctrine and Practice* (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 4*d*.) is very lucid, and ought to be very useful for young people. In one or two doctrinal passages we should differ from him, but his work is admirably done.

The Oxford University Press has issued a Revised Bible, bound in scarlet cloth, with the crown and the King's monogram stamped on the cover, and a presentation label pasted inside with space left for a name. It will be sought after by day and Sunday schools.

II. FOR BIBLE STUDENTS.

A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its Language, Literature, and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D. Vol. IV. Pleroma-Zuzim. (London : T. & T. Clark. 28*s.*)

Dr. Hastings and his staff are to be congratulated sincerely on the completion of their great task. Another volume is in preparation which will contain "Indexes, and certain subsidiary articles of importance," but the Dictionary as originally planned is now complete, and bids fair to hold its place for at least a generation as the most judicious and trustworthy guide to the treasures of biblical learning. The day is passed when the Higher Criticism could be ignored or scouted; but Dr. Hastings and his contributors have not rashly disturbed old beliefs, whilst they have poured new light on a thousand subjects. Even those who consider that undue weight has been given to some critical theories have reason to be thankful that Dr. Hastings has not given us another *Encyclopædia Biblica*. Our own Church has taken a worthy share in the preparation of this standard work. To the present volume Professor Moss contributes a set of articles on the Ptolemies, Rabbi, Rabboni, Salome, Syrophœnician, Tetrarch, Tirshatha, which are models of exact and condensed knowledge. They are brief, but all bear the stamp of a master's hand. Dr. J. Hope Moulton writes on "Zoroastrianism," which is said to have considerably influenced Jewish belief as to angelology, demonology, and the doctrine of the Resurrection. The article, which extends to twelve columns, brings out the general independence of Israel's religious development. Persian beliefs may, however, have stimulated Jewish thought and have prompted the sudden change from the idea of a resurrection of the just to a universal resurrection. Dr. Moulton has given us a most interesting study. The thorny subject of "The Book of Psalms" could not have been entrusted to better hands than those of Dr. W. T. Davison. Methodist scholars will find in his thirty-five columns a wonderful summary of the best attested results of critical study. Dr. Davison has made this branch of sacred scholarship pre-eminently his own.

He is master of the literature of the subject, and brings his own learning and taste to bear on the discussion with the best results. He divides his article into seven sections: The Name and Number of the Psalms, the Formation of the Collection, the Date and Authorship, the Titles and the Poetical Construction of the Psalms, the Moral and Religious Ideas prevailing in the Psalter, the Text and Version, the Literature of the Subject. The evidence for the gradual compilation of the Psalter is very clearly set out, and the difficult questions of date and authorship are treated with much skill and ample knowledge. The conclusion is reached that from ten to twenty psalms are of David's composition, including iii., iv., vii., viii., xv., xviii., xxiii., xxiv., xxxii., and perhaps ci. and cx. Dr. Davison thinks that the number of Maccabæan psalms "cannot be large, but the bare possibility that a few such psalms were included in the Psalter before the canon was closed should be left open." The section on "Titles" is the most interesting. That on "Religious and Ethical Ideas" is perhaps the most valuable and most suggestive part of the article. Anyone who masters this section will find the whole Psalter lighted up. The President has laid us all under obligation by his candid and careful discussion of a great subject. The articles on "Rome," by John Patrick and F. Relton; on "Synagogue," by W. Bacher; on "The Tabernacle," by A. R. S. Kennedy; and "The Temple," by T. W. Davies, deserve special mention. It is a real boon to students to have the latest and best information thus condensed into a few pages. The "Septuagint" and "Syriac Versions" have been entrusted to Dr. Nestle, who has contributed two masterly articles. Professor Ramsay's "Geographical Studies" have been recognised as among the best things in the Dictionary, and Sir Charles Wilson's contributions on the Holy Land will be of great service. The theological articles on Sin, Sacrifice, Propitiation, Righteousness, Resurrection, Prophecy, and Prophets are worthy of a great standard work, and the names appended to them will command general respect. The article on "Prophecy" is by the late Dr. A. B. Davidson, and it is a piece of his finest work. A brief notice can only touch lightly on a few points of interest, but enough has been said to show that the *Dictionary of the Bible* has won its right to a place at every preacher's side. He will never turn to it without finding the fullest information put in the clearest and most compact form in this great cyclopædia of Christian learning. The way in which the whole

scheme of the Dictionary has been carried out reflects the highest credit on editors, contributors, printers, and publishers.

The Gospel according to St. John. An Inquiry into its Genesis and Historical Value. By H. H. Wendt, D.D., Jena. Translated by Edward Lummis, M.A. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, in two volumes, has exerted considerable influence on English exposition. The first part of the original work, treating of the Gospel sources, was not included in the translation. In preparing a new edition of the original the author has isolated the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, giving to it more detailed discussion in this independent treatise. In the *Teaching of Jesus* the teaching in the Fourth Gospel was discussed separately as supplementary to the Synoptics. Subsequent study has only served to convince Dr. Wendt of the correctness of the view he took in the first work on the question of authorship. The position briefly is, that examination of the gospel discloses the existence of a source of earlier date which was subjected to later editing and revising. The gospel is thus "the sub-apostolic redaction of an apostolic tradition." Comparatively speaking, Dr. Wendt's conclusion is exceedingly conservative. He holds the source which forms the body of the gospel to be most probably St. John's own work, the redactor merely supplying the historical setting and modifying details. As he holds also that it is possible to discriminate between the original document and the reviser's additions, the former has great historical value. The reasons for these conclusions must be sought in the work itself. Little as we can accept them, we note the considerable approach they make to older views. The data the author uses are all gained by internal analysis and investigation. External evidence is not taken into account. The argument is that the hypothesis advanced explains the phenomena. The work deserves, and will no doubt receive, careful consideration. We have no wish to depreciate the evidence of minute, painstaking study which the work displays. The translation is good. J. S. B.

An Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles. Containing a Vindication of the Pauline Authorship of both Epistles and an Interpretation of the Eschatological Section of

2 Thessalonians ii. By E. H. Askwith, B.D., Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London: Macmillan & Co. 4*s*. net.)

This is a small book of only twelve dozen pages; but its worth far exceeds its size, and its pleas will require to be considered in all future study of the questions involved. Mr. Askwith sees distinctly the problems that have to be faced, and works them out in a scholarly and honest way, intent upon the discovery of the actual truth of the matter, and not upon the defence of some preconceptions of his own. To his method of establishing the genuineness of both epistles no objection can be taken; and for the use of that method he is competent in regard both to knowledge and to the faculty of taking pains. That both letters were written by St. Paul, and substantially in the form in which they are now found, is shown to be beyond serious doubt. To the difficult eschatological section in the Second Epistle he finds the key in our Lord's predictions respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, which he thinks to have been interpreted by the apostle in the light of the circumstances of the time at which he was writing. The "man of sin" (lawlessness) is accordingly the Roman emperor claiming divine honours; the "falling away" is the rebellion of the Jews against the Romans; the "one that restraineth now" is Claudius, whose policy was opposed to the propagation of compulsory emperor-worship amongst the Jews and kindred peoples; and a repetition of Caligula's attempt (ii. 8) might reasonably be expected, and actually took place in the form of increased hostility against Jews and Christians on the part of the Roman government, over which the "coming" (*Parousia*) of Christ enabled His kingdom to triumph. It is an ingenious interpretation, which Mr. Askwith puts forward tentatively; and to discuss it adequately would require much space. The chief difficulty is that it represents St. Paul as expressing with some detail an expectation which, if rightly understood, was not actually fulfilled, but has rather to be explained away. Unless the many phrases in this enigmatic paragraph can be brought into closer and easier relations it is better on the whole still to regard the section as in large measure apocalyptic, and as awaiting the illumination of events to come. The preface to this first-rate little book announces that Mr. Askwith is engaged upon a Commentary on these epistles,

and there is every reason to hope that in fulness and accuracy it will supersede even that of Bornemann. R. W. M.

The Epistles of St. John. The Greek Text, with Notes and Essays. By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., D.C.L. Fourth Edition. (London: Macmillan & Co. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

This edition is practically a reprint of the third edition, but a few slight additions made by Bishop Westcott himself have been incorporated in it and some errors corrected. It will long remain the standard work on St. John's Epistles. Dr. Westcott was equipped with all the gifts of scholarship necessary for the interpretation of the letters, but beside that he was himself a Christian seer on whom St. John's mantle had fallen. The whole atmosphere of this book is Johannine. Nothing is neglected that might contribute to a right apprehension of the apostle's meaning. Only patient labour can bring home the living truth of the epistles. Dr. Westcott says: "The study of Scripture is, I believe, for us the way by which God will enable us to understand His present revelation through history and nature. When once we can feel the divine power of human words, which gather in themselves the results of cycles of intellectual discipline, we shall be prepared to pass from the study of one book to the study of 'The Divine Library.'" Material is given in the volume for those who are ready to follow out special lines of inquiry for themselves, and no one can study St. John's letters without feeling that they have reached the crowning revelation of God and of Christ. It satisfies the highest hopes of man. "As we look back and look forward in the light thus thrown over the world we can work and wait." Every student of this volume will be permanently enriched both in mind and heart.

Demonic Possession in the New Testament: its Relations, Historical and Theological. By W. Menzies Alexander, M.A., B.Sc., M.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 5*s.*)

The three aspects of the subject in the title indicate the divisions of the work. The first two are amply illustrated. The gospel incidents are seen to be examples of a widespread history. The third aspect, as the more important, receives the greatest share of attention. The extent of demonic possession, the reality of which is asserted, is greatly limited by the criterion which the author lays down as the result of his investigation.

The criterion of genuine possession is said to be confession of Jesus as the Messiah. This at once rules out a number of cases, relegating them to the class of natural incidents. The reason assigned for adopting the criterion is the improbability of the omission of the confession if it had been made. But why should it be made in every case? The author believes in a special activity of the powers of evil in the days of Christ. "The Incarnation initiated the establishment of the kingdom of heaven upon earth. That determined a counter movement among the powers of darkness. Genuine demonic possession was one of its manifestations." Numerous appendices add to the large amount of curious information given in the body of the work.

J. S. B.

The Journal of Theological Studies. April, 1902. (London: Macmillan & Co. Annual subscription, post free, 10*s*.)

The first article, on "The Manifold Unity of Christian Life," by Rev. P. N. Waggett, is very abstruse, and needs an interpreter. Rev. G. H. Box, writing on "The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist," argues that the true antecedent is not the Passover, but the *Kiddûsh*—the weekly sanctifying of the Sabbath on Sabbath-eve. In that family service the use of the cup precedes the use of the bread, which is also the order in the account given in the *Teaching of the Twelve*. The Passover connexion, it is said, was a later growth. The article raises interesting points. The other contents include a long article on the Sardican Canons, another instalment of Origen's Commentary on Ephesians, many Notes and Studies, as well as Reviews, and a Chronicle of Publications on the Old Testament. J. S. B.

Outlines of Textual Criticism Applied to the New Testament. By C. E. Hammond, M.A. Sixth Edition. Revised. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.)

The first edition of this little manual appeared in 1872, and it has long established its position as the most concise and compact handbook of Textual Criticism. Canon Hammond has gone carefully through his work, and reconsidered and rewritten it in view of the discoveries and discussions of the last ten years. We have compared it with our treasured copy of the first edition, and have found it thoroughly brought up to date, well balanced in its judgments, and admirably adapted to guide and stimulate a young student.

III. HISTORY.

The History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages. By Ferdinand Gregorovius. Translated from the Fourth German Edition by Annie Hamilton. Vol. VIII., Parts I. and II. (London : George Bell. 4*s.* 6*d.* each.)

We heartily congratulate publisher and translator upon the completion of their great task. It speaks little for English historical scholarship that the *magnum opus* of Gregorovius should have gone so long untranslated. For the last thirty years it has been one of the great standard books of reference, absolutely necessary to every student of the Middle Ages, and for thirty years it has been practically a sealed book to the majority of Englishmen. They have had to content themselves with crumbs from the table; for instance, the numerous extracts given in Hare's *Walks in Rome*, and the chapter in Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, which seek to put before the reader some of the results of Gregorovius's search. Now the book is within the reach of all, for though its size (eight volumes in thirteen at 4*s.* 6*d.* each) may put it beyond the reach of humble purchasers, there are no libraries in the country which claim to be libraries at all which have not placed this great work on their shelves.

A word or two on the work itself may interest our readers. "Gregorovius"—to give the title by which the work is known, like "Gibbon" or "Green"—is not a history of the Papacy, or a history of Italy, but a history of the City of Rome. But the history of the Eternal City is in effect a history of the Papacy, of Italy, of the Middle Ages, and to some extent of Europe itself. Rome was the heart of the world, and a history of the heart—even in its decay—is needful to the student.

One of the great merits of Gregorovius is that he never loses sight of his main idea. Throughout his work all centres on Rome itself. It is precisely this fact that makes the work so invaluable to a tourist. If a man before setting off to Rome would read this work, better still if he could take it with him on his journey, he would come back with a better idea of Rome than all the "Bædeckers" could ever give him. For there is scarcely a monument in Rome, certainly not a church or inscription (discovered

before 1871), which Gregorovius has not noted, and the meaning of which he has not woven into his pages.

The industry of Gregorovius is marvellous. As we have read his pages—and we have read the book from beginning to end, not once nor twice only—we have scarcely known which to admire most, the untiring research or the skill with which he has marshalled his results. He surveys a thousand years of history, and seems as if by a sure instinct to put every monument into its right place. But Gregorovius is not merely an antiquarian. His wide survey of history, his intimate knowledge of some of the more special details, is most marked. Finally, we may remark as not the least of his merits his intense love of Italy, and his firm, uncompromising, yet judicious Protestantism, in his case we should imagine rather with the accent on the second syllable.

The translation has been admirably rendered. Gregorovius is no dull pedant; some of his sentences are like cut diamonds, and for this all thanks should be given to Miss Hamilton. We congratulate her heartily on the successful completion of her great undertaking. We hope also that the enterprise of the publishers will have its deserved reward. The work is admirably printed, and we have noticed few mistakes. We have only one complaint to make. While the publishers were engaged in their task, it would have been well if they had brought the volume up to date by asking Professor Lanciani or some other expert in recent discoveries to add fuller notes where corrections have to be made. The few notes of this sort are quite inadequate. Gregorovius's bibliography on general history should also have been brought down to date in the same way as Gibbon has been done by Professor Bury. But after all, any complaint is a sin and shame. We should be glad that in this world where nothing is perfect one of the great masterpieces of research is now within the reach of English readers. H. B. WORKMAN.

The Evolution of the English Bible. A Historical Sketch of the Successive Versions from 1382 to 1885. By H. W. Hoare. Second Edition, Revised and Corrected throughout, and including a Bibliography. With Portraits and Specimen Pages from Old Bibles. (London: Murray. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The distinctive feature of this handbook is that it gives a general account of the successive versions of the English Bible,

with a sketch of their historical setting. No one who studies the volume will be surprised that a new edition has so quickly been called for. The writer is an enthusiastic admirer of the Authorised Version, of which he says: "Being but a human work, it has its own defects, but none the less it is universally accepted as a literary masterpiece, as the noblest and most beautiful book in the world." He traces the evolution of that version from Wyclif's day, giving a sketch of each succeeding translator and his times, which is full of fresh matter, put in a vivid and picturesque way. It seems strange that England was so long content with a Latin Bible, but in mediæval times our country was "quite unripe for the Scriptures in the mother tongue." The illiterate majority felt no need of such a book; the educated minority were averse to any change. Wyclif represents the transition from the days of the Schoolmen to the new order. Mr. Hoare's sketch of him and his work is very full and attractive. We have been specially interested in the lists of words and phrases from the various versions which have retained their place down to our own times. The whole subject is treated in a way that will increase a reader's reverence for the word of God. Mr. R. Lovett's little primer on *The English Bible* deserves a place in the bibliography, and in that list B. F. should be read for B. T. Westcott.

Mediæval Wales, chiefly in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. By A. G. Little, M.A. (London: T. F. Unwin. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

Professor Little has done well to publish these six lectures, delivered at Cardiff in 1901. Those who wish to understand Welsh life will find themselves here at the springs. The failure of Wales to produce or develop political institutions of an enduring character was really its greatest blessing. It helped to create English history, and exerted a decisive influence on the Barons' War. The mountains of Wales have done much to preserve its language and its independence, but they have kept the people disunited. Professor Little's chapters on Gregory of Monmouth and Giraldus Cambrensis are of real value to a student, and the chapters on Wales as a land of castles and on religious houses are very instructive. The history is cleverly spiced. Wales has always delighted in sermons. One of the favourite ways of spending a holiday in the Middle Ages was to go to hear some friar preach, and the specimen culled from a homily on the

relative merits of the ass and the pig helps us to understand the popularity of such discourses with the common people. These lectures ought to have a wide circulation both in the Principality and outside of it.

History of Scotland. Vol. II. From the Accession of Mary Stewart to the Revolution of 1689. By P. Hume Brown, M.A., LL.D. With Four Maps and Plan. (Cambridge University Press. 6*s.*)

Students value the "Cambridge Historical Series" very highly, and this *History of Scotland* is marked by the painstaking accuracy and good judgment which characterise the whole series. It is written simply, but it is a book that one reads with unabated interest. The story of Knox is told with warm appreciation of one whose words "put more life" into his hearers "than five hundred trumpets continually blustering" in their ears; and the tragedy of Mary Queen of Scots loses none of its fascination in Mr. Brown's hands. As to her singularly unheroic son, he says that "James lied so copiously at every period of his life that no asseveration on his own part can be accepted as a guarantee for his veracity." The nightmare of witchcraft, which had ridden Scotland since the Reformation, led to many a horror, and the ministers were as guilty as the common people. With holy horror and unflinching conviction they set themselves to carry out the command, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Mr. Brown's work supplies a real want, and supplies it in the best style.

Old Sevenoaks. By F. Richards. Illustrated by C. E. Corke, F.R.P.S. (Sevenoaks: Salmon. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This little book is brightly written, and its illustrations of old bits of Sevenoaks are well chosen and well reproduced. The town owes its prosperity and almost its very existence to the great mansion of Knole, of which and the prelates and nobles who have inhabited it Mr. Richards has much to say. The chapel is still standing in which John Wesley first preached at Sevenoaks in 1774. In St. Nicholas Church, Henry Piers, the vicar of Bexley, preached a sermon in 1744 before the Dean of Arches and Rural Dean of Shoreham. "All went well till the preacher came to speak of the doctrines which they should preach, the tempers they should have, and the lives they should lead, and then the whole body of the clergy, headed by the dean, left the church." The sermon was too faithful for such

an audience. We hope the success of this volume may encourage Mr. Richards to publish a second edition with a chapter on Knole itself, which would be a welcome addition. Much labour has been bestowed on the book, and it will be of service and interest to visitors as well as to residents in and around Sevenoaks.

The Crowning of our Kings, from Ethelred II. to Edward VII. (London: Religious Tract Society. 2s. 6d.)

This is one of the best books on Coronation events and ceremonies that we have seen. The Introduction brings out the religious significance of the Coronation in an impressive way: then follow chapters on historic incidents of former coronations; coronation tenures; services specially rendered at the coronation; and the king's champion. The whole subject is handled with great skill and ample information. The last four chapters on the crowning of William IV. and his queen, Queen Victoria, and the Coronation Oath, help a reader to follow the events of the moment with added interest. The book is a storehouse of pleasant and well-timed information.

Dr. Augustus Jessopp has written a *Penny History of the Church of England* (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), which opens with the Druids and comes down to the Restoration. It is a masterly survey, packed with matter, and stamped on every page with the writer's own individuality. Dr. Jessopp never fears to speak out, and his frankness adds much to the force of this brief history. It needs another revision, but we have no doubt that its popularity will soon enable the writer to add the final touches. On page 44 there is an astonishing statement that "the Black Prince and his widowed princess protected Wyclif in 1378." The prince had been dead two years.

Messrs. Cassell & Co. have issued the first part of *The Coronation Book of Edward VII.* It is to be completed in six shilling parts. The second appears on June 11, and the rest will be got ready as quickly as possible after the Coronation. The text has been committed to the Rev. W. J. Loftie, who gives a very full and interesting account in his first chapter of "Crowns and Thrones." He is a master in such subjects. The illustrations are truly regal. The most advanced colour-printing, the most elaborate use of gold and silver, and the most carefully prepared and selected pictures, make this work a delight and a wonder.

IV. BIOGRAPHY.

Heroes of the Nations. Edward Plantagenet (Edward I.), The English Justinian, or The Making of the Common Law. By Edward Jenks, M.A. (London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 5*s.*)

Mr. Jenks says, "If ever there was a national hero, it was Edward I. of England. In his person, his character, his position, and his policy are summed up the essential elements of that great English nation which came into existence during his lifetime." This volume will show that the great Plantagenet well deserved his honour. The disastrous defeat at Lewes, which his conduct turned into a hopeless surrender, taught him a lesson which he never forgot. It changed the "reckless youth of promise into a sober, capable man." He had the supreme virtue of learning from his own misfortunes, and when Simon de Montfort fell at Evesham "there was left but one man fit to rule England; and that man, happily for her, was England's future king." Edward won great fame as a Crusader after the close of the Barons' War, and when he came to the throne in 1272 England found that she had a monarch who was determined to assert the royal power and to correct the abuses of royal administration. He showed equal force and prudence, and after he had reduced Wales to obedience he set about those reforms of English justice which have won him the title of the English Justinian. We have no record of these three brilliant years like that given in these pages. Mr. Jenks is Reader in English Law at Oxford, and he considers that if Edward had died at the close of his reforms "he must have come down to us as one of the greatest and wisest of rulers, who surveyed the body politic in all its members, and laid his healing hand on every sore." Few such monarchs have ever sat on a throne. The attempt to destroy Scottish independence was the "one great mistake in his career," and for that time brought a heavy reckoning.

The Life of Queen Alexandra. By Sarah A. Tooley. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 6*s.* net.)

Mrs. Tooley prepared the way for this volume by her *Personal Life of Queen Victoria*, and she has proved once again that she has

the light touch and the genuine enthusiasm for her subject which are necessary to make such a royal biography a success. Queen Alexandra's life is not bound up with our political history, nor has she published anything that would facilitate such a task as Mrs. Tooley set herself. Material had to be sought by correspondence with personal friends of the Queen, and with distinguished personages at home and abroad. Denmark had to be visited, and Mrs. Tooley was allowed special facilities for studying the interests, occupations, and general surroundings of life at Sandringham. The result is a thoroughly bright and well informed biography, which will deepen the respect of all classes for their queen. Her early life in Denmark and the story of her first meetings with the prince whom she was to marry are well described. Her conquest of England was speedy and complete, and the chapters which describe her as wife and mother show how richly she has earned the gratitude of her adopted country. One hundred and ten illustrations, admirably chosen and reproduced, make the whole story pass before us like a panorama. Mrs. Tooley's book will make many feel a new throb of interest and pleasure in the events of this coronation year.

Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales. With Eighty-eight Illustrations. (London: George Newnes. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is the first connected biography of our future king and queen, and it will increase the respect and affection with which the whole empire regards them. No young people could have had wiser and more loving training than the Prince and Princess. Every glimpse we get of their early days is pleasant. As a boy Prince George was described by Bishop S. Wilberforce as "full of fun and spirits and life." One of his German relatives called him "the right royal pickle." He was devoted to his profession as a sailor, and showed a fine sense of duty and responsibility. The Duchess of Teck was as wise and loving a mother as the present Queen. She contrived to have her children with her constantly, and was careful not to allow them any premature gaieties or excitement. She felt that there were "too many grown-up children in the present day." The Princess of Wales carries on those traditions. She is never happier than when she is surrounded by her little ones, and a charming group they make. This book gives a good sketch of the voyage of the two princes in the *Bacchante*, and the colonial tour of the Prince and

Princess. The pictures are very attractive. The book ought to be popular all over the empire.

Saint Berin the Apostle of Wessex. By J. E. Field, M.A. (London: S.P.C.K. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Bede and the Saxon Chronicle are the only authorities as to the work of Berin on which reliance can be placed. Legends and traditions have their features of interest, and these Mr. Field has studied with great care. If the picture of the saint does not grow much clearer for readers of this painstaking and scholarly volume, they will get a fuller knowledge of the times in which Berin lived, and will be better able to appreciate his work as the missionary of Wessex in the first half of the sixth century. He brought the faith to the royal house which two centuries later became the royal house of all England. The chapter on "Saint Berin's Miracles" as related in mediæval lives is especially interesting, and so is that on "Local Traditions."

Typical English Churchmen, from Parker to Maurice. A Series of Lectures. Edited by W. E. Collins, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London. (London: S.P.C.K. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

These lectures were first delivered at St. Margaret's, Westminster, and repeated in the Abbey Church at St. Alban's. The typical men are Matthew Parker, Hooker, Chillingworth, Usher, Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor, Burnet, Butler, Warburton, Simeon, Phillpotts, and F. D. Maurice. Their life and work is treated strictly from the historical point of view, by such writers as Professor Collins, Canon Henson—to whom the idea of the series was largely due,—Dr. Wace, Dr. Gibson, Mr. C. H. Simpkinson, and other well-known authorities. Churchmen will be profoundly interested in these brief lives. They light up the whole course of the English Church from the days of Elizabeth to Queen Victoria, and they are exceedingly suggestive and instructive. There is not a name in the series which does not attract us. Henry of Exeter is one of the strangest figures of the nineteenth century, and Dr. Gibson helps us to get closer to that redoubtable antagonist than we have ever got before. Bishop Warburton said, "I have no conception of a greater genius on earth than Dr. Jeremy Taylor," and even this praise does not seem altogether extravagant to those who know his works. Nonconformist readers will find this book scarcely less interesting

than Churchmen. It is an excellent idea which other Churches might do well to imitate.

Fifty Years at East Brent. Letters of Archbishop Denison. Edited by his Niece. (London: Murray. 12*s.* net.)

At the basis of his character lay the stubborn wilfulness of the old northern race of Englishmen, and the plain habits and old-fashioned breeding of the same old type. Every inch of his large physique belonged to the same breed. He was an Eton boy, and an Oxford classic of his age and school. But of modern scholarship he knew little or nothing, and of modern science, if possible, still less, whether physical or metaphysical. Such a man became not unnaturally the champion of immovable old High Anglicanism, utterly disliking at the same time all Neo-Anglican refinements. These letters are all thoroughly characteristic, and as such have an historical value. The archdeacon was not ungenerous, and was as much of a gentleman as an ingrained bigot could be. He is a very curious and instructive study. But alas for the Church whose honestest and most thoroughbred champions of the orthodox past have been no wiser than Archdeacon Denison! For, after all, this great country Churchman and high dignitary was remarkably ignorant, helplessly stupid, and hopelessly obstinate. Those whom he cherished as loving kinsfolk cherish his memory. That is natural and laudable. To others he ranks as a characteristic product of Oxford under certain conditions in the age of Lord Melbourne.

The Life of St. George. By Edward Clapton, LL.D. (London: 241, Shaftesbury Avenue.)

Dr. Clapton has not many facts to give us about the saint of England, but he sets himself "to fill up what is wanting by most reasonable conjectures, guided by such side-lights as may be afforded here and there." He is naturally indignant with Gibbon for mixing up the English patron saint with the Arian bishop, George of Cappadocia. He thinks that we may definitely rely on a few particulars. That St. George was born at Lydda, in the plain of Sharon, and became a distinguished soldier, a special favourite of the emperor Diocletian. His remonstrance against the persecution of Christians led to his own martyrdom in A.D. 303. The pamphlet will interest all who wish to know about George of England, but it is at best a mass of conjectures.

The Vicar of Madeley, John Fletcher: a Biographical Study. By J. Marrat. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 1*s.* 6*d.*)

This book ought to make the young people of Methodism share the writer's enthusiasm for Fletcher. They will find adventure and romance are not lacking, and will come into intimate fellowship with a great saint and a singularly gifted man. Mr. Marrat never allows the reader's interest to flag. Anecdote and incident are deftly woven into the story, and all is told so brightly that the last page comes far too soon.

Mr. H. J. Deane's *Bijou Biographies* are lives of the living, and there is no volume in the set which appeals so strongly to lovers of science as the sketch of Lord Kelvin's inventions and discoveries. Mr. Munro has served his facts with a spice of gossip which adds to the zest with which one reads this small book on a great life. The account of the laying of the Atlantic cable is quite exciting, and the sketch of Lord Kelvin as a lecturer gives some amusing instances of his dark sayings and his odd ways. A shilling will be well spent on such an introduction to our modern Prometheus.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has published a shilling edition of Dr. J. M. Neale's *Deeds of Faith.* The stories of martyrs and Christian heroes were written to interest children in Church history, and they are told with spirit and with an infectious enthusiasm. Dr. Neale's High Church views come out at various points. He hopes "that we shall have the sacraments of Christ to strengthen us, and the priest of God to absolve us" on our death-beds. But he says he would give up all these to have the honour of the Irish girl who died at Rosnakill in attempting to shelter her little brother from the tempest.

Messrs. Blackwood have given us *George Eliot's Life*, arranged and edited by her husband, J. W. Cross, in two small volumes. The 1,220 pages can be had for 4*s.* net, and both type and paper are excellent. The interest of the book, religious, moral, and literary, made it one of the outstanding biographies of the nineteenth century. Those who never read it will now turn to it with keen relish, whilst those who found earlier editions far beyond the reach of modest purses will be glad to embrace the opportunity of putting this "Warwick" edition on their shelves.

V. ART AND TRAVEL.

Sir David Wilkie. By Lord Ronald Sutherland Gower, F.S.A. (5*s.* net.)

Hans Holbein. By Arthur B. Chamberlain. (1*s.* net.)

Sir Joshua Reynolds, P.R.A. By Rowley Cleeve. (1*s.* net.)

Holman Hunt. By George C. Williamson, Litt.D. (1*s.* net.)

(London: George Bell & Sons.)

WILKIE'S "Blind Fiddler" was painted in 1807, when he was only twenty-two. In many ways it is as extraordinary a work of youthful genius as Paul Potter's "Young Bull," painted when the artist was three-and-twenty. For twenty years Wilkie's pictures enjoyed unbounded popularity. They appealed to the ignorant in art as well as to the learned—"to the one by their naturalness of subject, their humour, pathos, and delicate perception of the salient beauties and interests of every-day life; to the other by their richness in colouring, their fidelity of detail, and their mastery of the brush." But after his visit to Italy and Spain Wilkie's style underwent a fatal change. His "fancifully dressed historical personages with their strange similitude of expression, and the sombre brown that pervaded their colouring," failed to attract the public, and from 1829 to his death in 1841 his popularity was waning. Lord Gower gives an account of the man and the artist which makes us wish to know more. Wilkie's life was one of constant, earnest, honest work, and he knew in his earlier pictures how to invest homely scenes with a never-failing charm. This book is a welcome addition to a series which all lovers of art have learned to prize.

The three new volumes of "Bell's Miniature Series of Painters" are wonderful value for a shilling. Holbein lived so long in London, and has done so much to keep Henry VIII. and his courtiers alive for us, that we are thankful to get such a complete and compact handbook. Anything about Sir Joshua Reynolds is welcome, and this little volume is brightly written and well illustrated. Holman Hunt has been one of the great religious teachers of our generation. Dr. Williamson's account of his life and art, and of the Pre-Raphaelite brotherhood, is very pleasant to read and very instructive. We shall look forward

with great interest to the appearance of the larger book on Hunt which he has in hand.

Les Derniers Jours de Pékin. By Pierre Loti. (Paris: Calmann Lévy. 3*fr.* 50*c.*)

France may well feel proud of Pierre Loti. He is a great literary artist whose effects are never gained by crude work or violent colours, but show in every line a poet's sympathy and gift of vision. He found himself in Pekin just after the allied forces had rescued the European residents from the Boxers. Dead bodies lay unburied, imperial palaces were deserted and became the home of European soldiers and diplomatists. He rambled about Pekin with his two faithful attendants, finding the silence and horror insupportable. In one house, evidently a wealthy one, the dismembered body of the mistress was thrust into a bucket, whilst her head lay under an armchair beside a dead cat. Coming on the scene immediately after the relief of the legations, Pierre Loti is able to give many particulars of the siege. The humble heroism of the poor Chinese Christians, Catholics and Protestants, who knew that a single word of abjuration or a single act of homage to a Buddhist image would save their lives, is fitly recognised, and the Roman Catholic bishop, Monseigneur Favier, is a noble figure. During the siege two or three hundred children were sheltered in his church. Their cries for food were like the bleating of a flock of lambs prepared for sacrifice. The cries gradually grew fainter, because about fifteen had to be buried every day. The bishop spoke of their brave defender, the young ensign Henry, who did wonders in keeping out the Boxers, and died in the moment of victory. He was so simple, good, and kind to the little children that everyone loved him. Each morning he came to prayers or communion, saying, with a smile, "It is necessary to be ready." M. Loti's interview with Li Hung-chang is very effectively told, and the hunt for the Empress's slippers lends a welcome touch of fun to the sad scenes with which we grow familiar. By a strange irony of fate the Boxer rising was the means of throwing open to western barbarians the most sacredly guarded parts of Pekin. M. Loti got admission into the Imperial City, even into the private apartments of the young Emperor and the bed-chamber of the Empress. The sombre oratory behind it was full of Buddhist divinities. Among these was one little figure of very old wood with a bunch of withered flowers before it,

the last offering made by the Empress to her favourite image before her flight from the "Violet City." Still more interesting was the visit to the tombs of the emperors. The Chinese only come here at long intervals to accomplish the funeral rites. The splendour of the white marble bridges and of the wonderful temples is made more impressive by the air of repose which seems to have fallen on the place. M. Loti gives some charming pictures of the athletic sports and amusements of the Chinese youth. His book is a prose poem of the highest order. We note with pleasure the friendly feeling that sprang up between French and German soldiers in Pekin, but are sorry to find that M. Loti has no good word to say of the English and Americans.

The Great Deserts and Forests of North America. By Paul Fountain. (London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 9*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Mr. W. H. Hudson describes this book in a brief preface as "a breath from a fresher, more open world." It is not the record of a scientific naturalist, but that gives it a charm of its own. It is the fresh, unstudied work of a true observer who uses his eyes and ears, and has contrived to make his readers see for themselves the great deserts and forests of North America as Mr. Fountain saw them a quarter of a century ago. The descriptions of beasts and snakes, of Red Indians, and of the miners and bravadoes of Nevada are all alive, and both naturalists and general readers will read the book with interest. Mr. Fountain has his fling at theology, but on that subject he has no pretension to be an expert, and his references to Christianity among the Red Indians are neither just nor generous. We have been greatly interested in the account given of the rattlesnake and the methods adopted by the woodsmen to avert evil consequences from its bite. The most lurid pages are those which describe Carson thirty years ago as the Sodom of the West. "These devils made the atmosphere smoke of hell. One felt blasted by their contagion as by a black death. And there were women here; oh! God, such women! The men were almost clean compared with them." The city was then only about sixteen years old, and Mr. Fountain adds, "I am afraid that most western towns have had a similar baptism to that which I have attempted to describe." He warns all Englishmen to avoid Mexico as a country where they are abhorred and can never obtain justice.

The Path to Rome. By H. Belloc. (London: George Allen. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The writer of this book is a Frenchman who has made his home in England, and speaks of "the dear villages of Sussex that lie under my downs." He set out from Toul on a pilgrimage to Rome, crossing Switzerland and the Alps, and then dropping down into Italy. The book is neither a guide-book nor a history; it contains the impressions and reflections of a traveller who tramped his thirty miles a day and often slept under the shelter of trees or on a heap of straw. The pictures are from M. Belloc's own pencil, and some of them are gems. There are bits of happy description. The Alps conquered him. He tried to cross them with a guide, but failed. "Now I know that Italy will always stand apart. She is cut off by no ordinary wall, and Death has all his army on her frontiers." Much food for thought and some for laughter is in these pages, though the book will be pronounced too discursive and too meandering by some readers. M. Belloc does not write for such. He says: "Oh blessed quality of books, that makes them a refuge from living! For in a book everything can be made to fit in, all tedium can be skipped over, and the intense moments can be made timeless and eternal; and as a poet who is too little known has well said in one of his unpublished lyrics, we, by the art of writing,

Can fix the high elusive hour
And stand in things divine!"

The Scott Country. By W. S. Crockett. Illustrated. (London: A. & C. Black. 6*s.*)

The Scott country might be included in a triangle drawn from Berwick-on-Tweed to the Solway, thence northward to Tweedsmuir and Broughton in Peeblesshire, and back again to Berwick. Mr. Crockett was born in the region, and is now minister of Tweedsmuir. Like Sir Walter himself, he is steeped in the lore of the Borders, and knows how to chain his listeners' attention as he opens his treasures. Our pilgrimage over this enchanted ground begins with the little farm at Smailholm, where Scott was sent in his third year to get the fresh air and wholesome food of the country. The village has altered little in the last century, save for the gradual dilapidation which has overtaken it. It is in the heart of a romance-haunted region, and the little visitor drank in its legends and poetry with delight.

When he was twelve he spent six months at Kelso, which he has described as the "most beautiful if not the most romantic village in Scotland." The master of the grammar school, Lancelot Whale, was a prodigious man, almost as grotesque and ungainly as "Dominie Sampson" himself; but he was a true friend to the boy of genius, who was for a time under his care. The Ballantynes were Scott's schoolfellows. Under Mr. Crockett's charge we visit the lovely vale of the Jed and the town of Jedburgh, once a lair of Border fighting men. Scott's homes, Ashiestiel and Abbotsford, furnish a host of reminiscences. The fine pictures add much to the charm of the pilgrimage. Mr. Crockett has earned the thanks of every lover of the Borderland. His book is full of details which make Scott and Scott's stories and poems more delightful and interesting than ever.

The Lake Counties. By W. G. Collingwood. (London: Dent & Co. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The fourth volume of Messrs. Dent's "County Guides" has the characteristics which have won such a welcome for its predecessors. The usual information which a tourist or resident expects from a guide-book is served up with a literary flavour which makes it really pleasant reading, and the itineraries are supplemented by articles on birds, butterflies, and moths, the flora, the geology, fox-hunting, mountaineering, yachting, angling, shooting, and cycling, written by experts and enthusiasts. The Gazetteer is an excellent feature of these Guides, and this is thoroughly reliable and helpful. The beauties of the Lake Counties are known to all the world, and those who have long loved them will renew their pleasure as they read Mr. Collingwood's descriptions. The quaint customs of such regions as Borrowdale and the literary associations of the district are of special interest. The "dalesmen" are a race by themselves, and Mr. Collingwood's tribute will be endorsed by all who know them. We are heartily thankful for this handbook. It is really first rate.

Mr. C. A. Pearson has sent us five volumes of his "Gossipy Guide" (1*s.* per volume): *Paris and its Environs*; *London and District*; *The Thames from Source to Sea*; *Edinburgh and District*; *Great Yarmouth, Lowestoft, and Cromer*. The Guides are neatly bound in red, and are a convenient size for the tourist. The maps are excellent, and the volumes are full of pictures

which are wonderfully distinct and admirably selected. The arrangement of matter is clear, and the aim has been to give the facts in few words and to guide a visitor direct to what he ought to see. The itinerary suggested for the "Zoo" is a good illustration of the merits of these Guides. There is nothing quite like them, and they are bound to win their way to favour.

Days in the Isle of Wight. By Paul Bourget. The English Version by M. C. Warrilow. (London: H. W. Bell. 1*s.* 6*d.*)

M. Bourget's visit was in 1880, and he lingers pleasantly over the holiday life of Shanklin and Ryde, and a review by Queen Victoria of some troops proceeding to Afghanistan. His visit was only what the Italians call an "occhiata," and he has nothing to tell us about the chief beauties and sights of the Isle of Wight; but there is a charm of its own about this slight fragment which will make it a welcome companion for a leisure hour. It is very neatly got up, and printed with wide margins.

Messrs. Gall & Inglis have done cyclists new service by their *Royal Road Book of Ireland* (1*s.* net). It is similar to the volumes for England and Scotland, and contains 200 maps and plans, which form an outline picture of the roads with their rise and fall and the condition of the surface. Inns and objects of interest are duly noted, and the light and compact little volume will slip into any pocket.

Diocesan Histories: Llandaff. By E. J. Newell, M.A. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Newell has found abundant material at his hand for this history of Llandaff, and has taken great pains to make his record both interesting and instructive to English readers. It is not a very edifying story. Bishop Kitchin ruined the See in 1553 by granting the manor of Landaff to a layman. One of his successors described him as "the calamity of the See." "He sold in parcels all the episcopal farms with the exception of a very few, and let out the rest on very long leases, receiving extremely small payments." The chief friends of the diocese have been the present bishop and his predecessor, who have conquered immense difficulties, and set themselves to meet the claims not only of the cathedral, but of the growing population of their see.

VI. BELLES LETTRES.

Between Ourselves. Some of the Little Problems of Life. By Max O'Rell. (London : Chatto & Windus. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

MAX O'RELL plays the part of candid critic to perfection, and John Bull has not shown himself indisposed to listen. It is profitable to know our faults so thoroughly, and there is no lack of good advice as to the best way of amending them. We like to laugh even at ourselves, and sometimes Max O'Rell allows us the rare luxury of a laugh at our neighbours across the Channel. It is true that they teach the gospel of cheerfulness in France, whilst Anglo-Saxon teachers say with a sigh, "This is a sad world"; yet we are told that "the Frenchman is badly governed; he is a bad politician and a worse republican." "The Little Problems of Life concerning Men" are handled first in this volume, then come those concerning women. Brief chapters and well spiced keep attention alive, and there is a fund of wisdom and good temper beneath the banter and satire which makes Max O'Rell a delightful fireside companion. We wish that a few flippant and somewhat irreverent sentences had been cut out. Max O'Rell keeps his eyes open, but we conclude that he does not know everything. He says, "I have never met a woman who was afraid of her husband, but I have met any number of men who were afraid of their wives." We wish we could forget those we have met. Here are a few sentences picked out almost at random. "It has been said that men are as old as they feel, and women are as old as they look, and that is why men go to the chemist while women go the perfumer." "Outside of public life, the more privileges women will enjoy the happier men will be, and the more progress society will make." "Amiability and cheerfulness are the keynotes of happiness in matrimonial life." We are glad that none of the bitter and insulting criticisms made by the author upon this country during the South African war reappear in this volume.

The Buried Temple. By Maurice Maeterlinck. Translated by Alfred Sutro. With Portrait. (London : George Allen. 5*s.* net.)

These essays cannot fail to stir a reader's mind. The sub-

jects dealt with are The Mystery of Justice, The Evolution of Mystery, The Kingdom of Matter, The Past, and Luck. We have noted many brilliant and suggestive passages, but we cannot follow the essayist at all points. His "Justice" is vague, and his plea for vegetarianism is forced and out of place. The reference to Marcus Aurelius's attitude to slavery and to the "infinite iniquity" which stretched around him on every side is worth pondering. "It would surely have been highly dangerous to confide the destinies of the species to Plato or Aristotle, Marcus Aurelius, Shakespeare, or Montesquieu." The essay on "The Past" is stimulating, and some strange facts about human destiny are gathered together in the paper on "Luck."

The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D. Edited by Temple Scott. Vol. IX. Contributions to "The Tatler," "The Examiner," "The Spectator," and "The Intelligencer." (London: George Bell & Sons. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Scott's Introduction is a real help to the understanding of Swift's papers in *The Examiner* and *The Tatler*. He shows that it is a mistake to describe him as "The Prince of Journalists." The journalist is the man of the hour. "Both his text and his heads are ready-made for him." That Swift's writings took journalistic form was merely an accident. They are really a criticism of the social and political life of the first thirty years of the eighteenth century, when Swift was called in to assist the Tory party by his work in *The Examiner*. His appeal to the people of England for confidence in the ministry was made as no other living man could have made it. The papers are annotated with great skill, and anyone who wishes to understand the England of Queen Anne can have no more illuminating guide than this volume.

A Tale of True Love, and other Poems. By Alfred Austin. (London: Macmillan & Co. 5*s.*)

Mr. Austin's *Tale of True Love* pleases us less than its companion poems. The tale is of the slenderest, and we cannot understand the lady's position. It is certainly not likely to "console" many readers. Some of the descriptions in the poem reveal Mr. Austin's power as an interpreter of Nature, and these a lover of birds and flowers will fasten on with delight. The pieces that draw their inspiration from Italy are very happy. *In the Forum*, as the poet scans the wrecks of

Rome, the whole course of its history passes in review, till the conclusion is reached,

> There is no razing the divine ;
> The gods return, the gods remain.

There is real music in *Polyphemus*, and *A Border Burn* has a lilt and movement which well befit the theme. *Beatrice*, the story of a girl's life from her maiden glory to her grandmother's chair, is one of the best pieces in the volume, though the closing line irritates us. *Florence* is a tribute to the city of poets and sculptors. *The Passing of the Century* is the gem of the collection. Rich thought is here in stately words. Mr. Austin has given us real pleasure by this set of poems.

Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám in English Verse. By Edward Fitzgerald. (London : H. W. Bell. 3*s*.)

This is Fitzgerald's first edition, which had once to be consigned to Mr. Quarritch's penny box. It is accompanied by a life of the poet and the translator, by a critical note from the pen of N. H. Dale, and an address by the Honourable John Hay to the Omar Khayyám Club in 1897. A vocabulary and some verses in praise of Omar and his work add to the interest of an edition that many will learn to look upon as a treasure. It is got up in a style that makes it specially fit for a present. The problem of human life has seldom been more suggestively or sadly handled than by the Persian *Ecclesiastes* and his modern interpreter.

Messrs. George Bell & Sons publish a tasteful edition of the *Rubáiyát* with illustrations by R. Anning Bell, which add much to the interest of the poem. They seem to enter into its very spirit.

Messrs. Dent & Co. send us *Dramatic and Early Poems*, by Matthew Arnold, and *Past and Present*, by Thomas Carlyle. They are the latest volumes of "The Temple Classics" (1*s*. 6*d*. net). The portrait of Arnold is from a photograph taken when he was fifty-five ; the selection of poems has been made by Mr. Buxton Forman, whose biographical epilogue and notes will be prized by all who study the poems. *Past and Present* is a reprint of the first edition of 1843, to which Mr. Oliphant Smeaton has added some useful notes. The reproduction of Mr. Boehm's bust of Carlyle is very fine. This is an edition that many will be thankful to secure.

Horæ Fugaces. Poems. By W. A. Adams. (London: Elliot Stock. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

These poems are very unequal, and some of those that are least musical have unfortunately got to the front of the volume. We have lines there which are mere prose, and bad at that; but later pages show better results. There are fragments here that are both tender and musical, though some pieces are forced and empty. We cannot flatter Mr. Adams that he has given us anything that "mankind shall not willingly let die."

The Dark o' the Moon, by S. R. Crockett (Macmillan, 6*s.*), takes us again into the "Raiders'" country, among the Levellers and the wild gypsies. The region north of the Solway belongs to Mr. Crockett as it has belonged to no novelist since the days of Scott, and many a bit of description shows the hand of the master. The broad Scotch at times troubles a southern reader, but the wild passion, the unconventional love-making, the fighting, and the plotting make a stirring tale. Joyce Faa and Marion, the girl chief of the Levellers, quickly win their way to one's heart. Young people will greatly enjoy this stirring story.

Under the Greenwood Tree, by Thomas Hardy (Chatto & Windus, 2*s.* net), is an edition that many will prize. It is printed in large type, on fine paper, and very neatly bound. The story is rightly described as "a rural painting of the Dutch School," and it is not spoiled by offensive realism as are some of the author's later books. Village characters have rarely been painted by a more sympathetic or skilful pencil.

The Political Freshman. By Bushrod Washington James. (Philadelphia: Bushrod Library. One dollar and a half.)

This is a typical American book. Its hero and heroine strike us dumb with their graces and virtues. The ambitious lady lobbyist serves as a foil to the perfections of Ethel Joyce, and we watch the war of clashing interests within the Senate and are regaled with all the young senator's schemes for the good of humanity. The book is too highly coloured, too gushing and glowing; but it is a piece of genuine American work, and we have turned its pages with interest.

Gladys Fane. By Wemyss Reid. (Cassell & Co. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

This is the eighth edition of a favourite story. Gladys Fane herself is a woman made for love and homage, and Rex

Mansfield is worthy of her. But his evil fortune pursues him to the last, and the final catastrophe tugs hard at one's heartstrings. The story deserves its popularity. Some of its scenes fasten themselves on the memory, and from first to last the book is alive.

Sir Walter Besant's *Art of Fiction* is also republished by Messrs. Chatto & Windus (1*s.* net) in a dainty white cover. It claims that the story-teller is as true an artist as the painter or poet, and should inspire every novelist to make the best of his opportunity by careful observation and workmanlike work. The essay is very pleasant to read, and its practical sagacity is manifest in every paragraph.

The Life of John W. Walshe. Edited, with an Introduction, by Montgomery Carmichael. (Murray. 6*s.*)

We understand that this book is fiction, but few who read it will find that out. It is the story of a Lancashire boy who runs away from his hard and uncongenial life at home, becomes a Roman Catholic, and dies in the odour of sanctity at Assisi. Mr. Carmichael has certainly made his picture live. It is full of St. Francis and of Roman Catholic mysticism. Many pleasing glimpses of Italy and its people are found scattered through the pages. We are disposed to think that Mr. Carmichael sees all things through a halo of romance, and Walshe's parents strike us as unnatural and unreal.

We have received three of the earliest volumes of the "Unit Library" (Leicester Square)—Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*; Emerson's *English Traits*; Darwin's *Origin of Species*. The Sterne is in leather, price fifteenpence, and a dainty volume it makes with its cardinal dress; the Emerson, in cloth, price ninepence, is a little book that one finds it a pleasure to look at and to handle. Darwin is in paper covers, five hundred pages for elevenpence. There is an index, a glossary of scientific terms, and a very able and instructive Note of fourteen pages, by Mr. J. W. Matthews, summarising the development of the Darwinian theory since 1859. All volumes of the Library can be had in paper, but fourpence more will be well spent in cloth covers, and for elevenpence the dainty leather binding can be had. The page is 4¼ by 6⅝ inches, and the type is very clear. We hope the "Unit Library" will have a great success. It certainly deserves it.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS.

The New Volumes of the Encyclopædia Britannica. Constituting in Combination with the Existing Volumes of the Ninth Edition, the Tenth Edition of that Work, and also Supplying a New, Distinctive, and Independent Library of Reference Dealing with Recent Events and Developments. The First of the New Volumes, being Volume XXV. of the Complete Work. (London: A. & C. Black.)

FORTY THOUSAND copies of this greatest of all encyclopædias have been purchased in the United Kingdom alone during the past four years. In the United States more than four hundred thousand copies of the ninth edition have been sold. There is, therefore, a constituency of half a million readers who regularly use the Encyclopædia, and need to have it brought thoroughly up to date. The first weekly section of the work appeared at Edinburgh in 1768, and the first edition was completed in 1771. For a century and a quarter the Encyclopædia has been growing more comprehensive, more scientific, more voluminous. It is now fourteen years since the ninth edition was completed, and the world has never moved faster than in these years. Eleven volumes are therefore to be added to the work, containing seven thousand pages, and ten thousand new articles by a thousand British, American, and foreign experts. Two thousand five hundred maps, woodcuts, and illustrations of all kinds will be given. The complete Encyclopædia will then include more than twenty-eight thousand pages, and twelve thousand maps and illustrations. Special attention is to be given to the biographies, which will for the first time include those of living men and women. A vast index, extending to six hundred thousand entries, will form a key to the thirty-five volumes, and this index is not only to be exceedingly minute in its analysis, but to be constructed on the most approved methods for saving time and labour. To turn over the pages of the first volume is itself a study. The book has a kind of fascination. The article on "Agriculture," by Mr. Fream and Mr. Dabney, which covers fifty pages, gives a view of the subject which could

scarcely be found elsewhere. A table of contents and list of plates are prefixed, and as we look at the pictures of stallions, mares, shorthorns, and other cattle, with pigs and sheep, we almost feel that we are in a model farmyard. The article on "Agricultural Machinery" is splendidly illustrated. Science is represented by such articles as "Acoustics," "Accumulator," "Acetylene," "Air-gun." Dr. Ray Lankester writes on "Arachnida"; Professor Phillips on "Algæ." Every article is as complete as the chief experts can make it. The discussion of "Admiralty Administration" is the best we have seen. The subject of "Armies" is entrusted to such authorities as Major-General Sir J. F. Maurice. "Algebraic Forms" is caviare to most readers; but what a treat Mr. Matthews has provided for mathematicians in his seventy-six columns! "Allotments and Small Holdings" is a study of unusual interest and present importance. "Archæology" and "Architecture" are dealt with by Professor Gardner, Mr. Statham, and Mr. R. P. Spiers in eighty columns, which many will pronounce to be the most delightful in the volume. The advance of geographical science is represented by the forty pages on Africa, in which physical geography, exploration, trade communications, ethnology, recent political history are discussed by three experts. An interesting account of "Advertisements" is a relief to some of the graver subjects. The masterly articles on "Anatomy" and "Appendicitis" will show that medical subjects are not overlooked. "Astronomy" has been entrusted to Professor Newcomb; "The Acts of the Apostles" to Professor Vernon Bartlet; "Apocalyptic and Apocryphal Literature" to Professor Charles; there are valuable articles on the "Anglican Communion" and "Anglican Orders." The volume is really a library. Some of its illustrations and three-colour blocks are extraordinarily effective. Neither pains nor money has been spared to make this the most complete and most reliable encyclopædia in the world. When the whole work is finished we are confident that the verdict will be everything that the heart of editors and publishers can desire.

Studies in Hegelian Cosmology. By John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 8*s.*)

Since the decease of Dr. Wallace, Mr. McTaggart has been, perhaps, the foremost representative of British Hegelianism, unless Mr. Bradley is reckoned as belonging to this school. The present volume continues and supplements his previous volume

of Hegelian *Studies*, and is hardly intelligible without reference to it. Both show extreme carefulness, subtlety, mastery of the philosophy expounded, and a remarkable power of translating its difficult thought and phraseology into clearer terms. We may regard the volume from two distinct points of view: first, in its relation to Hegelianism, and then as to the help it affords towards an explanation of the universe. In his opening sentence Mr. McTaggart writes: "By Cosmology I mean the application, to subject-matter empirically known, of *à priori* conclusions derived from the investigation of the nature of pure thought." When this is limited to the exhibition and discussion of Hegelianism, it seems to us that, even when Mr. McTaggart modifies the positions of his text-books, he is faithful to their principles, and follows a sounder logic than has been employed before. His "three main principles"—"that the element of differentiation and multiplicity occupies a much stronger place in Hegel's system than is generally believed," "that Hegel greatly overestimated the extent to which it was possible to explain particular finite events by the aid of the Logic," "that the Logic involves a mystical view of reality"—appear to us established, except that the method of elimination by which Love is reached as the final determination of the Absolute rests upon a distinction between knowledge and volition which is rather accidental than essential. The only other criticism on which we will venture now is that Mr. McTaggart approaches perilously near to atomism in his contrast between multiplicity and unity, that his differentiations of the Absolute approximate to divisions. Nor do we see how this can be avoided. Moreover, if the Absolute is a "community," a "society," we cannot perceive the logical necessity of denying to "it" self-consciousness, on the ground that self-consciousness involves a "not-self" as well as a self. The Absolute might be conscious of its own differentiations which would be sufficiently not-self to produce opposition, as a man may be conscious of his own intentions.

If we inquire the actual value of this philosophy as a solution of the problem of the universe, we fear that it demonstrates little more than that man cannot by searching find out God. Hegelianism has resemblances to Christianity to which we attach higher worth than Mr. McTaggart does, and than Hegel himself probably did. Human intellect at its loftiest levels, in its strongest efforts, attains to shadows the substance whereof

is enshrined in Christianity. Yet the shadows are strangely distorted. We are offered an immortality involving eternal pre-existence, and both morally useless and spiritually unattractive; a substitute for God to which the only pronoun applicable is "it"; a theory of the Supreme Good and of Morality, less unworkable indeed than most of its atheistic rivals, but destructive of holiness; a curiously inept but withal dangerous conception of Punishment, startlingly clever and logical, but emptying it of nearly all justice; a presentation of love from which the love of God—both His to man and man's to Him—evanishes. With a closely reasoned chapter on "The Conception of Society as an Organism" we are in nearly complete agreement. The author shows that society can be regarded as an organism only by depriving the latter term of all true content. In some respects the chapter on "Hegelianism and Christianity" is the most important in the book. It displays plainly and forcibly the resemblances (not quite sufficiently) and differences between Hegel's philosophy and Christianity. The necessary verdict is that despite Hegel's formal adherence to Christianity his system is utterly irreconcilable with it. The last chapter manifests the tendency—to use no stronger word—of Hegelianism towards mysticism. It is enough to notice that idealistic philosophy, which is clearly the victorious system at the present day, inevitably brings men face to face with demands of the human mind before which "reason fails, with all her powers." Mr. McTaggart scarcely perceives whither the homage paid to emotion must in the long run lead.

We question if anyone has ever read completely the secret of Hegel. As an intellectual system, several scholars seem to have apprehended it, more or less fully and accurately. But the spirit of Hegel somehow evaporates in his commentators. For Hegel, philosophy was the expression of a real, if erroneous, religion. One is well-nigh inclined to say that Hegel came into touch with reality in a way analogous, *exceptis excipiendis*, with the experimental element in Christianity. For his commentators philosophy is chiefly dry dialectic. However this may be, Mr. McTaggart's *Studies* are not only a help to the understanding and appreciation of Hegel, an extension and application of his principles, but an intrinsic contribution to the progress of philosophy. The Christian idealist sees in their excellences no less than their defects the imperative need of

interpreting and guiding idealism by revelation, unless the claims of a great part of human nature must remain unsatisfied.

J. ROBINSON GREGORY.

Plato. By David G. Ritchie, M.A., LL.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 3s.)

Dr. Ritchie is Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of St. Andrews. He assumes that students of this book are willing to read a good deal of Plato himself. The subject is a difficult one. "To write on Plato is to tread on controversial ground at every step, and it is not easy to be at once brief and accurate"; but Dr. Ritchie has spared no effort to make this a reliable text-book, and he has brought a trained judgment to bear on such questions as Plato's relation to Socrates and Aristotle, and the order of the Dialogues. Great pains have been taken to keep the distinction between what is certain and what is merely hypothetical. The chapter on Plato's life gives the myths and anecdotes that have gathered round the name of the great master, and then seeks to reach some solid foundation of ascertained fact. Chapters follow on The Platonic Writings; Plato and his Contemporaries; Plato's Theory of Knowledge; The "Parmenides" and Plato's later Idealism; The "Timæus"; The Soul; Ethics and Politics; The "Republic"; The "Laws"; Platonism after Plato. The reader of this lucid little volume will find that he is in the hands of a teacher who knows how to arouse and hold attention. Plato's influence on philosophy and theology has been more widely felt and has penetrated through a greater variety of channels than even the teaching of Aristotle.

The Naturalist on the Thames. By C. J. Cornish, F.Z.S. With many Illustrations. (London: Seeley & Co. 6s.)

Mr. Cornish has spent the greater part of his out-door life in the Thames Valley, enjoying the delights which it yields so abundantly to sportsman and naturalist. The papers gathered together in this book were intended as a commentary on the natural history and character of the Valley as a whole, from the upper waters to the mouth. They are written in a style that will attract all who have any taste for such subjects. The shells of the Thames, which are quite unknown to most of those who boat on the river, have a chapter to themselves. Mr. Cornish says, "They are among the most delicate objects of natural

ornament and design in this country. Exquisite pattern, graceful shapes, and in some cases lovely tints of colour adorn them. River plants form the subject of another delightful chapter. Insects, fishes, eel-traps, poisonous plants, birds, hedges—everything about the river furnishes a text, and Mr. Cornish never wearies his congregation.

Anti-Methodist Publications issued during the Eighteenth Century. By Richard Green. (London : Charles H. Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Mr. Green has laid us under fresh obligation by this "chronologically arranged and annoted bibliography of all known books and pamphlets written in opposition to the Methodist Revival during the life of Wesley, together with an account of replies to them, and of some other publications." It is in some sense melancholy reading, but a new conception of the devotion of the Methodist leaders comes over us as we watch their bearing under this deluge of abuse and misrepresentation. No man could have carried out the task of preparing this bibliography so skilfully as Mr. Green has done, and every future historian and biographer of the Wesleys and Whitefield will be grateful for such a guide to the literature of the time. The volume is arranged in the same way as Mr. Green's Wesley Bibliography. Every library ought to secure a copy of this volume.

Foreign Missions. By Henry H. Montgomery, D.D. (London : Longmans. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Dr. Montgomery's experience as Bishop of Tasmania and his present position as Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel give special interest to this excellent and well-timed volume. He knows what "non-episcopacy," as he calls it, is doing in the world. "English-speaking missions which owe us no allegiance are annually spending millions more than we are, and are sending out thousands more workers than we, men and women full of holy zeal, well equipped, producing an enormous and high-class mission literature, and manifestly blessed by God in all parts of the world." He is persuaded that no Church or State ever died of over large-heartedness. He says "that Church will fare best which, while holding firmly the Catholic tradition, has the quickest ear to catch the whisper of the divine voice, and is guided by the most single-hearted, the most devoted, and the most teachable leaders. The Church of

the future will be the Church most in accordance with the mind of Christ." Bishop Montgomery thinks that Roman missions have been tainted by the political motives with which some of them have been undertaken. "History seems to show that all Roman Catholic missions cease to progress after a time, blighted by this taint, although the material in the field is excellent and the devotion beyond all praise." The thirteen chapters on the various Church of England missions, with lists of books dealing with each field, and the sensible chapter on Home Organisation and the things that should be aimed at in every missionary meeting, are full of facts and hints for speakers.

The Primrose and Darwinianism. By a Field Naturalist, M.A. Camb. (London: Grant Richards. 6*s.* net.)

The views set forth in the earlier chapters of this book have already been brought before our readers in an article which appeared in the LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW for October, 1899. The writer shows, with much wealth of illustration, that Darwin has not established his theory that reciprocal fertilisation is necessary to the full fertility of heterostyled flowers. On the contrary, self-fertilisation of heterostyled plants is the natural and legitimate fertilisation as being fully productive. Darwin failed to observe that the short-styled primrose was not subject to cross-fertilisation and yet was fully productive. He attempted to square nature to his theory. The writer of this acute and learned critique maintains that Darwin's experiments were unreliable and contradictory. Artificial observation under a net or in a greenhouse is not a safe guide. We need the facts which wild nature supplies in the fields and woods. Darwin gave an immense impetus to the study of nature, and the very failure which this volume fastens on his methods will show that the only safety of the observer is an open mind and a close study of nature in its natural state. The way in which the subject is discussed in these pages is most interesting and instructive.

Poverty and un-British Rule in India. By Dadabhai Naoroji. (London: Swan Sonnenschein. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

The present book, like Mr. Digby's work noticed in an earlier number, is an indictment of British rule in India,—like it in the unqualified condemnation of the methods and results of that rule, but very much unlike it in literary form and order. Indeed, the utter absence of arrangement will largely defeat the author's object. Papers written as far back as 1876 on the

Poverty of India, Correspondence with State Officials, Speeches in the House of Commons, Evidence before the Royal Commission, Appendices, Addresses at Public Meetings, are reprinted at length. A condensation and revision of the mass of material that would have omitted about half of the nearly seven hundred pages would have been far more effective. The Index is full, but the Table of Contents is a most inadequate and feeble guide to the volume. The imperfect presentation of the subject is to be regretted. However one-sided and exaggerated the indictment may be, we are all anxious to hear what natives of India think of us as rulers of the country. As it is, only experts, or those obliged to deal with the subject, will be able to use the ample material buried in the volume.

Commercial Trusts. By John R. Dos Passos. (London : Putnam's Sons. 5*s*.)

This is the argument which Mr. Dos Passos addressed in December, 1879, to the Industrial Commission at Washington, on "The Growth and Rights of Aggregated Capital." He has no difficulty in showing that some of the chief enterprises of the modern world would have been impossible without aggregations of capital, and he holds that the existing laws are adequate to deal with any cases of direct corruption. The subject is a vital one, and the argument here is worked out with ample knowledge and great legal ability. The evils of the trust system are largely left out of sight, yet Mr. Dos Passos is not defending abuses but upholding the right of capital to find remunerative employment.

One and All Gardening for 1902. Edited by E. O. Greening. (London : 92, Long Acre.)

This is the seventh issue of an annual intended for amateurs, allotment holders, and working gardeners. Last year's issue had a sale of 60,000 copies, and the present number ought to be still more popular. The annuals are arranged to supplement each other, so that anyone who has the set will be in possession of a mass of information on all sides of the subject. This number has a pleasant paper on the "Garden of Fancy," by the editor, with special articles on the Rose, the Culture of Peas, Garden Adornments, the Potato, and Floral Notes. The illustrations are very attractive, and every gardener will find just the information that he needs in the most helpful form.

Science Chats, by Walter N. Edwards, F.C.S. (Kelly, 6*d*.), is a little manual on the Temperance question, intended to teach young people about alcohol, food, the heart, the blood, the nerves, the air, the muscles, and kindred subjects. The text is well illustrated, and experiments are suggested which could be carried out in a Band of Hope. There is much to be learned from these Science Chats, and Mr. Edwards never allows our attention to flag.

The Complete Cyclist (Ward, Lock, & Co., 5*s*.) appeared in the "Isthmian Library," and gives abundant information as to cycles and their construction. We have never seen the history and development of the cycle set out more clearly, and a great deal that a cyclist needs to know is better put here than we have found it elsewhere, though the book needs to be brought up to date. It has nothing about the free wheel, and without that no book on cycling is now complete.

The Briton's First Duty, by George F. Shee, M.A. (Army League, 6*s*.), is a strong plea for universal military service, with a view to the effective defence of our own shores. The subject is one that must receive growing attention, and the case for universal military service could not be better put. We do not think England will accept Mr. Shee's position, but he deserves to be heard with attention.

Bœthius' *Consolation of Philosophy* deserved its place in the Temple Classics (Dent & Co., 1*s*. 6*d*. net), and Mr. W. V. Cooper has given us a translation which reads pleasantly. There are only two or three notes at the end of the volume, but they are a real help to the understanding of the work and its place in literature. With such a translation in our hands we can understand the attraction which the book had for our own King Alfred.

Messrs. Dent's *Primer of Psychology*, by Alex Hill, may be recommended with entire confidence to young students. Even experts will find the facts with which they are familiar stated and illustrated in a way that will teach them much. The explanations of sea-sickness, of the breaking of the voice, and other matters have greatly interested us, and we owe our hearty thanks to the writer of this valuable Primer. Mr. Hill does not attempt to cover too wide an area, but he makes everything so clear and so full of interest that a student will want to push forward his studies. The price is only a shilling.

VIII. SUMMARY OF FOREIGN REVIEWS.

METHODIST REVIEW (March—April).—Dr. Swift, of Chicago, gives a good account of the "Third Œcumenical Conference." He says it was "a genuinely œcumenical gathering," which deserved even Dr. Clifford's tribute: "You are far more than an imperial Church. You are truly Catholic. I rejoice in your thirty million adherents, but I do not count them your best possession. I rejoice most in your ideals. They are universal, and your spirit is in accord with them. You have always stood for three great universalities: the universality of the love of God, of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, and of the work of the Holy Spirit. These are great ideals, and have made your Church and Conference truly œcumenical." The net increase of the past ten years has been 5,061 ministers, 5,584 lay preachers, 17,891 church buildings, 1,155,326 members. The Conference made a profound impression on other denominations and on the outside world. It showed, says Dr. Swift, that "Methodism is one in theology, spirit, purpose, and aim, and it will some day be one organically throughout the earth." Methodism is an evangelistic movement, and it is "to have not a little to do in the work of moulding the civilisations of to-morrow."

METHODIST REVIEW, SOUTH (March—April).—Dr. Beet writes a brief paper, entitled "A New Experiment in University Education," which describes the new constitution of the University of London, of which Richmond College is now one of the theological schools. A sketch is given in Editorial Departments of the Rev. Timothy Richard, who has been working in China for thirty years. Since 1889 he has been secretary of the Society for the Diffusion of Christian and General Knowledge among the Chinese. "Possessing as he does the entire confidence of the ruling classes, having their ear through his numerous publications as well as by his voice, he can, and will, do a great deal to help them see what is for the real interest of the empire. Others, equally able, are associated with him in the great work of the society, among them, especially to be mentioned, Dr. Young J. Allen, of our own Church, and the Rev. Arthur Cornaby, a brilliant member of the English Wesleyan Mission." Dr. Tigert has an article on "The Virginian Romances of Mary Johnston." He thinks "Audrey" is perhaps as original a creation as is to be found in literature. "Shakespeare's greatest women afford the only standard of comparison for a proper estimate of Audrey." Dr. Tigert says: "I shall not soon forget Mr. Walter Page's telling description, at Dr. Baskervill's dinner table, of the sensation created among the readers of these great publishers (Houghton, Mifflin, & Co.) when the merits of Miss Johnston's first manuscript fairly broke upon them."

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, April, 1902, contains a supplement of one hundred and ten pages giving full lists of Theological and Semitic Literature for the year 1901. It is a wonderful list, which includes volumes like Mr. R. M. Pope's *Timothy and Titus*, and gives publishers and prices. The compiler, W. Muss-Arnolt, has certainly earned the gratitude of all students. The notices of recent theological literature, which cover more than a hundred pages, are very full. Mr. Dewhurst, who writes on Professor Findlay's *The Things Above*, has evidently skimmed the book in the most superficial fashion, for he says, "It belongs to the general type of millenarian literature. It is very plainly not 'of the world,' but it is just as plainly not 'in the world,' and herein, with all its class, it differs from the religion of Jesus, who knew how to weld together reality and spirituality." That is a strange comment on a book that is intensely practical as well as spiritual. The little paper on "The Literary Work of Joseph Henry Thayer," is one of the best things in the number. Thayer was a pattern of industry. He said to a friend, "I congratulate you that your year's end is in sight. As for me, I am swimming for life!" He told his students, "Do you wish to become great? Remember it means more hours at your desk. The greater you desire to become, the more hours you must work."